

This exhibit contains excerpts from documents available on Qwest's website at the following URLs:

Final Meeting Minutes of the CLEC – Qwest Change Management Process Redesign, Monday, December 10 and Tuesday December 11, 2001 Working Session

http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/downloads/2002/020122/CMP_Redesign_Meeting_De c_10-11_Final_Minutes.doc

Final Meeting Minutes of CLEC –Qwest Change Management Process Redesign, Tuesday, April 2 through April 4, 2002 Working Session

http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/downloads/2002/020715/CMP_RedesignMeetingMinutesApril2-4FINAL07-15-02.doc

Draft Meeting Minutes of CLEC – Qwest Change Management Process Redesign, Wednesday, June 5 and Thursday, June 6, 2002 Working Session

http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/downloads/2002/020724/CMPRedesignMeetingMinutes5-6_2002DRAFT7-23-02.doc

Meeting Minutes of CLEC – Qwest Change Management Process Redesign, Wednesday, June 5 and Thursday, June 6, 2002 Working Session

http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/downloads/2002/020924/CMPRedesignMeetingMinutesforJune5-6_2002Final09-24-02.doc

CLEC-Qwest CMP Redesign, Combined Gap Analysis

http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/downloads/2002/021004/CombinedCMPRedesignGapAnalysis_Rev10-01-02.doc

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions, Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/downloads/2002/021015/CLOSED-CMP_RedesignCoreTeamIssuesActionItemsLog-Rev10-09-02.doc

FINAL MEETING MINUTES

CLEC – Qwest Change Management Process Redesign
Monday, December 10 and Tuesday December 11, 2001 Working Session
1801 California Street, 23rd Floor, Executive Conference Room, Denver, CO
Conference Bridge: 877.550.8686, passcode 2213337#

NOTE: These are FINAL meeting minutes Qwest developed following the two day working session. Draft minutes were circulated to the CMP Redesign Core Team Members on Dec. 21, 2001. As of January 21, 2002, no comments were received from the meeting attendees.

INTRODUCTION

The Core Team (Team) and other participants met December 10th and 11th to continue with the Redesign effort of the Change Management Process. Following is the write up of the discussions, action items, and decisions in the working session. The attachments to these meeting minutes are as follow:

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: CMP Re-Design November 27 – 29, 2001 Attendance Record
Attachment 2: CMP Re-Design Meeting December 10-11, 2001 Notice and Agenda
Attachment 3: CMP Redesign Meeting December 11, 2001 Revised Agenda
Attachment 4: Qwest Proposed Production Support Language – Revised 12-06-01
Attachment 5: Qwest CMP Improvement Process - 11-26-01
Attachment 6: AT&T Re-Design Issues List - 11-13-01
Attachment 7: CMP Re-Design Meeting Action Item Discussion List - 11-29-01
Attachment 8: WorldCom Re-Design Issues List - 11-13-01
Attachment 9: Interim Qwest Product/Process Change Management Process – Revised 10-3-01
Attachment 10: Changes That DO NOT Alter CLEC Operating Procedures - 11-26-01
Attachment 11: Schedule of CMP Re-design Working Sessions - Revised 12-11-01
Attachment 12: CMP Redesign Core Team Issues Action Items Log - 12-11-01
Attachment 13: Master Redlined CLEC-Qwest CMP Re-design Framework – Revised 12-10-01

Qwest could do a timeline for systems and product/process CRs. Schultz-Qwest stated that she would try, but that it was complicated when there were systems components to a product/process CR. Clauson-Eschelon stated that Qwest should compose one for a product/process CR without systems components. Van Meter-AT&T asked if Qwest could report on compliance with the process for CRs at the CMP Meeting. Schultz-Qwest stated that she could. Clauson-Eschelon stated that Qwest CRs must be maintained in an identical manner to CLEC CRs. Schultz-Qwest stated that this was the expectation going forward. Menezes-AT&T stated that as the Redesign process continues Qwest should solicit feedback from the CLECs. Schultz-Qwest stated that she already solicited feedback from the CLECs at the conclusion of each CMP Meeting. Clauson-Eschelon stated that was ineffective because no one wants to give bad feedback at the end of a meeting. Menezes-AT&T suggested that the CLECs bring all their feedback to Redesign for review and resolution.

AT&T Issue 5

Menezes-AT&T discussed AT&T issue 5. Schultz-Qwest stated that Qwest would provide the CLECs a list of reasons that Qwest would use to deny CLEC CRs at the next CMP Meeting. Clauson-Eschelon stated that CLECs wanted the ability to deny Qwest CRs. Menezes-AT&T stated that the issue should be added to the running log. Clauson-Eschelon stated that she didn't understand why CLECs couldn't deny Qwest CRs under the interim process. Clauson-Eschelon asked why Qwest even bothered to call a Qwest change a Change Request if it could unilaterally implement it. Crain-Qwest stated that Qwest now used CRs to encourage a discussion for 45 days before implementation. Clauson-Eschelon stated that she wanted to make it clear that Eschelon does not agree with Qwest's interpretation of the interim process, and that the CR process for Qwest Initiated CRs was just a notification process, not a CR process.

AT&T Issue 6

Menezes-AT&T described issue 6. Clauson-Eschelon stated that the concern for walk-ons is that Qwest will try to force Qwest CRs in the CMP agenda as walk-ons. She stated that Qwest would use this as a tool to circumvent the notice rules. Schultz-Qwest clarified that CLECs can, and have, brought walk-ons to the general meetings.

