



January 10, 2001

# CCP Process Improvement Meeting MEETING MINUTES

|  |  |                           |
|--|--|---------------------------|
| MEETING NAME<br><b>CCP PROCESS IMPROVEMENT</b><br><b>BellSouth Conference Center</b> | MINUTES PREPARED BY:<br>Brenda Files – Change Control Team | DATE PREPARED<br>01/22/01 |
|--|--|---------------------------|

### Participants/Attendees

| PARTICIPANT        | COMPANY      |
|--------------------|--------------|
| Brenda Files       | BST - CCP    |
| Valerie Cottingham | BST - CCP    |
| Cheryl Storey      | BST - CCP    |
| Steve Hancock      | BST - CCP    |
| Bill Grant         | Telcordia    |
| Martha Weber       | BST- NCS/CS  |
| Jay Bradbury       | AT&T         |
| Kevin McCall       | BST - NCS/CS |
| Marva Goff         | BST          |
| Doyle Mote         | BST - NCS/CS |
| Tammy Swanson      | Accenture    |
| John Duffey        | FL - PSC     |
| Stephanie Smith    | dset         |
| Shamone Stapler    | ITC/Deltacom |
|                    |              |

| PARTICIPANT     | COMPANY             |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| Rick Woodhouse  | KPMG                |
| Graham Watkins  | KPMG                |
| Rich Bobik      | AT&T                |
| Brian Rutter    | KPMG                |
| Brent Marshall  | US Dept. of Justice |
| Lorraine Watson | Worldcom            |
| Judy Novo       | Mpower              |
| Ranae Clark     | e.spire             |
| Tyra Hush       | Worldcom            |
| Sandy Evans     | Sprint              |
| Mandy Jenkins   | Alltel              |
| Nicki Gray      | Alltel              |
| Donna Graham    | Mantiss             |
| Anthony Zerillo | Birch Telecom       |
|                 |                     |

### Meeting Information History

| DATE            | START TIME         | END TIME           |
|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| <b>01/10/01</b> | <b>9:00 AM EST</b> | <b>4:00 PM EST</b> |

|  |
|--|
| MEETING PURPOSE<br><b>To better understand the CLEC's needs with regard to the Change Control Process and to address outstanding action items from the November 1 and December 7 meetings.</b> |
|--|

January 10, 2001

## CCP Process Improvement Meeting MEETING MINUTES

| Agenda Items                     | Discussion  |
|----------------------------------|---|
| <b>1. Opening and Welcome</b>    | <p>Valerie Cottingham (BST) opened the meeting with a welcome to everyone and stated that there was a very aggressive agenda with plans to completely discuss the entire "marked up" CCP document (CR0171) and review outstanding action items.</p> <p>Valerie stated that BellSouth has an open action item to discuss the internal process of what happens to a change request after it is prioritized. Terrie Hudson had planned to discuss at the December 7, 2000 CCP Process Improvement Meeting, however time ran out. This discussion will be delayed until Terrie returns to work in February. Terrie had previously shared that changes to this process are in progress.</p>  |
| <b>2. Changes to the Process</b> | <p>Jay Bradbury (AT&amp;T) proposed an e-mail ballot to indicate how the group agrees on changes. Each change will be listed separately on the ballot and indicate whether simple or contested consensus was reached during the meeting.</p> <p>BellSouth agreed to the e-mail ballot as long as BellSouth has the right to "veto" a change that could not be supported as proposed. There were no objections.</p> <p>Valerie explained that if the CLEC community agrees on a change to the document that BellSouth cannot support, BellSouth would explain why the change couldn't be supported.</p> <p>Everyone agreed that all open action items would not be voted on at this time.</p>  |
| <b>3. E-mail ballot</b>          | <p>The attached ballot reflects changes that were discussed and submitted for voting by the CLECs and BellSouth. Ballots are to be sent to the entire CLEC community. The entire group supported this discussion.</p> <p>AT&amp;T will assist with the ballot. It was agreed the email ballot would be used for changes discussed in today's meeting only. Rules will be sent out with the ballot and the response is due back to BellSouth in one week.</p> <p>Subsequent to the meeting, BellSouth learned that the suggested language had slightly changed in Section 7.0, Introduction and Retirement of Interfaces, and will be presented to CLECs in our February meeting. Therefore, this section will not appear on the ballot.</p> |

