

**Verizon  
Mike Toothman Conference Call  
February 12, 2002**

**Mike:** It is Mike Toothman and I think I will try to do a roll call. Allegiance?

**Lori Ann:** Yes this is Lori Ann.

**Mike:** Telecordia?

**Lorraine:** Lorraine McDanielson.

**Mike:** V-Tel? CTSI? Global Crossing? BridgeCom? SBC? WorldCom? Network Plus? U.S. Click? Nextel? Broadview? Cablevision?

**Greg:** Greg Wadell is here.

**Mike:** I didn't know if I was on mute here or not. AT&T?

**Claudia:** Claudia is here.

**Mike:** Joyce was in the room but she left and will be back.

**Cheryl:** Cheryl is here.

**Rich:** Rich Krassley.

**Mike:** Sprint? Quintessa? Martech?

**Karen:** Karen DeBorg for Verizon Advanced Services.

**Dexter:** Dexter from Martech.

**Mary:** Mary from \_\_\_\_.

**Ann Marie:** Ann Marie Stearns from Choice One.

**Mike:** I guess we should try and identify the Verizon folks on the phone. I know Chris and Elaine are there.

**Christina:** Christina Hanson.

**Becky:** Becky King.

[Beeping, inaudible names]

**Mike:** Okay. Let me have the folks in the room identify themselves. This is Mike Toothman with Verizon. [Inaudible names] This is the February Verizon East [coughing in room, inaudible] Folks on the bridge should try and mute if they are not talking so we can limit the background noise. Folks in the room should not shuffle papers near the microphone. Please don't put us on hold as we get music then and it is the least thing we want to happen here. As you see from the agenda, there are several guest speakers lined up. Before we get into the agenda, does anybody have any opening comments? No opening comments?

**Eric:** I will be filling in for Kim this morning, kicking off.

**Mike:** Okay. We will go right into the first agenda item, which is topic 75 CAVA Uniformity. In place of Kim Brown will be Eric.

**Eric:** Good morning everyone. Kim Brown couldn't join the call this morning. I will try and fill in for her. I will tell you what I can. If there are questions I cannot answer, I will bring them back to Kim and we will get them out to you. I believe Neal Malaski is also on the line and Arlene Rock and many of you have spoken to Neal and Arlene in preparation for the conversion activity that is going to happen in March and in May. We are now about a month away from the March conversion. We have contacted and have follow-up calls with all of those impacted CLEC's that are involved with March phase one. I believe we have spoken on a follow-up call with all but maybe one or two CLEC's that will be impacted in May.

If you haven't been contacted, you should be on our schedule to speak with in the next few days. Many of you have had questions we have brought back to our subject matter experts. There is a Q&A on the documentation and those answers are posted there. If you asked questions we couldn't answer on the call, we should have gotten back to you individually. If not, please contact me or Neal or Arlene.

There are several CLEC's that we have not contacted, which have not done any business with Verizon in Virginia in the former GTE area and probably have no intent to do so. In that case, we will be asking permission to deactivate their former GTEDSBM since there is no intent to do business just to clean them all out. Any question about that? I don't believe there is anybody on this call that that will impact. It is mostly people that a year or two ago they might have done some contracting but didn't follow-up and don't have any accounts and, in many cases, don't even have any SBM. We want to make sure they are aware of what is going on and if there is anything out there that we can disconnect, we shall do so with their permission.

It is extremely important for any CLEC's that intend to do business with Verizon in the form of GTE to complete the new CLEC profile. That will ensure that information will be up to date and I am not sure if there are any in the pilot of phase one in March that

have not provided us with a new one. If you haven't done so, it is critical that you get one in through your account manager.

The preliminary ISOP USOP has been posted to the web and will be finalized shortly. It will also be available by FTP. Anyone interested in getting that by FTP can contact connectivity management and make those arrangements. Questions on that?

Finally, when we presented the activity for the uniformity for the Virginia conversion we had a follow-up call with each company and provided a listing of specific dates and activities and when you could do things and when you can't. The dates and deadlines surrounding that activity is going to be adjusted in a couple spots based on the issues CLEC's brought up. Watch out for change control modification in the next week or two, which will describe the changes. We will be sending out change control notices the end of next week and they will also be posted to the web. Anything that is significant, we will get back to people individually. Neal or Arlene, is there anything of importance that I left out?

**Arlene:** There is one thing issued over the last couple of days. Some of the CLEC's requested different service types than they had in former GA. Say they had UNI and GTO in former GA and just asked for UNI. Please double check the properties of the new profile to make sure all fields are filled in correctly and does indicate the service types you will be looking for in that area.

**Eric:** Good point. It is not just critical to fill out a new profile but please make sure you cross reference what you have today to what you want tomorrow so we make sure we have the best shot at making it all run smoothly. Just a reminder that the TAVA documentation is on the 128.11.40.241 and is listed on the last page of the document we sent. I don't think that is new. Please keep your eye out on the web and for change notices for any adjustments that might be coming your way regarding the March conversion. Any questions? Mike, back to you. Thank you.

**Mike:** Great, thanks. The next agenda item is Pat Hunjutory with WCC updates.

**Pat:** Good morning everyone. We have updated the WCC document on the Verizon website to update a couple e-mail addresses and also a change of a manager. We had one retire at the call center and that is Tom Scanlon to replace [beeping] That is all documented on the website. Any questions on that? Any issues or concerns you may have?

**Gloria:** My question is regarding where do we go when we have business rule questions relative to an up and coming release where the business rules have been finalized? Do we go to the WCC or to the CERT?

**Mike:** Are you in testing at this point?

**Gloria:** Yes but the question came up prior to testing. We sent e-mail to DA change control and then we were referred to the CERT. The CERT referred us to the WCC. I want clarification for future similar situations.

**Mike:** I think we recognize that we didn't handle that well. Pre-production questions on business rules should be sent to change control. We will send them to the business rules to get an answer. If you are in testing, send those questions to the testing coordinator.

**Gloria:** Okay, thank you.

**Pat:** Other questions or concerns? Thank you everyone and have a good day.

**Mike:** Thanks, Pat. I don't think Linda will be with us.

**Woman:** We may want to take a look at the line loss situation again. We are having problems.

**Mike:** I talked to Mary Ellen about that. I got your e-mail yesterday. We think the best way to handle that is submit trouble tickets through WCC and get responses there and if you are not satisfied with the response then escalate within the WCC escalation list.

**Woman:** You need to report it as a trouble.

**Woman:** Part of the problem is can the help desk for future development start making sure we have a recovery process? I don't think it has any power to do anything in that respect.

**Mike:** I think they do. I talked to Mary Ellen who is the director in charge of line loss support and Nancy Pushkar works for her.

**Woman:** We have contacted her and it has not helped at all.

**Mike:** We talked.

**Woman:** That is a complete failure route.

**Mike:** We can talk offline. We had a tough start but now I think we have the management team in place \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ and to get resolution. The WCC does have a lot of control. They are gaining more power by the minute within Verizon.

**Woman:** Who is the senior person, Mary Ellen?

**Mike:** WCC needs the trouble reported to it and there is an escalation list on the web. I am not sure what the first point of escalation is.

**Woman:** To me that is not an escalation.

**Woman:** The next step is John Doherty. Then it is Tom \_\_\_\_.

**Mike:** If it is not going fast enough for you then you can escalate to John. If you still need a higher point of escalation then it is Tom and then Tom reports into Mary Ellen like I do. We are finding if I try to get involved, I just get things mucked up. We are trying to drive all the troubles through that process.

**Woman:** It is important that we [breaking up, inaudible]

**Mike:** Anything else on line loss? For those folks with line loss problems, you need to submit it through the WCC to work up resolutions. Mary Ellen and Nancy are very much tied into the WCC. Is Pat Karney on?

**Pat:** Yes Mike, I am. I have one item today to talk about. It was sent out by the ITC team on January 25<sup>th</sup>. It was the CAB \_\_\_\_ full-scale phrase code conversation scheduled for the February 2002 release. Verizon will be implementing a broad \_\_\_\_ functionality changes for wholesale products. This project will deliver a common set of phrase codes and phrases text in CAB. All CLEC's and resellers which receive \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_ are affected.

The purpose of this retail phrase code is to have them appear on the CAB BTT as appropriate. This is a BTT enhancement and will provide improved descriptive information. The modification will facilitate our customers being able to electronically process their BTT as meaningful. Individual phrases will allow them to better identify their charges. One note here. Access BTT products are not included in this project. The announcement that went out contains two attachments. One is [beeping] and the second was a 34-page spreadsheet that contained all the codes [beeping] and a list for mapping purposes. This is a 1 to 34 page stream attachment you will receive.

The first four pages list the new phrase codes. The next group show a group of variable codes, "x" codes. Those will contain variable text or data information such as installment billing information where you have to put in a specific month or if you are listing discount information for specific percentages or amounts. The next group, pages 9-23 show the former North codes. The codes you can map to for retail codes. The last group of pages, 24-34 show the form itself and retail billing codes based on \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_ . Any questions on this item?

**Lorraine:** The only question I have is to confirm the changes only affects those people on CAB BTT? Those of us on NDM, does it affect us?

**Pat:** CAB BTT only.

**Lorraine:** CAB transmissions. We receive nothing on tape.

**Mike:** We use that term but I think NDM is just a delivery vehicle. So if you are receiving electronic records of your billing, it really is data tape records delivered to you over NDM. This would impact you.

**Lorraine:** Okay.

**Pat:** Thanks for that clarification, Mike.

**Mike:** Okay. I think I will skip down to Chris because I know she is here. Some other folks may not be joining until later. Chris, do you want to go ahead now?