AT&T Issue 7

Menezes-AT&T asked that Qwest add a discussion of the Exception Process to the Action item log. (Action item 215)

AT&T Issue 8

Menezes-AT&T described the issue. Bahner-AT&T asked if Qwest had any guidelines for differentiating account team requirements and CMP issues. Maher-Qwest stated that differentiating criteria was under development. Menezes-AT&T stated that this criteria should outline the specific functions of different Qwest groups who work with the CLECs. Bahner-AT&T stated that the account teams have sometimes told AT&T that when AT&T challenges a Qwest position it should take its complaint to CMP. (Action item 216)

AT&T Issue 9

Menezes-AT&T explained that he felt CLECs needed a way to halt a change that did not use the CMP. Dixon-WorldCom stated that this was the same issue as the Additional Testing escalation. Menezes-AT&T stated that this was for instances where Qwest had not issued a CR. Bahner-AT&T described a problem with customer codes. Crain-Qwest stated that the problem Bahner described may not have been a process change. Clauson-Eschelon asked if there were procedures in place to check CLEC impacts before someone makes a process change at Qwest.

Dixon-WorldCom recommended a CMP Help Desk be staffed. Lee asked if this issue was really a CMP or training issue rather than a Redesign issue.

Van Meter-AT&T stated that she had an issue that applied to AT&T issue 8. She stated that she had submitted several CRs after waiting for a month for the account managers to solve a problem. After a month she was told by her Account Manager to use the CMP. Schultz-Qwest stated that she had targeted modules of CMP training for account and service managers. Menezes-AT&T stated that Qwest needed to develop guidelines for the responsibilities of account and service managers so the CLECs don't waste time going to them for issues that should be submitted to the CMP. Zulevic-Covad stated that a CMP Help Desk could help with this.

Clauson-Eschelon stated that she had an issue that pertained to AT&T issue 4. She stated that Eschelon had submitted a CR in the beginning of November, and that they had not been contacted for a clarification meeting to date. Schultz-Qwest stated that Qwest had sent Eschelon an immediate response to that CR and that the issue was outside of the scope of CMP and being worked elsewhere. Clauson-Eschelon stated the Qwest response did not make those points adequately clear. She stated that regardless of whether the CR was within the scope of CMP it should be posted and have its status reflected as denied. There was further discussion of whether that specific CR was within the scope of CMP. Powers-Eschelon stated that the team needed definition of how the PID/PAP apply to CMP. Crain-Qwest reiterated that the issue was whether or not changes for PID/PAP were up for discussion in CMP. He stated that Qwest's position was that they were not. Powers-Eschelon stated that the question Eschelon had was whether Qwest was within the bounds of a PID. Schultz-Qwest stated that Qwest does not think the forum for PID/PAP is the CMP.

AT&T Issue 9b

Menezes-AT&T described the issue. Bahner-AT&T stated that when Qwest makes a back end systems change that affects CLECs, Qwest should open an ISC ticket that documents a workaround so that AT&T doesn't have to call in 200 tickets for 200 LSRs with the same problem.

AT&T Issue 10

Menezes-AT&T stated that the team should discuss this issue later.

AT&T Issue 11

Menezes-AT&T asked how Qwest reconciles two similar CRs. Schultz-Qwest stated that she could craft language to this issue. She stated that Qwest also had to develop a housekeeping process for old CRs.

AT&T Issue 12

Clauson-Eschelon asked if Qwest could publish the dates for CMP status filings. Crain-Qwest stated that he would try to send out an email with the dates. (Action item 69)

AT&T Issue 13

Menezes-AT&T described the issue. The issue was added to the Issue/Action log and the Running List(See Attachment 7).

AT&T Issue 14

Maher-Qwest stated that the language Menezes was looking for was under CR initiation. He stated that the team should copy this language to changes to existing interfaces, retirement of interfaces, and introduction of interfaces. Menezes-AT&T stated that he wanted language to

FINAL MEETING MINUTES

**CLEC – Qwest Change Management Process Redesign
Tuesday, April 2 through April 4, 2002 Working Session**
1801 California Street, Room 2, 13th floor, Denver, CO
Conference Bridge: 877.550.8686, passcode 2213337#

NOTE: These are FINAL meeting minutes Qwest developed following the working session. Draft minutes were circulated to the CMP Redesign Core Team Members on April 23, 2002. As of July 11, 2002, no comments were received from the meeting attendees.

INTRODUCTION

The Core Team (Team) and other participants met April 2-4 to continue with the Redesign effort of the Change Management Process. Following is the write up of the discussions, action items, and decisions in the working session. The attachments to these meeting minutes are as follow:

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1: CMP Redesign April 2-4 Attendance Record
- Attachment 2: CMP Redesign Meeting April 2-4 Notice and Agenda – Revised 04-01-02
- Attachment 3: Qwest_Proposed_Qwest-Initiated_Product-Process_Changes_Language 04-02-02
- Attachment 4: Master Redlined CLEC-Qwest CMP Redesign Framework - Revised 04-04-02
- Attachment 5: Ranking of ATT Priority List Items Identified as 0's - Revised 04-04-02
- Attachment 6: CMP Redesign Core Team Issues Action Items Log - Revised 04-04-02
- Attachment 7: Qwest Service Center and Manager Roles in Relation to CMP - 04-03-02
- Attachment 8: Qwest Proposed Managing the CMP Language - 04-03-02
- Attachment 9: Interim_EXCEPTION_process - Revised 04-03-02
- Attachment 10: Qwest Proposed TERMS Language - 04-04-02
- Attachment 11: Change_Management_Process_Improvements_11-26-01Rev04-04-02
- Attachment 12: Action Item 227 - ATT Proposed ICA vs CMP Language - 04-04-02
- Attachment 13: Late Adder CR Language - 04-04-02
- Attachment 14: Qwest Proposed OSS Release Calendar Language - Revised 04-04-02
- Attachment 15: Qwest Proposed Production Support - Help Desk Language - Revised 04-04-02

MEETING MINUTES

The meeting began with introductions of the meeting attendees. (Refer to Attachment 1 for attendance record) Judy Lee, the meeting facilitator, reviewed the three-day agenda (Attachment 2).