January 10, 2001

## CCP Process Improvement Meeting MEETING MINUTES

| Agenda Items                          | Discussion   |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <b>4. General Discussion</b>          | <p>It was suggested that the pre-order and ordering categories for the January 31, 2001 Change Review Meeting be combined since BellSouth IT sizes work requests by feature and not by interface or category.</p> <p>It was agreed that on a case-by-case basis, BellSouth would negotiate response intervals for handling large volumes of defect requests that are received simultaneously from one CLEC to Change Control.</p> <p>Doyle Mote (BST) addressed the outstanding action item for a “matrix format” for the BBR LO. Change Control will distribute a notice for a sub-team meeting on 2/01/01 to address improvements to the BBR-LO.</p> <p>“Exceptions” were defined as changes not accomplished in the standard timeframes (ex: OSS99). It was agreed a separate section was not needed for “Exceptions” as long as text would be added to the “Retirement of Versions”, to indicate how additional time could be requested to extend a sunset date, etc.</p> <p>CLECs expressed concern with High and Medium Impact defect intervals. BST advised that it is working to try to improve these intervals.</p> <p>Everyone was in agreement to defer discussion on Section 10 – Test Environment until the CLEC Test Bed is implemented.</p> <p>Dispute Resolution Process – Jay Bradbury (AT&amp;T) stated he needed to review the “mediation” text. No other comments were provided.</p> |
| <b>5. Summary of New Action Items</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BellSouth will investigate who will initiate the dispute resolution process when CLECs reach consensus and BellSouth objects to a change. BellSouth or CLEC?</li> <li>• BellSouth to distribute ballots one (1) week from 01/10/01.</li> <li>• BellSouth to present an overview of the CCP Internal process.</li> <li>• Page 42 – BellSouth to investigate the note regarding “CLEC notification of documentation updates (Non-System Changes) will be posted five (5) business days in advance of documentation posting date)” and determine if this statement needs to remain in this section.</li> <li>• Page 46 – BellSouth to investigate what type of status information BellSouth can provide to original CLEC on High Impact Defects within a 24 hour timeframe.</li> <li>• BellSouth to provide additional information regarding the Internal Process (CRB) in Step 3 of Types 2-5 process flow.</li> </ul>  |

January 10, 2001

## CCP Process Improvement Meeting MEETING MINUTES

| Agenda Items           | Discussion   |
|------------------------|--|
|                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 41- BellSouth to determine when User Requirements can be presented to CLECs for expedited features.</li> </ul>   |
|                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BellSouth to investigate if scenarios can be shared with CLECs for multiple releases.</li> </ul>  |
|                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BellSouth to consider multiple releases for large items that are not scheduled for next release.</li> </ul>   |
|                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BellSouth – To investigate Step 7-cycle time for Types 2-5 can be changed to six (6) months prior to release date.</li> </ul>   |
|                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BellSouth - “NLT” will be replaced with “at least” throughout the document to better clarify.</li> </ul>  |
|                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BellSouth – Section 6 - Part 3 (Prioritizing Change Requests) – Revisit- CLECs may choose to vote “no” on Change Requests that may negatively impact its business. If the majority of CLECs vote “no” on any certain Change Request, that request will not be prioritized.</li> </ul> |
|                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BellSouth to prepare language regarding the appeal process for the retirement of versions.</li> </ul>   |
|                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BellSouth – Page 58 – Revisit escalation process - (Type 6 High Impact Issues – Time and Turn Around).</li> </ul>   |
|                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BellSouth – Reclassified defects, bullet 3, Bellsouth to determine if “BST” should remain in sentence.</li> </ul>   |
|                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BellSouth – BST to address providing potential release package combinations prior to prioritization.</li> </ul>   |
|                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BellSouth – Section 9 – Changes to CCP – Revisit proposed changes.</li> </ul>   |
|                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BellSouth - BST to investigate if Defect Steps 3 &amp; 4 are worked in parallel or serial.</li> </ul>   |
|                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BellSouth – Change Control Process to send out notification regarding a meeting and conference bridge to be held on 02/01/01 to address improvements to the BBR LO. A CLEC sub-team will meet in the PM to discuss with BellSouth.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>6. Next Meeting</b> | The next CCP Process Improvement meeting is tentatively scheduled for the week of 2/11/01. Meeting details will be distributed via Change Control.   |