**Chris:** Sure. I would like to say Happy Valentine's Day to everyone. We have a web-based system called WPTS, which is a \_\_\_ provisioning tracking system, which has been in trial with some of our customers who are online today. It is developed primarily for \_\_\_ and we want to announce we are offering \_\_\_ \_\_\_ as of today. To give an overview to some who may not know WPTS, it is a web-based organizational and notification tool for the coordination of the \_\_\_ Verizon \_\_\_ \_\_\_ over to a \_\_\_. It was created to assist the CLEC community and our regional CLEC coordination center and administrative functions and communications associated with \_\_\_. It helps organize the \_\_\_ \_\_\_ and replaces many of the telephone calls that used to go back and forth between the RCC and the CLEC's.

It basically is designed to improve quality and processes and efficiencies between our organization and the CLEC community and eliminates a lot of the manual work we had before and very time-consuming calls. Since the system identifies many different things about order receipt \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ and sometimes we need to have migrations involving integrated \_\_\_ \_\_\_ and you can tell that with the system. You get notification of the situation and also recognizes communication of the go-ahead while verification \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ and confirmation notice, etc.

We are planning a hands-on workshop for March 6<sup>th</sup> in New York at [background coughing, inaudible] We will be working on a notification of the details of that meeting hopefully by the end of the week. This is an official change control system. This is an exciting venture for us. I would like to thank all the CLEC's that have participated with us. You have helped to develop the system and make it what it is today and we really appreciate the partnership. We are looking forward to a partnership with the remainder of the CLEC community [beeping, inaudible] Any questions?

**Lori Ann:** One quick question. Will new loops be on WCPS anytime soon?

**Chris:** We are in the preliminary phases of looking at development of applications for the new \_\_\_ \_\_\_ and we do not have a timeline for that at this time. I talked to Mark Clark earlier who is one of the account managers heavily involved in that and I may want to defer to Elaine Goras to see if there is anything to add.

**Elaine:** We are working on getting the new loops into the production. I really can't answer the question now as to how change control becomes available. I am assuming we will handle it in the same manner as hot cut where we would have a trial and then it would go into general deployment. You could participate in the trial as much as you did in the hot cut trial. That would probably be at the end of second quarter.

**Lori Ann:** We sign up for every trial.

**Chris:** What would be the primary thing you would like to see on there?

**Lori Ann:** As closely as possible the information we get on WTTS. We would have everything there to compare with our own automated cut sheet.

**Woman:** That would eliminate a lot of calls back and forth between CLEC's and Verizon.

**Rich:** You mentioned something with regard to jeopardy and this is what supports that and it doesn't replace the jeopardy process?

**Chris:** It will not \_\_\_\_ [breaking up, inaudible] It is the part that happens thereafter to ensure recovery happens at the same time on the date \_\_\_\_\_. You can verify whether the sales organizations are issuing orders \_\_\_\_\_ and almost like a double verification that the number of lines that will happen from provisioning operations coordinate with conversion \_\_\_\_\_. You can verify port assignments as well.

**Rich:** If I receive an FOX(?) on my initial request and you can't make that time, I will still receive a jeopardy notice?

**Chris:** They would be doing that before they sent the order down the system through the coordination center. This is totally different from your FOX.

**Rich:** And jeopardizing an order if, in fact, you can't make that date and time?

**Chris:** Yes and no. Sometimes \_\_\_\_\_ will jeopardize an order for whatever reason when it goes through the \_\_\_\_\_. What type of jeopardy are you used to?

**Rich:** I am talking like an EDI transaction, which provides you with a jeopardy reason code and the text.

**Chris:** The jeopardy process whereby we send an electronic interface back to the \_\_\_\_\_ to say we can't do your work for another reason comes through the \_\_\_\_\_.

**Mike:** What happens? We update the backend system and that drives the jeopardy process back to the CLEC? We are updating that system with the status and then the CLEC would receive an electronic jeopardy?

**Chris:** If we took it back to the \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_ electronic process \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_.

**Rich:** In all cases, I will continue to receive jeopardy's in the normal fashion? The implementation of this WPTS capability does not change in any shape or form the jeopardy notification process that exists?

**Chris:** It is supporting information and [breaking up, inaudible]  
We would like to offer a full demo of the system. Your welcome to that. We will be sending out a notification at the end of the week.

**Mary:** Will that be about change control?

**Chris:** Yes.

**Mike:** This really has nothing to do with platform or resale. We are only talking about loops here.

**Chris:** Anything that involves an unbundled loop. Any other questions?

**Mike:** We really are trying to drive the loop CLEC to use the system because it does eliminate a lot of calls and a lot of confusion in the process. We are going to do our best to drive you to use WPTS.

**Lori Ann:** We were involved in the trial from the beginning and have found it to be excellent and I would encourage everybody to use it.

**Mike:** Let me ask if Nancy Donovan or Monica is out there?

**Monica:** Monica is here. This is Monica Moore. I am the Director of Connectivity Management and Support. I will be coming on change control every month to give you a brief update on some of the changes you can expect to receive on the Verizon wholesale website. That address is [www.verizon.com/wholesale](http://www.verizon.com/wholesale). We sent out a notification last week about sample orders. You can get to those sample orders by going to the main address. Hit local service providers and online library and you will see sample orders. We have eight sample orders designing on that link. There are four for the Bell Atlantic or East and four for the West. They include sample orders for platform and resale and UNI. They provide you with the forms in the fields for your LSR's for business and resident services.

To the side, you will see links to other information on our website as well as the direct link to our training and education website portion of the main website. What is different about this is that we are reformatting the Verizon website to take it from a bulletin type source of information to becoming much more interactive for you. If you go on and look at the sample orders, you will see that you can come into that, you can pick the type of service you are interested in. We have eight on there and are developing more.

We are working on the next round of 17 of them and we will notify you when we post those on the web. We are looking for customers that would be interested in doing usability testing with us. That means we would like to observe your actual order reps at the site and see how they are using those and if they are helpful. We would like to follow it through from submission to see how it goes through the system. We talked to a few customers and are looking for volunteers.

If you would like to volunteer your company, you can send me an e-mail at [verizon.systems.team@verizon.com](mailto:verizon.systems.team@verizon.com) and indicate that you are interested in usability testing with us. That has been put out there in the last week. Coming up very soon we will put out the rolling calendar, which is in response to what you have asked for which is basically a view of all scheduled events, workshops, meetings, etc. held for you at Verizon. You can search the calendar by topic. We also allow you to be able to access prior presentations by giving you the links to those.

Another thing is the training and education link on the wholesale website. We added quite a bit to that. We have our 2002 workshop schedule posted there. We have online registration capability available to you for that. As a matter of fact, tomorrow we will be holding a workshop on notifiers for both East and West. Coming up next month, we will be doing a workshop on ASR for local. Towards the second and third quarter we will be having workshops on pre-order CLEC migration and caption listings. We held one in November for East and West and had quite a few participants and a lot of questions associated with it. We post all our former workshops and include all presentations and slides. You can view those at any time. If you missed it, you can go online at any time on the website and take a look at that.

Also, we have two web-based training modules. We have taken the former classroom training content for basic resale, which was a five day class and UNI and UNI platform, which totaled four days and converted it into a self-pace training module that allows you to take the class as well as practice online the types of transactions you would be placing for those services. That is available to you 24/7 from your PC and can be accessed through the training and education link on our website.

Other things coming down the road that we will be announcing to you are the interactive functionality [beeping, inaudible] One of the first things we will rollout is a connectivity wizard, which is to come online to establish connectivity and you will be asked what type of interface and so on. The website will give you back the choices you have and you can select the connectivity you want, which will drive you to the form to fill out, which will be forwarded to connectivity management to start the implementation. It is the type of interactive functionality that we are building into the wholesale website.

Under development and coming to you soon is your connectivity profile information and CTE profile information. This is where we select all the information about your connectivity arrangements with us, which we share amongst ourselves and we are

working with our IP business partners to roll it out to customers so you will have access to read this information and verify it.

Down the road, we will build in online capability for you to submit this information to us. That is pretty much what is going on with us here at Verizon as we work to revamp the website and make it much more user friendly for both our customers as well as ourselves to use. Any questions?

**Mary:** The connectivity information that is being put together, is any of that [background noise, inaudible]

**Monica:** We are still in the process of loading customer information. One of the things we have done is

**Mike:** Excuse me. We have somebody that is speaking in the background. Can you go on mute, please?

**Monica:** Okay. Customers are operating in both footprints. It truly will be one snapshot of everything.

**Mary:** If we call in to the help desk or clerks, is this connectivity arrangement available?

**Monica:** They are one of the first organizations we are working with to get set up for access to that information.

**Mary:** They don't work with connectivity everyday. They may work with pre-ordering or ordering. They don't have all the information sometimes. That will help.

**Monica:** It will give them instant information to your site information. We will keep you posted as we roll that out.

**Greg:** I was wondering if this will be recast on the web?

**Monica:** How to put a trouble ticket in, you mean?

**Greg:** Right.

**Monica:** We have not developed an area for that. We are working with our business partners because we want to build this website so it covers all domains and so that each and every one of the domains is following along without interactive function. I will put that on my list. It is part of the whole picture. You have to imagine that the website today is about 12,000 pages. We have a big undertaking to recreate this thing. We are taking small steps and hopefully making great strides.

**Man:** Will the connectivity setup [beeping]

**Monica:** The scheduling will remain the same. I have not seen any changes to that.

**Ann Marie:** Quite a few of us attended the meeting in January and had a presentation on the calendar that is coming. Do you have a new estimated date?

**Woman:** I know it was January 2002. I can see what the new date is. I know it is very soon.

**Mike:** Anything else for Monica? I do encourage everybody to get on the website and navigate through it to be familiar with what is there. There is a lot of information on there that has been put on fairly recently.

**Al:** Sorry, I dropped off. The calendar is all ready to go. It is live and in production but is not on the site yet. We should be loading it this week. There is a person doing it and they were off on another assignment. It should be out momentarily really.