Qwest-initiated Product/Process Change Request Initiation Process

Level 0

Schultz-Qwest began by stating that several members of the core team reviewed Product/Process notifications issued from 2/1-3/15 at a sub-team conference call meeting on March 28th. She then reviewed the sub-team meeting and discussed that Level 0, Level 1 and Level 2 change categories had been discussed in that meeting. She stated that the team touched on Level 3 and Level 4 change categories, and that the team agreed to work on those levels during the first day of Redesign on April 2. She stated that the team developed a Level 0 list, and that Qwest had additional items to add to the category. Schultz stated that the document had been updated to reflect the changes from the sub-team meeting (Attachment 3). Maher-Qwest stated that Level 0 list of categories was developed from a list sent by Clauson-Eschelon. Travis-WorldCom asked what Level typos in numbers would fall into. Schultz-Qwest stated that typos were Level 0, and that Level 0 changes do not include interval changes. Menezes-AT&T

3) then it would be issued as a Level 3. Dixon-WorldCom stated that at the end of the 15 day comment period for Level 3, the CLEC could request that the change be upgraded to a CR or stay with the level Qwest proposed. Schultz-Qwest stated that the reason Qwest agreed to the exhaustive list was because Qwest could bring forward changes not on the list as Level 3. Meeting adjourned.

Wednesday, April 3, 2002

Lee welcomed the team and reviewed day two agenda. She stated that the team would start with AT&T "0" List items (Attachment 5).

I.A.4

Lee stated that language was already in the Master Redlined Document (Attachment 4) relating to this issue. This issue is closed.

I.A.10

Schultz-Qwest stated that this issue applied to Service Manager vs. CMP language that Qwest proposed in the distribution package (Attachment 7). Menezes-AT&T asked if the language only applied to Service Managers. She stated that if the Service Managers needed additional internal assistance they could bring in a Qwest SME. Clauson-Eschelon stated that Eschelon had a different process for escalation in their contract in comparison to what was listed in the document. She stated that she did not think the document answered all of the questions in I.A.10. She stated that the document assumed that the CLEC already knew who to take the issue to. Bahner-AT&T stated that the Account Team did not know the role of CMP, and that the document needed to be shared with them. Clauson-Eschelon stated that if a Service Manager received the same question from several CLECs, then the issue needed to come to CMP. Schultz-Qwest stated that just because two CLECs bring a similar issue to an Account Manager, does not mean that it's a CMP issue. The issue could be with billing for instance and be specific to those two CLECs. Schultz-Qwest stated that the document (Attachment 7) would be added to the "Getting Started" information on the website and also distributed to everyone. Wicks-Allegiance stated that the role of the Service Manager should also be to bring changes to CMP. He stated that they should analyze all issues they receive from different CLECs, and bring related CMP issues into CMP. Schultz-Qwest stated that if there were an issue with a process the Service Manager would contact the process specialist responsible for that process. The process specialist would then complete a Qwest Product/Process Change Request. Wicks-Allegiance stated that this does not prevent the CLEC from completing a CR. Menezes-AT&T asked who the process specialists are. Schultz-Qwest stated that they are process owners and are responsible for M&Ps. She stated that they are often the SMEs at the CMP Meetings. Clauson-Eschelon stated that taking issues to her service manager to escalate was a process change from what she was currently doing. Schultz-Qwest stated that CLECs initial Qwest point-of-contact is the Service Manager, and if they have additional questions they can go to the Account Manager. Menezes-AT&T stated that the document would give the Service Managers and Account Managers a common understanding of their roles in relationship to CMP. Clauson-Eschelon referenced the escalation process in the document and stated that the team already created language for systems (Attachment 4). She stated that she wanted a link added into the document (Attachment 3). She continued that if CLECs escalated a billing issue they would not go to their Service Manager. Schultz-Qwest stated that a CLEC would escalate through the Billing Escalation Process. She stated that she would confirm the process with Judy Taylor (Qwest Billing) and also identify the Account Manager role. **Action Item #269.** Lee asked if the document (Attachment 7) could be baselined with the action items for Schultz-Qwest to review the Billing Escalation Process and Account Manager role. Schultz-Qwest asked if there was agreement in concept. AT&T, WorldCom, Allegiance, and Eschelon agreed. Issue closed in concept.

Menezes-AT&T asked what would a CLEC do if he/she was improperly directed to CMP by their Service Manager. Schultz-Qwest stated that the CLEC should contact her or the appropriate CMP Manager (Product/Process or Systems). Menezes-AT&T asked how would the CLECs reach Schultz-Qwest or the appropriate CMP Manager. Schultz-Qwest stated that the CLEC

could email their Service Manager with the issue and cc: the cmpcr@qwest.com mailbox. **Action item #271.** Clauson-Eschelon stated that the process says to check the website and then contact your Service Manager if you have additional questions. She stated that the Eschelon contract states that they may go straight to the POC without the extra website step. She stated that Eschelon tries to tell their personnel to check the website first. Schultz-Qwest stated that the document is trying to put a process around the issue.

1.A.4

Thompson-Qwest stated that LOE language was listed on Page 11 of the Master Redline Document (Attachment 4). He stated that on page 15 the document states that LOE is expressed in a range of hours. He continued that in the first LOE that is given to CLECs it is a broad range and the second time it's more defined. He stated that the document needed to state that LOE is always a range of hours and an estimate. He suggested adding information to the Terms document. Lee asked if the WorldCom comment could be taken out of the document and closed in the Gap Analysis. Travis-WorldCom agreed. Lee asked if I.A.4 could be closed. Menezes-AT&T asked if LOE was just a range of hours. Thompson-Qwest stated that Qwest would share any additional information, like having the additional costs of purchasing a software package to make the change. Allegiance, AT&T, WorldCom, and Eschelon agreed to close this issue.

V.e

Lee referred the team to the proposed language section 7.0 Managing the CMP (Attachment 8). Clauson-Eschelon asked about website management. Lee stated that it was covered in 8.3. Menezes-AT&T clarified that the "team representative" was intended to be someone at the CLEC's company. He stated that because there would be Level voting at the CMP Product/Process meeting, the team needed to address authorizing parties to vote. Lee stated that this issue had already been discussed. Wicks-Allegiance stated that a Letter of Agency must be submitted prior to voting. He stated that this was the case for CMP Redesign voting and could be rolled over to CMP. Language was baselined. The team will address responsibilities during a vote after the Voting Process concept is discussed. **Action item #172.**

I.A.5

Wicks-Allegiance stated that the CLECs would prefer to receive the comments through email. Clauson-Eschelon stated that in section 8.3 it states that the comments will also be posted on the website. Schultz-Qwest stated that Qwest would gather all CLEC comments and send a notification, including all comments received, with the Qwest response. Clauson-Eschelon stated that she wanted to see the comments so that she could join in. Schultz-Qwest stated that web posting could take up to 3 days and that every time a comment was received it would have to be updated. If a CLEC wanted another CLEC to view their comments before Qwest sent them out, the CLEC should copy their comments to other CLECs. Menezes-AT&T stated that the team could investigate adding a field where CLECs could add cc:s to the comment website. Clauson-Eschelon stated that this would be acceptable if the submit comment function emailed the comment back to the originating CLEC. The originating CLEC could then forward the comment to whomever they wanted. White-Qwest stated this was possible, and he would investigate the solution. Clauson-Eschelon asked what a CLEC should do if the comment button doesn't work. White-Qwest stated that CLECs could also the comment to cmpcomm@qwest.com. That information was added to the document.

Clauson-Eschelon stated that this did not solve the way CLECs receive notices. Schultz-Qwest stated that Qwest uses the Mailout Tool as a "post-office". She stated that she understood that it was confusing to determine what notifications were related to CMP and which ones were not. She suggested that she would investigate adding "CMP" in the subject line of the notification. **Action item #272.**

Lee moved the team to the related Action Item #156. Menezes-AT&T asked if planned outages were governed under the proposed CMP notice heading. Wicks-Allegiance stated that he did not want planned outages to say CMP, and that he just wanted the heading for items that were being

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

CLEC – Qwest Change Management Process Redesign
Wednesday, June 5 and Thursday, June 6, 2002 Working Session
1801 California Street, 13th Floor, Denver, CO
Conference Bridge: 877.550.8686, passcode 2213337#

NOTE: These are DRAFT meeting minutes Qwest developed following the two day working session. Draft minutes will be circulated to the CMP Redesign Core Team Members on July 23.

INTRODUCTION

The Core Team (Team) and other participants met June 5th and June 6th to continue with the Redesign effort of the Change Management Process. Following is the write up of the discussions, action items, and decisions in the working session. The attachments to these meeting minutes are as follow:

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: CMP Redesign Meeting June 5-6 Notice and Agenda
Attachment 2: CMP Redesign June 5-6 Attendance Record
Attachment 3: Ranking of ATT Priority List Items Identified as 1's - 06-06-02
Attachment 4: Master Redlined CLEC-Qwest CMP Redesign Framework - Revised 06-6-02
Attachment 5: CMP Redesign Core Team Issues Action Items Log - Revised 06-06-02
Attachment 6: CMP Redesign Roadmap to Conclusion - 06-07-02
Attachment 7: Ranking of ATT Priority List Items Identified as 0's -06-06-02
Attachment 8: Change Postponement and Arbitration Language-ATT Comments 6.4.02
Attachment 9: Exception Process 6-6-02
Attachment 10: CR timeline- IMA Software Development Timeline
Attachment 11: Qwest Service Center and Account Manager Roles-6-6-02
Attachment 12: Qwest Proposed Nested CR Process-6-6-02
Attachment 13: Qwest Proposed History Log Addition to Terms-6-6-02

MEETING MINUTES

The meeting began with introductions of the meeting attendees. Judy Lee, the meeting facilitator, then reviewed the two-day agenda. Refer to Attachments 1 and 2. She stated that Menezes-AT&T and Woodcock-Qwest worked off line and closed 1.A.6- PID Administration (Attachment 3) and that the language needed to be added to the Master Redline Document (Attachment 4). She stated that with this language agreed to, action item #262 could also be closed (Attachment 5). Lee then stated that the team needed to review the Roadmap to Conclude (Attachment 6).

Osborne-Miller-AT&T asked if the team could discuss whether the redesigned CMP includes a system change that concerns AT&T. Schultz-Qwest stated that Qwest was working on pulling all of the SMEs together. She stated that the issue related to the process when Qwest is the customer of a CLEC. Lee stated that the issue would be added to the agenda after the review of the Roadmap to Conclude.

Quintana-Colorado PUC stated that when she reviewed the AT&T 1's and 0's list (Attachments 3 and 7) she wanted to make sure that the team had closed on the SGAT issue (V.f.). The team agreed that the issue was closed. Quintana-Colorado PUC then stated that there would be a meeting on June 19th to discuss the inclusion of Qwest Product/Process Change Process into the CPAP. She stated that parties would have one week to comment on the CPAP.