**Mike:** Nancy Donovan? I guess not. Let me fill in with a couple things. We talked about the LSR cancellation policy. We had a couple meetings on this subject. We have had some feedback from the CLEC's both during the meeting and outside the meeting. We want to have another call on the LSR cancellation policy. We will go over the concerns and issues and take another check of where we are.

**Lisa:** That would be great. Is change control going to participate in that?

**Mike:** Sure. I would like to schedule the call for the afternoon of February 28<sup>th</sup>. Yesterday we scheduled a call that morning to talk about pending orders. If there is no strong objections, we will send something out to explain this all but we will target a call the afternoon of the 28<sup>th</sup> to review where we are with the LSR cancellation policy.

**Lisa:** Will we have information ahead of time so we can do a bit of research?

**Mike:** Yes. I will leave that up to them. I will see what they can provide in advance of what our plans are. That is about the only item I think I needed to bring up. Nancy is scheduled to be here at 11:30. I thought we could move ahead and start going through the ISR release report, if that is acceptable to everybody. Hearing no objections, the ISR release report is labeled change control items by release and it goes landscape across the page. Does everybody have it?

**Woman:** I understand a revision went out on Thursday, February 7<sup>th</sup>. The file name was 21218 release item-1 revised.

**Woman:** That is the one that is 38 pages?

**Woman:** Yes.

**Mike:** Becky King will lead us through the changes to this report from the last time we were together.

**Becky:** The footer contains the date of February 5<sup>th</sup>.

**Mike:** That is right.

**Becky:** I have been out of the office for two weeks so yesterday was my first opportunity to look at the report and I do have changes to it. Tomorrow I will reissue the report highlighting the changes in red. I will speak to them today. The first one is on page 4 under February and it is CR1143.2. This should have been type two. It should have said that when we have multiple orders involved in the package they drop to level two today. This change is for orders involved in the entire package or for pending orders it will flow through.

The next one is on page 5. This is putting in an edit. When a customer moves or desires a telephone number forwarded to another location the \_\_\_ \_\_\_ indicates the length of time the customer specifies to have it forwarded and the current language indicates the resting state can be the same as the period of resting. It doesn't make sense. It cannot equal the resting stage. It should be greater than the resting stage. The date in this field must be greater than the date in the field on the ISR form.

The next one is on page 11. It is CR1750. This is to clarify the use of the TN reservation transaction [beeping, inaudible] The CLEC's need the ability to return all numbers not used in a timely efficient manner. It gives the ability to return numbers. The occurrence is being changed to \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ and the note should say \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ otherwise prohibited.

**Claudia:** I believe this is misclassified, as I believe the last one was misclassified. Type one are for things that are broken. These are not broken. They are just changing.

**Becky:** I can go back and find out why it was classified as a type one.

**Claudia:** It would be easier to get through that way.

**Woman:** This was in response to a trouble ticket. The CLEC was trying to return all the telephone numbers and they kept getting an [coughing] and you have to reserve at least one number. I want them to turn all of them so it was in response to a trouble ticket.

**Claudia:** That is fine but how are the current \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_? I can understand that the CLEC's would want to do that. However, if the business rules say they have to reserve at least one right now then it is not broken.

**Becky:** We did put out a bulletin to advise the CLEC's that they had to. We did treat it as a trouble and proceeded with a fix. Originally the \_\_\_ \_\_\_ did not specify you had to reserve at least one number.

**Nancy:** This is Nancy Donovan.

**Mike:** Hi Nancy. Hang with us a second.

**Man:** Is that to say that in the future any time your business rules don't state something that [beeping] a type one?

**Becky:** It is like a trouble ticket associated with it. It is a type one.

**Mike:** I think the CLEC was submitting TC per same as the date and we were taking it. I think the only reason these are showing up on this report is usually we would send out a bulletin to make the changes and the change would be implemented off the release. What we did in this case is we couldn't get them done prior to the release and that is why it is showing up on the temporary release report.

**Claudia:** What about 1286 on page 6?

**Becky:** That is one that was covered in December. I can follow-up and find out.

**Claudia:** I really believe these are misclassifications.

**Mike:** I don't agree. The last sentence is the result that no LC is currently being generated for these ISD requests. That is a trouble. We are not generating an LC for a \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ and that is a trouble. Am I missing something?

**Man:** They probably equate to a step one, right?

**Mike:** No, step two. Step one is when the whole interface is down.

**Man:** So a type one equates to a step two?

**Mike:** A type one has three severity levels. One, two or three and a type one severity one is when the whole interface is down and no transactions can be submitted. A type one severity two is when part of the interface is down and service is degraded. A type one grade three is basically cosmetic type changes.

**Claudia:** The sentence before that says currently the process \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ is not part of the LC rules matrix.

**Mike:** We need to do a much better job explaining things. That sentence is talking about an LL record is an internal record that is passed from one system to another. The system that generates the LC is ignoring this LL record. It is not part of their rules matrix. That is what is causing the local service confirmation to not be generated.

**Claudia:** Okay. I can go along with that.

**Becky:** We have a lot to go through. Do you want to stop and let Nancy go?

**Mike:** Is it okay with you guys to put Nancy on?

**Nancy:** Thanks, Mike. Good morning. I am here to talk about two letters that went out to change control regarding \_\_\_\_ ordered on the ASR. One is regarding a CRS form, which is a clarification request form that will also be used for customer notifications on your ASR. It will be implemented in the North on March 25<sup>th</sup> and in Verizon South April 22<sup>nd</sup>. Does anyone have questions on that letter?

**Teresa:** Will we receive notification on that information?

**Nancy:** This is the letter that went out. I don't know the exact date. Also, there was a lot of questions about how do you know if you have electronic notification in CSG? If you populate your e-mail address on the admin section of the ASR forms, we will send an e-mail notification that there is a CRF and to go and look for it. If it is not populated, we will not send you an e-mail notification.

**Teresa:** It will just tell you that there is one.

**Nancy:** Yes. This is also for queries. Today queries or ASR's are done via phone calls.

**Teresa:** Oh, okay. That is not just if you input orders in CSG?

**Nancy:** I don't understand.

**Teresa:** We send our ASR's via EDI. We look in CSG for facts.

**Nancy:** I am not sure about that. It was explained to me that if it comes over NDM or CSG. If you use NDM, you will get the same thing.

**Teresa:** That is wonderful.

**Nancy:** The second letter was the 30-day customer not ready cancellation policy. It will go into effect at the same time in the North on March 25<sup>th</sup> and in the South on April 22<sup>nd</sup>. It is for unbundled UNI DS1 and DS3 and all \_\_\_\_ products. Verizon will cancel the ASR and the order. This process is already in place today for the UNI IOS products. We are adding the rest of the ASR products to this process. You will get a notification when there is a customer not ready jeopardy on the order. We will send you the CRF notification to tell you either change the due date or whatever. The rule is you cannot change the due date 31 days past the original due date. If you had to move it out that far, you would have to cancel and reissue.

Verizon is also going to provide the CLEC's a list of all pending customer not ready orders you have had in the past. We will send that out and give you a chance to look it

over and make changes to it. We can cancel them or get them completed. Work with your account manager on that. That is it. Any questions?

**Mike:** Thanks, Nancy.

**Man:** Those two letters dealt with ASR's?

**Nancy:** Right. All UNI products ordered on the ASR. We will have the letters sent out on the web. If you have any problems, call your account manager and they will get in touch with me. Thanks.

**Mike:** Let me take the temperature of the group. We need to finish the ISR release report and then the afternoon session has one new one. I am estimating we have an hours worth of material left. Do we want to take a break and maybe come back at 11:30 and push this to 12:30 or do we want to push ahead? What do you want to do? I am getting some push ahead thoughts. If we could keep pushing on. We will go back to Becky King.

**Becky:** Okay. The next entry is on page 20. It is CR2140. This initiative involves two change requests and the description has one and the business narrative describes the other. When I resend this out, I will send two different change requests. The first one should be \_\_\_\_\_. Currently today there is the listed address and it is not being picked up for the additional listings. For this CR2140, it is to migrate the exiting listed address and CSR to any additional main listings. It is only effective for Pennsylvania as that is where the problem is. We are talking about \_\_\_\_\_ loop accounts. They are associated with CR2176 and this was a type one and it was to allow a free additional listing for \_\_\_\_\_ customers in Pennsylvania. The change is in the business rules to allow you to have an additional main listing in Pennsylvania. Today we don't. This affected UNI, UNI 2, and resale. It affected the web goeey for some of our backend.

**Woman:** Did you say the business rules would change a little?

**Becky:** You can order an additional main listing in Pennsylvania.

**Woman:** Did you recently change some of your rules around certain states that could get this type of a listing? I don't have the information. You changed in February and it was published. Are you changing those rules again?

**Becky:** I don't think so. Probably what went out in the February business rules included this. You could order it in Pennsylvania. I will follow-up and check to make sure that is a true statement.

**Claudia:** I need to take it back a few pages. On page 13, CR1808, which is classified as a type one, I would like clarification as to why that is a type one.

**Becky:** I would have to find out and get back to you.

**Woman:** There was a trouble ticket on this one too. It was supposed to identify if it was a government listing by \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ and you weren't able to return the value. It wasn't working correctly. I will supply the trouble ticket for you in the future.

**Becky:** That would be very helpful.

**Claudia:** On page 15, why do we need that? The LDAT2 is gone.

**Becky:** Right. I think it is more of a process whenever we have a future version. I don't think we need to include that on here.

**Mike:** This is an internal only change and should not be displayed here.

**Claudia:** It is also classified as a type three regulatory and I am not so sure that it really is regulatory.

**Becky:** Industry standard.

**Mike:** It had to do with the implementation of \_\_\_ and I am not sure why it is \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_.