Attachment 11

Qwest Service Center and Manager Roles in Relation to CMP – Revised 06-06-02

As discussed in Section 1.0 of the Qwest Wholesale Change Management Process Document, the purpose of the Qwest Wholesale CMP is to afford Qwest and the CLECs a way of changing, retiring, or providing development input for a Qwest OSS interface, product, or process. The CMP is not a forum to resolve isolated issues or CLEC problems that do not involve a change to the way Qwest does business. The CLEC/Qwest Interconnection Agreement may contain applicable procedures and if so this document will not supercede the Interconnection Agreement. CLECs should pursue resolution of all problems of this nature through the informative materials Qwest provides to the CLECs (e.g., Qwest web sites, Product Catalogues (PCATs), and Technical Publications) and through Qwest's Service Centers and Service Managers, as described below. CLECs should contact their assigned Sales Executive when they want to submit an initial product idea, qualify a new opportunity, and ask questions regarding their contract pricing or want to negotiate contract amendments.

When a Service Manager becomes aware of an issue that should become a CMP change, he/she should contact the appropriate product manager, process specialist, and other Qwest SMEs as appropriate who will address the issue in accordance with the CMP.

- **Requests for Information** - If a CLEC requires information that cannot be found in the appropriate website, PCAT or Technical Publication, the CLEC should contact its Service Manager. The Service manager will contact the Sales Executive to obtain the information if necessary. If the Service Manager is unable to resolve the problem or provide the requested information to the CLEC's satisfaction the CLEC should escalate the problem through the Service Management Escalation Process (<http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/clecs/exesscover.html>).
- **Systems Problems** - If a CLEC encounters a systems problem, the CLEC should first contact the Wholesale Services Help Desk (WSHD). If the WSHD is unable to resolve the problem or provide the requested information to the CLEC's satisfaction the CLEC should invoke the escalation process detailed in the Qwest-CLEC Technical Issues Escalation document (<http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/systems/generalinfo.html>).
- **Service Order Problems** - If a CLEC encounters a problem with service orders, the CLEC should first contact the Qwest Interconnect Services Center (ISC) Help Desk. If the ISC Help Desk is unable to resolve the problem or provide the requested information to the CLEC's satisfaction the CLEC should escalate through the ISC Help Desk. If the center escalation does not resolve the problem to the CLEC's satisfaction the CLEC should contact the CLEC's designated Service Manager.
- **Billing Problems** – If a CLEC encounters a billing problem the CLEC should first contact its designated Qwest Billing Representative. If the Billing Representative is unable to resolve the problem or provide the requested information to the CLEC's satisfaction then the CLEC should escalate through each level of the Qwest billing management organization. Questions concerning the application of the CLEC/Qwest ICA are considered compliance issues.
- **Compliance Issues** – If a CLEC encounters contract compliance issues, the CLEC should contact its Service Manager. If the Service Manager is unable to resolve the problem or provide the requested information to the CLEC's satisfaction the CLEC

Attachment 11

should escalate the issue through the Service Management Escalation Process (<http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/clecs/exesscover.html>).

- **Network Repair Problems** – If a CLEC encounters a network repair problem, the CLEC should contact the Network Repair Center. If the CLEC is not satisfied with the Network Repair Center's solution the CLEC should escalate through the Network Repair Center as outlined on the Qwest Business Procedures - Maintenance and Repair Web site, <http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/clecs/maintenance.html>. If, after escalation, the Network Repair Center is unable to resolve the problem or provide the requested information to the CLEC's satisfaction the CLEC should contact its designated Service Manager.
- **Product Information** - If a CLEC requires product information that cannot be found in the appropriate website or PCAT, the CLEC should contact its designated Service Manager. If the Service Manager is unable to resolve the problem or provide the requested information to the CLEC's satisfaction the CLEC should escalate the problem through the Service Management Escalation Process (<http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/clecs/exesscover.html>).
- **Chronic Performance Issues** – If a CLEC encounters chronic poor performance from a Qwest division or employee the CLEC should contact its Service Manager. If the Service Manager is unable to resolve the problem or provide the requested information to the CLEC's satisfaction the CLEC should escalate the problem through the Service Management Escalation Process (<http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/clecs/exesscover.html>).
- **Isolated Personnel Performance Issues** - If a CLEC encounters isolated poor performance by a Qwest employee the CLEC should contact the applicable service center. If the applicable service center is unable to resolve the problem or provide the requested information to the CLEC's satisfaction the CLEC should escalate through the Service Management Escalation Process (<http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/clecs/exesscover.html>).

In all above instances the reporting CLEC should be prepared to discuss the specific details and examples of the issue and all informative documentation researched. Qwest will conduct a root cause analysis of the examples of the problem, and provide its analysis to the reporting CLEC in a timely manner.

MEETING MINUTES

**CLEC – Qwest Change Management Process Redesign
Wednesday, June 5 and Thursday, June 6, 2002 Working Session**
1801 California Street, 13th Floor, Denver, CO
Conference Bridge: 877.550.8686, passcode 2213337#

NOTE: These are FINAL meeting minutes Qwest developed following the working session. Draft minutes were circulated to the CMP Redesign Core Team Members on August 22, 2002. As of September 24, 2002, no comments were received from the meeting attendees.