**Claudia:** That one is very confusing.

**Becky:** Let me see what I can find out on why they still have that.

**Claudia:** The next one is on page 15. It is a type four request and was it not prioritized?

**Mike:** This is one of the ones to get done for October. Remember I came to you last summer and said recap wanted to do some changes and they hadn't been prioritized but we wanted to recap at that point? This was originally targeted for October.

**Becky:** This was one of the ones we discussed before retest.

**Woman:** We had to phase out this project so it originally went into December and some of the functionality had to be phased out to February. Industry notification did go out on this.

**Claudia:** Page 18, I cannot recall but I don't remember prioritizing this one either.

**Becky:** This was the one we talked about last year and was issued as a type four and was agreed upon that we wouldn't prioritize it because we weren't going to do it.

**Mike:** It had to do with the Pennsylvania hearing.

**Claudia:** [Breaking up, on speakerphone, inaudible]

**Becky:** It doesn't look like it. It is one of those product ones.

**Mike:** I don't know much about this one. I will have to look into it. I remember something about it but I can't recall.

**Becky:** The next one is on page 23. It is CR1326, return all \_\_\_ errors simultaneously. It is going in sometime in April for the North. Additional errors [beeping]  
The North and the South will be in sync.

**Woman:** Would this cover the working ports like if we get a notification of a working port and then we can correct it and send it back and then we may find another one down the list?

**Becky:** I don't know. I can ask that question.

**Mike:** I still have that note from the jeopardy meeting where we asked that question. Why don't we validate all the ports instead of just the first one?

**Becky:** I am writing it down. The next one is on page 25.

**Claudia:** On page 24 \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ that it was prioritized and what the ratings were. This is great, this one.

**Becky:** Good. On page 25, which is CR1717-2, it should have been a type two and the platform partial migration of the BTN is going on here. The next one is on page 29. I am not sure what type of CR this would be or if it even should be on here. The jurisdiction is just Delaware and Pennsylvania and there was a trouble ticket opened because an error was going back to the CLEC's when we had the system accounts, which are where we have two accounts on one CSR. The system \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ and then if they didn't find the telephone number they would reject and return an error to the CLEC. This change is to go past the first remarks and look for this \_\_\_ \_\_\_ and continue on and then have it drop out to level two.

**Sue:** I notice that should be a type one.

**Becky:** That is what I thought. I don't think it is a type four.

**Claudia:** I would tend to agree that this one is a type one.

**Becky:** The next one is on page 30. This is for 1413, which should be a type two CR and it is for going through resale partial migrations of the BTN.

**Woman:** The CR738 looks like it is new. This is the first time we have seen any items for June on this report.

**Becky:** We discussed 738 in January. It was a candidate for February at that time or for April. Now it has been moved to June.

**Woman:** Why is it a candidate for June and not committed for June?

**Woman:** That probably changes in the next week.

**Mike:** To commit it?

**Woman:** Yes.

**Mike:** It is just that we will go with the IS organization and they don't firmly commit stuff until they are 100% sure it can be done in a release.

**Claudia:** Oh like they were for the April release?

**Mike:** This is generated from internal discussion. Trust me.

**Claudia:** I do trust you. I was just being a smart aleck.

**Becky:** We tried to include these June ones on here even though we knew many weren't committed. The next one is on page 31. This was classified as a type two. The goal of this project is to eliminate need for entering file codes for the deletion of a listing. Right now it requires that you have the file codes and then it gets caught in this loop and doesn't allow you to delete the listing. It is being changed to eliminate the need for the file codes to be entered.

**Claudia:** I don't think that makes it a type two.

**Becky:** I don't argue with you.

**Mike:** That doesn't make sense. We could talk about making it a one but then we could take about why does it take them so long to fix it? We will look into this.

**Becky:** We had a type two in our system but they have it should remain a type four.

**Mike:** If the CLEC is unable to do something, and I haven't really read this so I'm just going on what I thought I heard you say, and they are in some kind of loop and can't perform a function then it says type one to type two.

**Becky:** The business rule was changed from prohibited when the IRCT field is a Z otherwise required and changed to prohibited in the IRCT field equals D or B or otherwise required.

**Claudia:** We need more discussion on this one.

**Mike:** To understand or

**Claudia:** If the business rules change, I need to understand if you do it the way the business rules state to do it then does it work?

**Mike:** It doesn't.

**Becky:** The DI form requires a file code to delete a listing. The DSDR form needed to practice the delete is only required on a newer change to an \_\_\_\_ otherwise it is prohibited. Let me go back and look at this and find out exactly what happened. My understanding is you get caught up in this loop. The business rules say one thing and the next say something else. They conflict with one another.

**Woman:** It would be a dropped revision for business rules. I operate under the understanding that this is draft at this point. This may change or may go in sooner than June?

**Becky:** Right.

**Mike:** That is what I will push for.

**Woman:** It could happen in April?

**Mike:** We would send out a bulletin.

**Woman:** If this goes into April and it is considered to be a non-CLEC affecting release and you are changing a business rule that goes in in April, does that tell me that your April release is CLEC affecting?

**Mike:** No. It is not a CLEC affecting release. If there is a trouble that prevents a CLEC from doing something, we need to fix it. It doesn't mean it is a CLEC impacting release. We are fixing the trouble. I would try to get this done in March.

**Cheryl:** This is Cheryl Peterson. I would have to agree that it could not be CLEC impacting because there could be coding on the CLEC side.

**Mike:** You are right. It could be coding to accommodate this business rule change.

**Man:** So then it would be CLEC affecting.

**Mike:** This one change would be but not the whole April release.

**Man:** It is like if you put verbiage with respect to the release then it has to state that it is CLEC affecting. It is one instance but to put it out as non-CLEC affecting, someone will miss it.

**Mike:** Understood. We would highlight it in a bulletin.

**Cheryl:** Some of the points here are that CLEC's need to understand whether or not they have to do any coding.

**Mike:** How would you want me to handle this?

**Cheryl:** I think it would be clearer if you change a business rule and it affects CLEC's doing directory listings then you have to notify them.

**Mike:** When would you want me to make this change?

**Cheryl:** During a release so a CLEC knows they have to change their code.

**Mike:** So you want me to allow CLEC's not to deal with the delete listing until June?

**Cheryl:** I hear what you are saying but

**Man:** Can you make the early release CLEC affecting?

**Mary:** I think in the past there has been many changes that really a CLEC had to know about and account for and maybe even make coding changes for that have been outside the three month or three particular major CLEC affecting releases. This is correcting something that should be corrected and should be scheduled and done as long as everyone has notification about it. It can then be planned for.

**Mike:** I agree.

**Cheryl:** The whole purpose of the change control process was to drive CLEC impacting releases in three major timeframes within the year. Right now we are going back to a moving target again, which we were trying to get away from. I understand the full impact but I think the issue is prioritization of that particular subject matter because it seems like it will come right back around for every time one of these come up and you are right back to development in each one of the CLEC's to have to go back through documentation for every time a new documentation comes out with new coding. Their development people don't feel they are getting that three times a year CLEC impacting releases. It is still a monthly kind of scenario.

**Mike:** The only thing we want to do outside of February, June and October releases is to fix troubles.

**Mary:** I think that is a good thing. We don't want troubles to go on forever. If it is a major impacting change then that needs special attention and change control too if it is something very serious that needs to be fixed. I think it needs a lot of vigorous discussion in change control so everyone understands this better. The goal is to have three releases but if things are broken and need to be fixed, they need to be fixed as well.

**Mike:** I agree.

**Cheryl:** As long as we have enough time.

**Mary:** If it is not a step one and another type change that is affecting their business then as long as that issue is brought through change control and everyone understands it and can plan for it, if it is a problem for a company to work through a particular change at a time then that needs to be discussed too. Things need to be addressed.

**Mike:** When we make changes like this, we try to make it such that you don't have to do a coding change. You can keep doing business today but opens up another option. As I am reading the proposed change, it is basically relaxing edit on the LATT field so you can put the style code field \_\_\_\_ equals D. You don't have to make coding changes to accommodate that. You don't have to change anything you are doing today. When we fix things we try to fix things such that it would not cause you the way you are processing.

**Cheryl:** When it is a relaxation allowing a CLEC to enter something that is on the business rule stated today, I would agree. That would usually mean unless a CLEC out there has miscoded it then in that case yes it would not be CLEC impacting for code redevelopment. It would just be allowing that current value to flow through on your side. I think a lot of times it comes down to actually interpreting what the real issue is. The initial conversation appeared as if it could possibly be CLEC impacting. When you use the terminology of relaxation of a code then that is a whole different picture.

**Mike:** It doesn't cause any changes but if there is a trouble that is preventing the CLEC from performing a function today then are you requesting that those only be done in February, June or October?

**Cheryl:** Wasn't the agreement that there would be like an emergency scenario for those particular situations?

**Mike:** Right and that is the bulletin process. The way we have been handling this for years is that we create a bulletin saying here is the problem and here is the fix. If anybody has problems that they can't accommodate it then we work with them. I bet 95% of the bulletins we send out no one has had a problem doing it.

**Cheryl:** As long as notifications and bulletins are issued, which is part of the change control process. It is a matter of continuing documentation changes that we all seem to bump up against. The CLEC's have to go back through and review all that continued documentation change to see if it is actually impairing the CLEC on our side.

**Mike:** That is true.

**Woman:** We want to make sure if an order is flowing through now and we don't implement business rules that it won't negatively affect something else. I hear what Mike is saying. If you have this problem and you want to get it fixed, you have to change your rules. As long as that doesn't affect any other locations, I guess people would be fine with it.

**Cheryl:** I think each of the CLEC's would have to check with their own development team to ensure it doesn't impact our development. I don't think that decision can be made today on that issue.

**Mike:** What would you consider proper notification for a change like this? Right now we give you two days.

**Cheryl:** A week would be much more valuable as far as our development team. They could identify whether it would impact by getting a hold of people.

**Man:** [Inaudible]

**Mike:** What I hear is a change in the bulletin process unless it is some kind of a dire emergency. Today we send the bulletin out on Thursday and have a call on Friday and unless somebody throws their body in front of the train, we implement the change on Saturday. I think we need to change to sending the bulletin out on Thursday but not implement the change until the following Saturday. We can talk about that on Friday. That would provide more opportunity for you to understand the change and take it back and see if it is enough. Would that be agreeable?

**Man:** We have to make changes to our map \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_

**Man:** Is there a possibility you could put them in a fashion that you did this one wherein it is almost like if you want to move to this you can and, if not, you could wait until one of your normally scheduled releases?

**Mike:** We always try to do that to prevent any impact on the CLEC's but what CLEC's will tell me is you don't know my system and you can't predict the impact that change will have on my system, so don't pretend that you are telling me it won't impact me. We do what we think will impact you but I am hesitant to say that it will or won't.

**Cheryl:** That is all we are asking. It is a matter of identifying something that does appear it might be something outside of that three CLEC impacting releases and we have the opportunity with a better timeframe to review it.

**Mike:** That is the bulletin process and we can make the change to the process that I just outlined to give additional notice.

**Cheryl:** Thank you.

**Man:** On page 28, 2192 seems to [breaking up, inaudible]

**Mike:** This is in the June release. I am sorry. It will be done in the April release. Again, you can still continue to use C. Today you are using C. You can continue to use C if you want to. If you want to use N, you can. You don't have to change these. If you want to use the new functionality, you have to change the match. In April, there are some CLEC impacting changes and the reason that these fives are in there is we push very hard to get type fives done and we were able to get some done in April. I have been told internally this is the last time we will do this. We would not put 2192 or 2203 in an April release. It has to be in February or June or October. The only reason I put them in the April release is to try and get them done.

**Claudia:** I have to agree with your point of view on a lot of these. I know you don't often get support from me but you are going to get it right now. I think we have been waiting for these changes for a long time and in the case of type fives you have pushed and pushed and pushed and are trying and trying and trying. To put them in April, I thought was a good idea. The sooner we got them in on that one, the better.

**Mike:** Thanks. I appreciate that. This is a one-time event. If it ain't then you will be talking to another director of change management if I do this again. The heat I got over this, you wouldn't believe.

**Woman:** 2192 is CLEC and is not \_\_\_ \_\_\_?

**Mike:** Right.

**Claudia:** When you look at 2192 and say currently we can do an active C when you are ordering \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ and now you are adding a new thing to do active new. What is the difference between active new and active C?

**Mike:** The result would be the same. This was sponsored by Sprint because a new listing to them is an activity code event. The reason it is C to us is that this listing account already exists and you are adding a listing to an existing account and our way is to change the account. The only time you would use an N the way we process is you will create a new account in our system. Sprint wanted the ability to use an activity code of N to add a listing to an existing account because of the way their system operates. We could accommodate that request by going out and feeding a new account there and in essence be treated like a change. The results are the same.

**Claudia:** The same thing would apply for D.

**Mike:** Right.

**Man:** I guess it is okay as long as it is not affecting current maps.

**Claudia:** That is what I was trying to drive at.

**Mike:** Understand that if on 2203 you could give some additional values returned to you in April in the North on the service order inquiry. I believe that is what that is. I am sorry I took us down that path. I am not sure how we got here.

**Becky:** We are on page 31. I think I need to investigate why it is not considered a type one.

**Man:** Can you please also double check if the DSDR form is required for L.5? That form is not there.

**Becky:** That is correct. They combined the \_\_\_ and \_\_\_ forms into one fix.

**Man:** Maybe we need to rephrase the business narrative for L.5.

**Becky:** Yes. The next one I have is on page 32. It is CR1720. The jest of this is that in Maryland, Virginia, DC and West Virginia, if you get to the point of 99% capacity on new loop accounts there will be an error sent back to the CLEC saying no \_\_\_ codes available for SDN. The other part of this is that there is some internal notification that is done when they are down to 20% availability. Who is responsible when it gets to 20% for establishing the new SDN? Does it go to somebody at the CLEC or an account manager? I need to get the answers for that.

**Mike:** I thought this already was the process.

**Becky:** It is in the North and in New Jersey and in Pennsylvania and Delaware. That went in October of 2000.

**Woman:** It is classified as a type four. I am not sure it is really flow through and really is a process change and probably should stay type four but it hasn't been prioritized.

**Becky:** Right. We could prioritize it now, if you would like.

**Woman:** I think we need to save it to the prioritization part of the meeting.

**Becky:** It doesn't appear on that documentation.

**Woman:** Let's remember we need to do that then.

**Woman:** We have a situation where we get a reject on the LSR saying the band is no longer valid anymore. That happened to us recently. Are you proposing that the process will change?

**Mike:** No.

**Becky:** I think what may be changing is the internal part of the process. What I don't know is who is the entity who receives this notification when we are at 20% availability?

**Woman:** If there is an internal notification that you are down to 20%, that notification should come to the CLEC and tell how many more we can process and adjust a new SBN at the same time or at least in a very reasonable period.

**Man:** What is the timeframe for obtaining a new SBN?

**Becky:** I don't know.

**Man:** Does anyone?

**Woman:** I know it doesn't happen quickly.

**Mary:** My understanding is the billing manager who manages the SBN can assign a new one fairly quickly and I was told there was a process to monitor how full the bands were. There are controls in place for when they get pretty full and then a new one is assigned. This is a weekly evaluation.

**Becky:** You are correct. I guess that is in place everywhere except for Maryland, Virginia, DC, and West Virginia.

**Woman:** We just got a notification yesterday from our account manager for Pennsylvania.

**Mike:** That is the way it has been working. Malveck Rosini is the one that notifies you of that.

**Claudia:** Don't we have some CR's out there that are trying to change the way \_\_\_ codes are assigned?

**Mike:** What we said on January 10<sup>th</sup> was I want to look at the whole process of how \_\_\_ codes and directory listings are handled for loop and full facility based situations and come up with a whole new methodology. When we do that, we will accomplish five CSR's that we will roll into there. I think CLEC's allow the assigning of \_\_\_ codes. We will launch a whole analysis of the way we handle directory listings for loops and come up with proposals and review it with you guys and try to implement something in October that will accommodate a lot of these ills.

**Man:** Still shooting for October on that?

**Mike:** Yes. This being one of them. I would state this is an internal process that shouldn't have been on this list at all.

**Becky:** I agree.

**Mike:** Becky, you can't go on vacation anymore.

**Becky:** I know, I won't. This is the last time I will do this.

**Man:** Someone said they ran into the problem in Pennsylvania.

**Becky:** When it is 99% full then you

**Man:** That is what I was looking at. How much lead-time did you have? It was when it was 99% that you got notification?

**Mike:** Did somebody say they got notified that they could not add a directory listing to an account? I don't think that is the case. I don't think we reject that.

**Woman:** We had an instance not too long ago there where we were getting rejects and it was assigned. The band was assigned to \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_.

**Woman:** They weren't dropping out and the reps were manually assigning them new SBN? I thought that was supposed to happen.

**Woman:** No.

**Mike:** Who is speaking?

**Gloria:** This is Gloria.

**Mike:** Okay.

**Gloria:** It is rectified now but the whole band thing is very confusing. It is rectified.

**Man:** You were literally using bands only for the directory portion?

**Mike:** In this case, yes. The directory listings associated with loops.

**Man:** For your facilities base.

**Mike:** Right.

**Man:** If we were to establish 20 bands per CLEC, what would prevent you folks from automatically populating that information and returning to us as to which band you are using and not even require us to provide it to you?

**Mike:** That was one of the type five change requests that we will analyze as part of this directory listing process. The short answer is we can't find the listing on the

confirmation to tell you what band we put it on. Then you have to give that band back to us if you want to change or delete that list because we can't find it.

**Man:** I haven't seen that CR.

**Mike:** It says don't require me to give you the directory listing band that has directory listings on it. The way we process, we can't do that. I couldn't find the listings.

**Man:** The question would be whether or not you can go beyond the 13,000 bands and whether we develop a process where you return it to us. It looks as though there is some churn associated here. If I have to give it to you every time, that means I have to hard code it otherwise I have to have somebody input it. That would become a nightmare.

**Mike:** You have to associate with that listing what band it is on in your database.

**Man:** That occurs now or will be or should be if they are over 13,000. Would you agree?

**Mike:** I can't tell you what they are doing in the CLEC.

**Man:** If you need that band subsequent to any changes I may make on it two years from now and have gone through five other bands, I can't use the current band I am using. I have to use the one that originally went in with this particular customer.

**Mike:** With that listing, right. This begs a whole discussion. There is something called an \_\_\_ report that you can use to determine what band and listing. Some CLEC's may rely upon that.

**Man:** Is there any plan of this band issue at some point?

**Mike:** It will be part of this overall project to address \_\_\_ code listings for loops and full facility \_\_\_.

**Man:** Good, thanks.

**Becky:** On 1720, I would like to get additional information on this as to what is the current process and what exactly will be sent back to the CLEC's and when and who is responsible for setting up the new \_\_\_ accounts. I can include that when I resend this out. I have a call in on this but have no response yet. Is that agreeable with everyone? The next one is on page 33. CR1870 is if the yellow page heading verbiage is not completed the order rejects to the \_\_\_ and they have to manually handle it. The yellow page heading verbiage has to be completed.

**Mike:** This should be a type two?

**Becky:** Yes.

**Man:** This is also a business rule change?

**Mike:** No. Today if you don't populate the verbiage, it drops to the \_\_\_ to send you a manual query. This is saying that the query will be an automatic back from the system.

**Becky:** The next one is on page 34. The first one is CR1953.1. It has to do with local service provider \_\_\_ in Pennsylvania and it is to redirect \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ to the CLEC's. I don't know why they have industry standard on it.