INTRODUCTION

The Core Team (Team) and other participants met June 5th and June 6th to continue with the Redesign effort of the Change Management Process. Following is the write up of the discussions, action items, and decisions in the working session. The attachments to these meeting minutes are as follow:

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1: CMP Redesign Meeting June 5-6 Notice and Agenda
- Attachment 2: CMP Redesign June 5-6 Attendance Record
- Attachment 3: Ranking of ATT Priority List Items Identified as 1's - 06-06-02
- Attachment 4: Master Redlined CLEC-Qwest CMP Redesign Framework - Revised 06-6-02
- Attachment 5: CMP Redesign Core Team Issues Action Items Log - Revised 06-06-02
- Attachment 6: CMP Redesign Roadmap to Conclusion - 06-07-02
- Attachment 7: Ranking of ATT Priority List Items Identified as 0's -06-06-02
- Attachment 8: Change Postponement and Arbitration Language-ATT Comments 6.4.02
- Attachment 9: Exception Process 6-6-02
- Attachment 10: CR timeline- IMA Software Development Timeline
- Attachment 11: Qwest Service Center and Account Manager Roles-6-6-02
- Attachment 12: Qwest Proposed Nested CR Process-6-6-02
- Attachment 13: Qwest Proposed History Log Addition to Terms-6-6-02

MEETING MINUTES

The meeting began with introductions of the meeting attendees. Judy Lee, the meeting facilitator, then reviewed the two-day agenda. Refer to Attachments 1 and 2. She stated that Menezes-AT&T and Woodcock-Qwest worked off line and closed 1.A.6- PID Administration (Attachment 3) and that the language needed to be added to the Master Redline Document (Attachment 4). She stated that with this language agreed to, action item #262 could also be closed (Attachment 5). Lee then stated that the team needed to review the Roadmap to Conclude (Attachment 6).

Osborne-Miller-AT&T asked if the team could discuss whether the redesigned CMP includes a system change that concerns AT&T. Schultz-Qwest stated that Qwest was working on pulling all of the SMEs together. She stated that the issue related to the process when Qwest is the customer of a CLEC. Lee stated that the issue would be added to the agenda after the review of the Roadmap to Conclude.

Quintana-Colorado PUC stated that when she reviewed the AT&T 1's and 0's list (Attachments 3 and 7) she wanted to make sure that the team had closed on the SGAT issue (V.f.). The team agreed that the issue was closed. Quintana-Colorado PUC then stated that there would be a meeting on June 19th to discuss the inclusion of Qwest Product/Process Change Process into the CPAP. She stated that parties would have one week to comment on the CPAP.

Menezes-AT&T asked if Qwest would honor one CLEC's report that a change was cost prohibitive. Schultz-Qwest stated that the team had agreed to work in good faith. She continued that a CLEC could use the Dispute Resolution Process at any time. Language was modified.

Travis-WorldCom asked if all systems were prioritized. Schultz-Qwest stated that only systems with resource constraints were prioritized. Travis-WorldCom asked if a CLEC wanted to expedite a system CR, would it impact the resources available for that particular system. Schultz-Qwest stated that it would depend on where the system was in the development cycle for the next release.

Wicks-Allegiance asked if super majority was 2/3 vote of the CLECs in attendance. Menezes-AT&T stated that AT&T and Eschelon were concerned about the requirements for quorum and stated that he wanted to address the issue in the voting section.

Lee asked how denied exception CRs would be referenced in the database. Schultz-Qwest stated that if the change returned to a CR then the "ex" suffix would be removed. If the requestor wanted to forgo the change, then the CR would be closed under the normal process. The Team completed discussion on language for the Exception Process. Menezes-AT&T requested that the document be e-mailed out to the team after the meeting and the team could complete a final review before baselining the language the next morning.

I.A.1 Section 5.2- IMA Software Development Timeline (Action items #197 and #214)

Lee stated that Jacobs-Qwest would join the team to answer any questions on the language (Attachment 10). Osborne-Miller-AT&T stated that Jacobs presented the timeline several months ago and that the CLECs had additional questions. Lee asked the team if the timeline should be included in the Master Redline. Jacobs-Qwest stated that it should not because the timeline could change. Schultz-Qwest stated that there was a disclaimer at the top of the document addressing the possibility of change. Maher-Qwest stated that the CLECs should not view the timeline as a commitment. He stated that he did not want this illustrative-purpose timeline to cause any confusion with the timelines currently in the Master Redline. Osborne-Miller-AT&T stated that she thought the document was helpful and there would not be confusion. She mentioned that the document stated that the times were approximate. The team agreed to add the IMA Software Development Timeline to the Master Redline.

Schultz-Qwest stated that the team should address I.A.1 on the ATT 1's list. Clauson-Eschelon stated that she thought that there should not be two sections for Qwest and CLEC changes. She stated that it should be one process. Jacobs-Qwest stated that early on in the development of the language there were two sections that addressed the lifecycle and now all the information was in one. Lee asked the team if I.A.1 could be changed to "yes" and if Action items #197 and 214 could be closed. The team agreed.

I.A.10 Qwest Service Center and Account Manager Roles

Schultz-Qwest stated that the language (Attachment 11) included Sales Executive roles and that it would be posted on the CMP Web site, but not in the Master Redline. Zulevic-Covad asked about the referenced Billing Escalation Process. Schultz-Qwest stated that billing is not a Service Manager role and those issues are handled through the billing personnel. Language was modified. Clauson-Eschelon stated that none of the processes listed overruled the individual contracts. Schultz-Qwest agreed and stated that a CLEC could also use the Dispute Resolution Process. Zulevic-Covad stated that a lot of his problems related to the interpretation of the Interconnection Agreement (ICA). The language was modified to add clarification. Van Meter-AT&T asked if all the processes that were listed in the document were ways for the CLECs to address problems outside of CMP. Zulevic-Covad stated that in the past he had many issues with billing. Language was modified. Lee asked if the language could be closed with the pending action item and what the next step was. Schultz-Qwest stated that Qwest would send out a notice of the location of the document on the Web site. Bahner-AT&T stated that AT&T could not

close on the language until the links were included. Lee stated that **Action Item #216 and #269 could be closed** and Schultz-Qwest would provide URLs the next day.