**Elliott:** I carefully have not said anything today but in Pennsylvania I haven't seen the final submission report of the collaborative come out yet, so don't you think it might be \_\_\_ \_\_\_?

**Mike:** We were directed to allow local service providers \_\_\_ on platforms from Pennsylvania with the October release.

**Elliott:** I understand that. The point is there may be a major revision in which case all this effort may be wasted.

**Mike:** Could be. Have you been attending those collaboratives? I have not.

**Elliott:** I have. There is a written output test dupe. As we are talking I am trying to go to the Pennsylvania website, which I have not checked in a week or so to see if anything is posted.

**Lisa:** This is only applicable to L.5. That is what it is stating. What happens on L.4? Are there local frozen picks there on the database?

**Mike:** Yes. L.4 did not have this field we are talking about here. It is the same way you do it for resale. We sent out examples last summer on how to put the local service provider freeze on platform accounts in Pennsylvania for L.4. This field did not exist. This isn't changing any L.4's. It is changing L.5 with it.

**Lisa:** The business rules to list it will be once the collaborative is completed?

**Elliott:** There was also comments about what would be applicable and required documentation to place on should the carrier be required to keep the customer authorization files so if another carrier complains of improper placing fixed freezes the placing carrier would then have to produce it. Things like that.

**Lisa:** The process needs to be clear and finalized. It is hard to put something in if you don't have a process to remove that pick freeze.

**Mike:** To remove the pick freeze we sent out exhibits on how to do that.

**Elliott:** Everybody that commented was opposed to what Verizon proposed, which is why the staff at Pennsylvania was supposed to make decisions.

**Mike:** They were opposed to the way Verizon said to remove it?

**Elliott:** To everything Verizon said about it particularly about the way to remove it.

**Mike:** Okay. Well, you know my feeling in this matter.

**Elliott:** I understand that.

**Lisa:** This is a mess. This whole thing is a mess. I want to make sure we be careful that we know the rules that we have to abide by and I don't think that is clear yet.

**Mike:** When the order comes out or whatever it will be, we will have to modify what we are doing to accommodate the order.

**Elliott:** I don't see anything on their website.

**Mike:** I think our attorney on this is Stan Monagel. I will check with him.

**Elliott:** The last time I was in Pennsylvania, staff told me they were writing. What that means, I don't know. I thought they had a deadline to produce it by now. I guess I am wrong.

**Mike:** They don't have deadlines.

**Elliott:** They do but they also need the power to change them.

**Mike:** Okay. I'll follow up and find out what the status is.

**Elliott:** Thank you.

**Becky:** Okay the next one is 1959 on the same page and this too was a type \_\_\_ and is to eliminate an error code for these two \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ premium package and the \_\_\_ package so they will flow free.

**Mike:** This is another flow through that should be type two.

**Becky:** Maybe these are being handled by the \_\_\_\_.

**Elliott:** How many of these are there?

**Becky:** I don't know offhand.

**Elliott:** We said you could almost call anything flow through and make it a type two even if it had minimal impact.

**Mike:** I remember that conversation.

**Elliott:** Once you get me started...

**Mike:** I'm trying not to get you started.

**Becky:** The next one is on page 35. It is CR2014. It is a type five CR. Currently the \_\_\_ to populate the \_\_\_ field, the \_\_\_ field and the \_\_\_ \_\_\_ from the \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_. The next one on the same page is \_\_\_ and another type five. [Background noise, inaudible] The next one is on page 36. CR2180 is the next one. Again, this is a type two CR. Currently errors are rejected back to the \_\_\_ when the desire date due right field is populated with a date earlier than the application date and these now will get rejected back to the CLEC's. There is a new error code needed for the South. The existing error code DOEE113 is in the North. I added to the documentation impact, error documentation. On the same page, 2286 is a type two but I believe it should be a type four.

**Claudia:** I agree.

**Becky:** This is expanding the reason codes on the \_\_\_ so they are more defined. There are two new codes going in. CD will equate to the \_\_\_ follow up and CO, which will take the installation other.

**Claudia:** Can you pull this?

**Mary:** This is a change that I think AT&T would strongly support.

**Mike:** Thank you, Mary. I was getting ready to say something like that.

**Claudia:** I agree but it needs to be prioritized.

**Mary:** Right.

**Becky:** I pulled it out. It wasn't included.

**Woman:** I don't see platform listed.

**Becky:** Let me see what I've got. I don't know. I have to check on that.

**Woman:** That is important to know.

**Mike:** I would expect it would impact CLEC's. We will verify.

**Woman:** Can you talk more about those two L codes?

**Mike:** Mary, do you have the details on that?

**Becky:** I will see what I can find out on these. I don't have a lot of information on it. What I show is that there will be two more jeopardy reason codes. The CO means installation other and then the CD, which means the NNC will follow up.

**Bob:** I think the problem is we had two different situations that were coming out under one code. One was an automated generation and one was being done by the NNC. I think the request was to split that into two so we had separate codes so they could be identified.

**Becky:** Was the existing code one of these or a different code?

**Mike:** We will resend this stuff out. You will update it.

**Becky:** I will get that information and include it.

**Bob:** I can give you that.

**Becky:** Thank you.

**Woman:** I assume your documentation sent out for jeopardy notification might be a version 5.0 and when you add reason codes it would be on the documentation so that in your documentation section you will indicate that it will be updated.

**Mike:** Good point.

**Becky:** Yes. The next one is on page 37. This allows a period in the \_\_\_ \_\_\_ field for that \_\_\_ listing and currently these drop out to level two \_\_\_ \_\_\_ in the North and this will allow them to flow through and also appear correctly.

**Mike:** A type two.

**Becky:** Right. The next one is

**Mike:** An internal change?

**Becky:** It looks internal to me.

**Mike:** I don't even know what this means. I would say this is an internal change that should not be discussed here.

**Becky:** Okay. The last one is the retask, which lets \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ and this functionality allows \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ on a customer line. It will allow the CLEC to do verification on the customer \_\_\_ only and verify features. [Background noise, inaudible]

**Mike:** Is this something we need to prioritize?

**Becky:** Yes and this one is over on the prioritization list.

**Elliott:** If something hasn't prioritized, why is it on the candidate list? That sort of makes a mockery out of the process.

**Sue:** When it comes to trouble admin, we have very few initiatives and one of the objectives of prioritization is there are so many initiatives, you can't accommodate them in the next available release. You don't have that problem with \_\_\_ \_\_\_.

**Elliott:** I don't disagree. I am not saying this is not a good idea. The whole point is the purpose of prioritization was to allocate resources in a way that provided \_\_\_ benefits to the industry. At least that is my understanding. Therefore, I thought all the work we have done over a variety of collaboratives on writing rules and change control that was clearly understood. Otherwise we have wasted hundreds of hours. I am sure this will get a high rating and that is not my issue.

**Mike:** I think we want to get to the issue of resources that do retask are totally separate and independent of the resources that do order \_\_\_ \_\_\_ [beeping]. The question we have to ask ourselves is should we have a separate prioritization list for retask that orders pre-orders? Sue is saying we have very few retask enhancements and those usually can be accommodated without a need for prioritization.

**Claudia:** It does need to be prioritized, no matter what resources are being used. It can be made clear that these are different resources than resources that would be needed to accommodate other requests. The CLEC representatives are smart enough to prioritize appropriately. As Elliot said, it makes a mockery of the process when something is a candidate for a release before it has even been introduced into the prioritization process no matter whose resources are being used.

**Sue:** One thing you will like is they would like to put it into June and we have told them they absolutely cannot unless the CLEC's approve that. That is why we have it here. They are waiting for feedback. We are trying to follow the process.

**Mike:** Okay. I think we are through the release. Then we need to move into the session where we prioritize initiatives. We have some holdovers and I am thinking half an hour. Do you want to press on? Do you want to take a break?

**Elliott:** We will take the break. One quick issue. 2249, on the aggregate how low is Verizon and when will this approve and could it just be considered a type two because of

that? I can call almost any change we have done flow through in which case everything becomes a two.

**Mike:** I am not sure we can classify everything we have done as flow through.

**Elliott:** 60-80%.

**Claudia:** It brings us back to the change in verbiage to change type two's. It has never been settled.

**Elliott:** Sooner or later, Claudia will just escalate it beyond Verizon. You guys and we guys haven't reached that level of frustration yet.

**Mike:** I don't want to have discussion now. We don't have time. I thought we had thoroughly discussed this issue with Elliott and AT&T offline.

**Elliott:** You presented your opinion. We gave you our comments. I don't know that I can accept the fact that mother knows best or baby knows best. Mother is being Claudia, in this case.

**Claudia:** Thank you so much, Elliott.

**Mike:** How long of a break do we want?

**Man:** A short break.

**Mike:** Marie wants to get the heck out of here.

**Woman:** How about 15 minutes?

**Mike:** Okay at 12:45 we will do it again. Bye.

**Mary:** This is Mary. I'm back.

**Claudia:** This is Claudia.

**Mike:** Shall we wait for others or shall we just begin? Okay. We need to prioritize heldovers and we picked up a couple during the \_\_\_ release discussion. There is a type four that came in. I only see about four or five that we need to prioritize. I am in the items that are not rated \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_[beeping] and is page five of 42. It is dated [beeping]

**Mary:** I think that was resent out as a revision. It ended up including that type four. That was sent out on the 7<sup>th</sup>.

**Mike:** Okay. It is dated the 5<sup>th</sup> just to confuse us as much as possible. Is everybody with me?

**Woman:** I don't see a type four.

**Mike:** It is that retask enhancement.

**Becky:** The title of the file was CWG12-12 \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_. It is on page seven of 42.

**Mike:** I will march through here. Is Karen on?

**Karen:** I am here.

**Mike:** The first two are listed together, which have to do with the ability for a line share provider to make the line sharing service or the data portion available at the same time the voice portion is established. How do we do that? Last time we said we will talk about it after pending order workshops [beeping] and did not talk about it yesterday. We are looking at how to do this. People are meeting and people are talking. It is very difficult to get the two things to take place at the same time. I guess where I am on this is we should go ahead and prioritize. I am not sure why \_\_\_\_ [beeping] I guess I thought we would be at a different place than we are now.

**Mary:** I think that is what it was. We thought we could solve the questions and talked about the whole process.

**Mike:** I think it is turning out to be a bigger nut to crack than originally thought. So since we are working on it, I have to be honest with you, we are working on it, I suggest we prioritize it. Any other thoughts? I am not sure we will do exactly what these change of requests are asking but I understand the business driver. So I would recommend we prioritize them as \_\_\_\_ recognizing that the solution will be put forth and may be somewhat different than what they are asking for. We have to satisfy the business people. Discussion or questions before we prioritize these two? I guess we will do them individually.

**Woman:** Can't we rate them together?

**Mike:** This is rated one so we will follow the same rating with each. I guess what we are doing is prioritizing CR2353 and 2354 and I usually start with the originator and that is \_\_\_\_\_.

**Claudia:** Before we go there, can somebody explain how they would want this to work again?

**Mike:** I can try. Today the simplest case is to take a new \_\_\_\_ a new voice circuit. Residence one line and in the line sharing arrangement that voice circuit is being provided by Verizon. Somebody moves into Verizon territory and calls Verizon retail and says I want to establish service in a few days from now. At the same time, they contact \_\_\_\_\_ and say I want you to provide DSL service for my new voice line. So

\_\_\_\_\_ wants to be able to have that status and go ahead and issue the order even though the voice hasn't been completed yet and have the data and voice provisioned on the same day. Today what has to happen is you have to wait for the voice line to be established, updated in the record and then you can submit the LSR to add DSL to that line and then you are delayed at least ten days. The customer is unable to get DSL service for ten days. That is how I see the situation.

**Woman:** That is pretty much right. 2353 basically affirms to this but a pre-order portion of that is we can't access a CSR today while it is pending update in the ILEX system. The 2354 is basically the order portion of that where we don't want the LSR to be rejected. The only other comment is I don't want to leave Elliott out in the cold. You said \_\_\_\_\_ but we want it to apply to both line sharing and line splitting.

**Dan:** Elliott had to step off the line. We discussed it earlier. It seems to be a good change request but applies to line splitting.

**Woman:** It has been modified to reflect that.

**Dan:** Great.

**Mike:** Okay.

**Woman:** I give them both a five, Mike.

**Mike:** When I say we are working on this issue, we are also looking at the line splitting aspect of it. I can't guarantee that they will both be at the same time. They are different processes, blah blah blah.

**Claudia:** That would be a problem.

**Dan:** I was about to say that.

**Mike:** I understand. Frankly, the issue is we have virtually no line splitting today – none – outside of some test circuits that are up. We do have a significant amount of line sharing. I will just throw that out there.

**Dan:** That may change by the time it is implemented.

**Mike:** It might. You are right.

**Dan:** If it is done in June, that is one thing. If it is a year from now, things can be very different then.

**Mike:** I thought Elliott wasn't on the phone.

**Dan:** That is why he sends me, Mike.

**Claudia:** This is \_\_\_ and not Metro making this request. It could be October and not a year from now.

**Dan:** Understood. Of course, that brings up another issue.

**Claudia:** I would have to say that any rating I end up giving these would be predicated on the belief that both line splitting and sharing would be implemented at the same time. If not, it will change my rating considerably.

**Dan:** Likewise.

**Woman:** I have to agree with that.

**Mike:** I love my job.

**Claudia:** I knew you did, Mike.

**Dan:** We try to bring as much joy to it as possible.

**Mike:** And you do.

**Woman:** You don't want to get bored.

**Mike:** I don't know about that. I understand Claudia's qualification of her rating. It is duly noted.

**Dan:** That brings up another issue.

**Mike:** Oh, good.

**Dan:** Given that there has been some changes in place of terms of \_\_\_ relationship with Verizon, we are requesting that these be types five or four.

**Mike:** That is required to use the same interfaces that the CLEC's have. I treat that as a CLEC.

**Dan:** Elliott is more aware of this but I guess Verizon is sort of taking over \_\_\_ or something to that effect.

**Mike:** I have heard the term reintegration and I have never understood what that means but whenever I ask my lawyers or other people how I should be viewing \_\_\_, I am told I should view them as a CLEC like any other CLEC.

**Woman:** Just for clarification, my understanding is the same thing. It has been cleared through legal that we have to continue to use this process.

**Mike:** Okay. We are voting. \_\_\_\_ gave it a five. WorldCom?

**Lisa:** I am going to pass for a minute.

**Mike:** Is Allegiance on?

**Woman:** I am here. I will pass on this one.

**Mike:** AT&T?

**Claudia:** 3.75.

**Mike:** I am not even going to react to that. Broadview?

**Woman:** We will give it a four.

**Mike:** Covad? Cox?

**Woman:** A three.

**Mike:** CTSI? Met-Tel?

**Man:** A 4.5 with the same caveat of line splitting.

**Mike:** Who else is on that would like to vote on these two?

**Ann Marie:** This is Ann Marie from Choice One. We will pass on this one.

**Lorraine:** Lorraine from \_\_\_\_\_. I will pass.

**Mike:** Anyone else want to record a vote? Does anybody that passed now want to vote? Okay. What I have recorded is Allegiance passed. AT&T is 3.75, 642. Broadview at 4. Cox at 3. Met-Tel at 4.5. \_\_\_\_ at 5. WorldCom passed. Choice One passed. \_\_\_\_ passed.

**Woman:** This is WorldCom. I just have to verify something.

**Mike:** I am not sure what the rules are. I am moving onto the next page, which is CR2370.

**Dan:** With 2353, in terms of \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_, is it limited to the ones listed here?

**Mike:** I will look at a whole list of solutions. What we come back with will address the business needs.

**Dan:** It seems limited looking at this. If you look at a whole perspective, that sounds much better. That would be included in the session we have?

**Mike:** Maybe not to the detail you would expect, frankly. It depends on when we have the requirements review session. I don't know. We will have to see how it goes.

**Dan:** Would we have some clarification at some point in writing?

**Mike:** We have that pretty early in the process so I am not sure that we can get down to a detailed field level explanation in that requirement review session.

**Dan:** Would we at some point prior to the

**Mike:** Oh yes. I am ready to move to 2370. We talked about this in January. I forget again why we deferred this one. I was trying to understand that. What happens today is line sharing can be provided on a cheap FX line. She is saying that Verizon should do the verification of cheap FX line and allow \_\_\_ to be processed. I think the CLEC has to do other work to actually get it to work. Note the comment under the status comment column dated 1/8/02. It says only line sharing can have FX service therefore this change request does not include line splitting. Line splitting would not apply in this scenario. Does anybody remember why we deferred this in January?

**Woman:** It was to investigate whether it would affect other products. It got lumped together with the other two.

**Mike:** Okay. That makes sense. I am ready. I think it is appropriate to rate this one.

**Dan:** A question. How come this isn't a type one? It sounds like there is a process in place.

**Mike:** I don't know. That is a good question.

**Dan:** If you read the details on the descriptions that change on the actual change request form, it mentions that back in October line sharing is compatible with the type of FX but the system is still rejecting it. The system should be fixed. It doesn't sound like \_\_\_ \_\_\_ this is not compatible with something that is in place.

**Mike:** My recollection was something to the effect that extra work had to be done to submit the LSR and what was being requested is that Verizon do that work instead of the data provider. Maybe I am wrong. I know it doesn't read that way.

**Dan:** The process is in place and the business rule was allow for and the LSR is still being rejected.

**Mike:** Right. I need Elizabeth.

**Erin:** I am looking for my copy of that CR.

**Elizabeth:** I am on. Today what currently happens is if we get a reject, we have to go into the web gooey and validate if the \_\_\_ \_\_\_ match in Maryland. If they do, it should work and should flow through. We are getting a system reject upfront and we have to put in a project i.d. and force it through.

**Erin:** It is a manual work around.

**Mike:** So you submit the LSR initially. It gets rejected.

**Elizabeth:** It actually gets rejected before we even put an i.d on there.

**Mike:** I would think if you knew cheap FX, it would put the i.d. on the first time. There must be a reason that I don't understand. That is what happens.

**Elizabeth:** Our systems are not capable of doing that upfront.

**Mike:** Now we know. Did that help?

**Elizabeth:** It is just being rejected and shouldn't be.

**Mike:** So that gives credibility or support for what Daniel was saying. It should be a type one as opposed to a change request. Does anybody beside me hear this hum?

**Dan:** Yes.

**Woman:** Based on the discussions we have had today on type ones, I agree that it should be a type one.

**Mike:** Want me to treat this as a type one? I can do that. Moving ahead to 2371.

**Lori Ann:** We are going to withdraw that because after further investigation we found that it was only New Jersey and more an issue that the NMC's were not being followed. Supposedly as of February 1<sup>st</sup> all the reps have received coaching and I don't think anybody should see this problem again.

**Mike:** Good. Thank you. That brings us to 2096.

**Dan:** 2376?

**Mike:** The one that is being withdrawn?

**Dan:** Never mind. Keep going, sorry.

**Mike:** Can we get Elliott on the phone?

**Claudia:** I bet you thought you would never say that.

**Dan:** I will tell him you said that. You may take back those words.

**Mike:** This is the one we looked at during the Ironside release to enable retasks to do something. Sue, are you on?

**Sue:** I am.

**Mike:** Sue will explain to us what this CR is trying to do.

**Sue:** Okay. This request came out of the RCNC where they are trying to make their operations more efficient and according to the RCNC they did solicit feedback from their customers. They told me that 10% of their total volume of calls are trouble tickets that come into the center and have to do with a request to verify features on the line. Their position is they want to provide new automation to make it easier to be able to check data and when submitting the LSR the first time or if you are getting a reject on a LSR you would be able to do this feature validation check without having to put into a trouble ticket and find out immediately if there is a feature discrepancy.