Nested CR

Schultz-Qwest stated that the Nested CR process (Attachment 12) related to systems CRs that needed a manual work around. She stated that the CR would be tracked through the system CR. She stated that the question was on how to track the CR. Bahner-AT&T stated that she was concerned about the manual solution, because if the implementation of system CR resulted in problem she would want the manual solution reopened. Schultz-Qwest stated that the production support process would solve the issue. Lee asked if there were any additional question and stated that the language would be e-mailed out for final review and baseline tomorrow.

Action Item #275 History Log addition to Terms section

Lee asked if the term "History Log" and the definition (Attachment 13) could be added to the Terms. The team agreed. Action item closed.

Thursday, June 6, 2002

The meeting began with introductions of the meeting attendees. Judy Lee, the meeting facilitator, then reviewed the day's agenda.

I.A.10 Qwest Service Center and Account Manager Roles

Lee stated that the team reviewed the language (Attachment 11) the day before and several CLECs asked for the associated URLs be added to the document. Maher-Qwest explained the location of each escalation process. The team made modifications to language. Zulevic-Covad stated that he would like a separate billing process, but that the reference was acceptable. Lee asked if the team could accept the language. She stated that the language would not be part of the Master Redline, but that it would be presented at the CMP meeting for final review. The team agreed to the language and closed I.A.10.

Nested CR

Lee asked if there were any additional questions on the language (Attachment 12). Travis-WorldCom suggested grammatical changes. Lee asked if the team agreed to the language and asked where the document should be placed in the Master Redline. The team stated that they agreed to the language and it should be placed in Section 5.

Issue and Action Log

Lee directed the team to the Issue and Action Log and stated that there were several items that could be closed.

#69- Quintana-Colorado PUC stated that the action item could be closed for Colorado because Woodcock-Qwest was providing the Status Reports. She then stated that Qwest did not need to provide any future Status Report for the state of Colorado. Woodcock-Qwest stated that she would continue providing Status Reports in Arizona and any other state requesting it. Van Meter and Osborne-Miller, both AT&T, asked that this item remain open until Menezes (AT&T) provides his input regarding whether this item should remain open or be closed.

#89- Lee stated that the action item could be closed because the team already decided that there would not be proprietary CRs. She stated that there might be proprietary comments. The team suggested language on addressing proprietary comments. Travis-WorldCom asked if the comments had to be related to a CR. Schultz-Qwest stated that they did not. Travis-WorldCom asked if any comment or question could be sent in marked "proprietary." Schultz-Qwest agreed. Maher-Qwest stated that the language should be listed in section 2.5 under Methods of Communication. Quintana-Colorado PUC asked if Qwest would ever have proprietary comments. Schultz-Qwest stated that she could not think of an example. Clauson-Eschelon

CLEC-Qwest CMP Redesign
Combined Gap Analysis

| # | Element/ Topic | Submitter(s) | Gap/Issues/Comments |
|--------------|---------------------------------|--------------|--|
| SCOPE | | | |
| 1 | Scope-Rates | Eschelon | <p><u>Rates</u>: Whether and to what extent/how included in CMP</p> <p>“The extent to which rates are within the Scope of the CMP needs to be addressed and, if part of the Scope, language needs to be developed with respect to this issue. . . . Whether and how either Qwest or CLEC rates may be the subject of CRs has yet to be addressed.” (Eschelon Comments/Nov. Status Report.)</p> |
| 2 | | AT&T | <p><u>Relationship to interconnection agreements</u></p> <p>Should have a discussion of what a “rate validation” is, how Qwest goes about it and address CLEC concerns raised in CMP. These are changes Qwest makes to rate tables that impact CLECs and there is not enough discussion (and no negotiation) before Qwest unilaterally makes changes to rates. [CLOSED 6/14/02]</p> |
| 3 | Scope- Interim Scope of CMP | Eschelon | <p><u>Interim Scope of CMP</u>: “The Parties agreed that the Scope of CMP encompasses changes to products and processes (including manual) and OSS interfaces that affect system functions that support or affect the capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users. Based on discussions since then and the Qwest-initiated CRs submitted (and not submitted) to date, however, the Parties have identified that further discussion is needed as to whether all issues within the Scope of CMP require use of CRs and, if not, the parameters for when CRs are required. The resolution of this issue may ultimately appear in the documentation in another section, such as the types of changes, but the relationship to Scope must be addressed.” (Eschelon Comments/Nov. Status Report.)</p> |
| 4 | Scope-Define | WorldCom | <p><u>Scope fully defined when 100% of the processes have been negotiated to determine completeness</u></p> |
| 5 | Scope- Production defects | WorldCom | <p>Are production defects included in scope of CMP?</p> <p>[CLOSED 4/4/02: Software defects are included under CMP-Production Support].</p> |
| 6 | Scope- Retail | Eschelon | <p><u>Retail</u>: “CLECs have indicated that they interpret the Scope language to include changes to Qwest retail systems or processes when those changes affect CLECs. For example, if a dramatic improvement was made to the raw loop data tool used by Qwest retail, ensuring that CLECs are aware</p> |

CLEC-Qwest CMP Redesign
Combined Gap Analysis

| # | Element/ Topic | Submitter(s) | Gap/Issues/Comments |
|-----|--------------------------------|--------------|---|
| | CLEC Comments | Facilitator | [CLOSED 6/6/02: Refer to Master Redlined framework] |
| 164 | Misc. - CR vs. Account Team | Eschelon | <p>CR v. Account Team: When an issue is within the Scope of CMP and should be handled by CR versus when an issue should be handled by the Qwest account team for that CLEC.</p> <p>We have had instances where we take an issue to the account team. The account team tells us to go to CMP when we don't think it is a CMP matter. How are account teams informed of the distinctions between their functions and the functions of CMP? (AT&T 11/13 email)</p> |
| 165 | | Covad | How does our account /service manager fit into the CMP process? Are they going to work with us to get resolution to issues that have become CRs? Will the CMP supplant the account/service manager? ACTION ITEM #216 |

**CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED**

CLOSED ISSUES and ACTION ITEMS

| # | Issue/ Action | Originator | Category | Description | Owner | Due Date | Resolution/Remarks |
|----|------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------|-------------------|--|
| 1A | Issue | July 11 Meeting | 3 rd Party Provider Role | <p>What role do 3rd Party Providers play in this re-design effort?</p> <p>a) 3rd Party Providers are part of the core team to re-design the process, however no ‘voting’ rights on behalf of themselves or the CLEC-client [Process=Yes, Vote=No]</p> <p>b) 3rd Party Providers are allowed to ‘voice’ and ‘vote’ as any CLEC in this re-design effort [Process and Vote=Yes]</p> <p>c) 3rd Party Providers are excluded from the core team [Process and Vote=No]</p> <p>d) 3rd Party Providers are part of the core team to re-design the process, however no ‘voting’ rights on behalf of themselves, but can vote on behalf of the CLEC client with an LOA [Process=Yes, and Vote=Yes for CLEC client, Vote = No for themselves]</p> | Core Team | CLOSED July 19 | <p>DECISION:</p> <p>d) 3rd Party Providers are part of the core team to re-design the process; however no ‘voting’ rights on behalf of themselves, but can vote on behalf of the CLEC client if a Letter of Authorization is in effect. The LOA must be provided to Judy Schultz.</p> |
| 1B | Action | July 11 Meeting | 3 rd Party Provider | Core Team to conclude discussion and participants to decide on one of the above scenarios | Core Team | CLOSED July 19 | COMPLETED in July 19 meeting. |
| 1C | Issue | July 19 Meeting | Voting | Can a CLEC represent another CLEC on Voting for CMP re-design process? | Core Team | CLOSED July 19 | <p>DECISION:</p> <p>Yes, if a Letter of Authorization is in place for a specific session and on specific issues. The LOA must</p> |

**CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED**

| # | Issue/Action | Originator | Category | Description | Owner | Due Date | Resolution/Remarks |
|-----|--------------|----------------|--|--|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 216 | Action | Dec 11 Meeting | Issue Management | Qwest to outline what the guidelines are for when an issue is appropriate for the CMP vs. when the Account team should handle it. | Qwest— Judy Schultz | CLOSED June 5 | GAP ANALYSIS #165 COMPLETED: Qwest to present at upcoming CMP meeting and mail out to entire CLEC community. |
| 217 | Action | Dec 11 Meeting | Addendum Documentation and Software (Changes to An Existing OSS Interface) | Qwest to develop language regarding addenda to release software and documentation. How is it done? How is it communicated? How is it documented? Are CLECs ever consulted? | Qwest— Jeff Thompson | CLOSED June 6 | 01/28: Following is a high level overview of the current disclosure, release and addendum process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Developer Worksheets -- 45 days prior to a release the draft Developer Worksheets are made available to the CLEC's. • Final Disclosure – 5 weeks prior to a release the Final Disclosure documents, including I charts and developer worksheets are made available to the CLECs. • Release Day – On release day only those CLECs using the IMA GUI are required to cut over to the new release. • 1st Addendum – 2 weeks after the release the 1st addendum is sent to the CLECs. • Subsequent Addendum's – Subsequent addendum's are sent to the CLECs after the release as needed. There is no |

**CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED**

| # | Issue/Action | Originator | Category | Description | Owner | Due Date | Resolution/Remarks |
|-----|--------------|------------------|----------------------------|---|------------------------|--------------------|---|
| | | | | Wednesday. The actual notices can be found on the web. (Qwest will send out the directions to the location on the web with the original list on Monday) | | | |
| 268 | Action | April 2 Meeting | Product/ Process Level | Qwest to evaluate whether a 25-page limit for a Level 2 when new documentation for an existing process is provided by Qwest. | Qwest— Judy Schultz | CLOSED Apr 16 | COMPLETED: Qwest-initiated Product/Process Change Process language baselined—see Master Redlined framework |
| 269 | Action | April 3 Meeting | Billing Escalation Process | Confirm Billing Escalation Process and modify document on roles. | Qwest— Judy Schultz | CLOSED June 5 | Document modified 04-10-02 COMPLETED: Language included in document. |
| 270 | Action | April 3 Meeting | Escalation Web Site | Verify Clausen/Eschelon requests on Escalation web site were implemented | Qwest— Judy Schultz | CLOSED 07-10-02 | Verified 04-08-02 Qwest is prepared to discuss and close this Action Item. |
| 271 | Action | April 3 Meeting | Comment SUBMIT Button | Create process if comment SUBMIT button does not work—i.e., CLECs may submit comments by email through cmpcomm@qwest.com | Qwest— Judy Schultz | CLOSED June 6 | COMPLETED: Language added to web site and web instructions 04-10-02 |
| 272 | Action | April 3 Meeting | CMP Notice Subject Line | For CMP notices, include “CMP” on subject line | Qwest— Judy Schultz | CLOSED May 15 | COMPLETED: Already implemented. |
| 273 | Action | April 16 Meeting | Color Coding of changes | Look into whether or not Qwest can color code level changes in the same notifications or just identify them in the history log. | Qwest— Judy Schultz | CLOSED Apr 16 | DECISION: Color coding is not a feasible option |
| 274 | Action | April 16 Meeting | Rate validation Process | Ask Sue Burson to join the Redesign meeting to provide an overview of the Rate Validation process. Determine if | Qwest— Judy Schultz | CLOSED May 2 | DECISION: Discussion rescheduled for the May 15 CMP Product/Process |