The RCNC put this together to reduce the number of calls and trouble tickets coming in and it is providing greater functionality from the CLEC's. You can check this real time and it will help you if you are getting a reject on an order. They want to do a few as soon as possible. We have to get agreement from the CLEC's through change control. That is where we are. Any questions?

**Mike:** Are we ready to prioritize this? Since we don't get a vote and we originated it, I guess we can start at the top of the list. Allegiance?

**Woman:** We will give it a five.

**Mike:** AT&T?

**Woman:** Five.

**Woman:** We will give it a 4.5.

**Mike:** Cox? Hello Mary? She gave up on us. Met-Tel?

**Man:** We will pass.

**Mike:** \_\_\_\_?

**Woman:** Five.

**Mike:** WorldCom?

**Woman:** Five.

**Mike:** Choice One?

**Woman:** Five.

**Mike:** \_\_\_\_\_?

**Woman:** Five.

**Mike:** Anybody that would like to vote on this that I didn't call? Here is what I recorded. Allegiance at 5. AT&T at 5. Broadview at 4.5. Met-Tel passed. \_\_\_\_\_ at 5. WorldCom at 5. Choice at 5. \_\_\_\_\_ at 5. Thank you. We need to go back and pick up some type four out of the release?

**Claudia:** Did I miss CR2376?

**Dan:** I was wondering about that, Mike.

**Mike:** I don't have that number. What is that?

**Claudia:** Activate the directory listing form to work during voice.

**Dan:** Page 41 and 42.

**Mike:** It is not in my zero-rated thing.

**Dan:** You have to look at the full listing.

**Mike:** Miss King?

**Becky:** I am here.

**Mike:** We have talked about this. I thought we prioritized it.

**Becky:** It looks like it got left on there.

**Mike:** Are you sure? I thought this was prioritized. Let's go ahead. Mary, are you on? Is this the issue where there is nowhere to update the number of books delivered and what Verizon is doing is overriding the number of books delivered with one?

**Woman:** No.

**Mike:** That is the one I thought we prioritized. I am thinking of the wrong issue. Is anybody from Cox on to describe this for us? If not, should we hold this over or push forward with this? Our rule is if the author is not here, we hold it for one meeting and then we cancel it if they still don't show. Claudia?

**Claudia:** This was not even on the list and so it is possible they looked at the list quickly and saw it wasn't included so they thought they didn't need to be here.

**Mike:** What should we do?

**Woman:** Hold it until March.

**Claudia:** Can we get them on the line now? Can anybody try and call somebody?

**Mike:** Mary was here a minute ago.

**Woman:** I will try Michelle.

**Mike:** Becky or Tim or Sam or Fred?

**Becky:** She is calling now.

**Mike:** I don't think this is true.

**Woman:** I got her voice mail. I will try Michelle Johnson.

**Man:** I just tried Michelle G. and she is going to get Michelle Johnson on the line. They will be joining us.

**Mike:** There are two issues here. Should we look at the type four's? Is there just one?

**Becky:** There were two. One had to do with notifying about the 20% but I was going to find out more information on that.

**Mike:** I recommend we don't prioritize that. This humming is driving me absolutely nuts.

**Woman:** Me too.

**Mike:** Should I get the operator so we can find out where it is coming from?

**Lori Ann:** I was not able to get either Michelle.

**Mike:** I think they are coming now. I think someone did get them. We are trying to get rid of this humming noise.

**Operator:** This is AT&T Teleconference. I will take a few people off the conference. Someone moved their phone and it faded. Did you hear that?

**Mike:** I think when you talk it goes away because you capture the voice circuit.

**Operator:** I will take a few people off at a time and try and locate it.

**Mike:** Great, thanks. Is it gone?

**Woman:** Sounds pretty quiet.

**Operator:** It is not on your line. I have you on with the recorder and it is not the recorder. Let me put you back.

**Michelle:** This is Michelle for Cox. Sorry about that.

**Mike:** That is okay. We are trying to isolate some problem on the line right now. Those beeps are the operator taking people off and putting them back on. Someone is shuffling papers. Do you want to do an update on digital certificates?

**Joanie:** I just wanted to remind the community about changes to the access procedures for web gooe [beeping] A digital certificate will need to be downloaded and there is a new url. Notices went out through BA change control. We want to remind everybody out there on a weekly basis.

**Claudia:** Do you have that url?

**Joanie:** The url is <https://wholesalegw.verizon.com/gsi/webgooey> Keep in mind that before a user can access an application they need to download a digital certificate. Once you get to that url, it will prompt you to select a digital certificate and if you don't have one on your browser, you won't be able to get access.

**Lorraine:** You had a few of my people there that were supposed to start today with downloads.

**Joanie:** We seem to be playing phone tag. I have tried a few times. Any questions, you can e-mail the connectivity management team. The url to download a certificate is [https://wholesalegereg.verizon.com/gsi-searchdtrs/.docs/AutoRA\\_1](https://wholesalegereg.verizon.com/gsi-searchdtrs/.docs/AutoRA_1) Existing users need their web gooe log on i.d. and password. They will be prompted to enter that in. I would remind super users that from now on any new i.d.'s they create they would need to download a digital certificate for also. You can point them to the new url. Don't even let them know about the old url. That will be going away soon.

**Mike:** Okay, thank you. Michelle is on, right?

**Michelle:** I am.

**Mike:** We want to go over 2376 to understand the situation.

**Michelle:** Did Michelle Johnson join?

**Woman:** When I spoke to her she said she would not be able to.

**Michelle:** Okay. Is Tracy on?

**Tracy:** I am.

**Michelle:** We did the test. Were you successful in getting those disconnects?

**Tracy:** Yes.

**Michelle:** What about migrate over? Kathy Sheeley put in an order to migrate.

**Tracy:** I didn't look at hers but to my knowledge it was successful. I know it was on residential we did.

**Michelle:** At this time, can we go ahead and roll this over to the next change control meeting so we can do a little more research? I apologize for the last minute on this.

**Mike:** That is okay. We will hold it to March. Any discussion?

**Michelle:** I need to make sure it is working properly.

**Mike:** We are thinking it is not an issue?

**Michelle:** There were some changes to the gooey back in December and some changes made during system enhancements have helped this issue. I still need to test it and make sure it is working properly. We can readdress it in March.

**Mike:** Great. The only thing I have left to do is go back to the Ironside release and pick up those type four's that need to be prioritized. The first one I see is 2286, which is on page 36 of 38 having to do with electronic jeopardy update. This is the one that Bob gave us a brief message on. One code was being used to do two different things. This is going to split it out into two different values. I know that AT&T has been pushing this very hard. That is about all I know about this. Do you think we can prioritize this? Allegiance?

**Woman:** We will give it a four.

**Mike:** AT&T?

**Claudia:** Five.

**Mike:** Broadview?

**Woman:** Four.

**Mike:** Cox? Met-Tel.

**Man:** 3.5.

**Mike:** \_\_\_\_?

**Woman:** Four.

**Mike:** WorldCom?

**Woman:** Four.

**Mike:** \_\_\_\_\_?

**Woman:** Three.

**Mike:** Anybody else need to vote?

**Woman:** Cox.

**Mike:** I called you.

**Woman:** Sorry. We will give it a three.

**Dan:** What page?

**Mike:** Page 36.

**Dan:** Elliott would have given it a five.

**Mike:** Do whatever is right. I wrote down Allegiance is five, Broadview is four, Met-Tel is 3.5 and \_\_\_\_ is four and Choice One is [beeping] Cox is three. WorldCom is four. Others that we need to prioritize?

**Becky:** I don't think so.

**Mike:** With that, I am done. Any other thoughts?

**Woman:** Did we withdraw 2376?

**Mike:** We deferred it to March. Okay, thank you all.

**Woman:** Is Joyce still in the room?

**Joyce:** Yes.

**Woman:** I believe there are two issues. One has been brought forward by Claudia, which is on publication of pre-order specifications, in particular Corba, the IDL. I believe we asked Verizon to take a look at publishing that document specifically one section in a Word or text format. Now it is only published in a pdf format. The reason behind this is from an IDL perspective, we must match identically your specifications. Not having it publicized in a Word format causes quite a bit of additional activity and work on our part. In your February release after you published final documents you revised your IDL three times. We would like to put that request forward again.

**Mike:** I wasn't familiar with the request. We will look into it. The system we use to produce the documents only produces them in pdf. Then we went after the business rules in rtf, which you can import into Word but it is not going all that well. It takes a lot of time to do it and the files are really big. They are on the web. If we are going to produce Corba in rtf, I think we need to go back to the developers of that system to see what they could do. We are looking at changing the way we produce the documents and enhancing the system mainly to produce documents for East and West. We will take this into consideration as we develop that new system. I am not sure how much we can do with the old system. We will look into it.

**Woman:** Is it plausible to see something in the year 2002?

**Mike:** We hope to get a new system deployed by fourth quarter. I don't think it is plausible to expect this for the June release. October would be very iffy. I wouldn't count on it.

**Woman:** Then the other item is for your April release. Do you know at this point in time whether there will be any changes to your IDL? I have that question out to be a change control.

**Mike:** I don't know. I would have to follow-up.

**Woman:** I would appreciate that. Whether you use all the methods like a transaction or not, when you code from a CLEC perspective we must match 100% even though we don't use the message. That is the way Corba works. When you say there is no business rule change, sometimes that might not always be true as it relates to Corba.

**Mike:** You know more about Corba than I do. We will get to our Corba folks and try to verify. It was just used for pre-orders?

**Woman:** Correct.

**Mike:** Other items we need to bring up? Okay, thanks a lot.