January 10, 2001

## CCP Process Improvement Meeting MEETING MINUTES

| Agenda Items  | Discussion  |
|---|---|
| <b>7. Review of Outstanding Action Items from 11/1/00 and 12/07/00 CCP Process Improvement Meetings</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(11-01-00) BellSouth - Update on the evaluation of documentation needs for provisioning vs. requirements (coding). Investigate an electronic solution for documentation, preferably in a "matrix" format. Telcordia provided a "matrix" example to be considered as a guide.<br/><br/>Status: OPEN - BellSouth is continuing to investigate this "matrix" format for the BBR-LO. Doyle Mote plans to send out notice for a proposed meeting on 02-01-01 to help determine what works and what would not work using this format.</li> </ul> |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(11-01-00) BellSouth - Provide "draft" requirements 90 days in advance for minor enhancements to existing versions, and 180 days in advance for major release changes.<br/><br/>Status: OPEN - BellSouth proposed changes to the "marked up" version of the CCP document. Currently these changes are still open and will be discussed at the February CCP Improvement meeting.</li> </ul>   |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(11-01-00) BellSouth - To communicate the time intervals that will need to occur for CLEC Test Environment requirements to be received by the CLECs in a timely manner.<br/><br/>Status: OPEN - To be discussed at a CLEC Test bed meeting on January 17, 2001.</li> </ul>   |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(11-01-00) BellSouth - BST will propose a process on how it would collectively evaluate a non-OBF standard request.<br/><br/>Status: OPEN - Language was included in the "marked up" version from BellSouth, however there will be further discussion at the February meeting.</li> </ul>  |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(12-07-00) BellSouth - To investigate how "unofficial documentation" and "job aids" will be supported.<br/><br/>Status: CLOSED - Meeting Consensus was obtained on the BellSouth language and this item was added to the voting ballot.</li> </ul>   |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(12-07-00) BellSouth - To investigate the Presale Quality Team and Start Up Team documentation. Is there a relationship between the two teams?<br/><br/>Status: CLOSED - BellSouth determined that these groups are the same.</li> </ul>   |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(12-07-00) BellSouth - To investigate adding the system outage ticket number with Type 1 email notification.<br/><br/>Status: CLOSED - BellSouth has implemented this change effective 12-15-00.</li> </ul>  |
|   |   |

January 10, 2001

## CCP Process Improvement Meeting MEETING MINUTES

| Agenda Items | Discussion   |
|--------------|--|
|              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(12-07-00) BellSouth – To investigate CLECs not getting a call back from EC Support –<br/>Status: CLOSED – BellSouth investigated this claim with the CLECs and EC Support. No supporting examples were provided by CLECs as requested. BellSouth stressed to the CLECs that EC Support would adhere to its policy of returning calls to those CLECs who call into the center.</li> </ul> |
|              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(12-07-00) BellSouth – CLECs need the API and Specs at the same time as the final requirements, 45 days prior to external test start date.<br/>Status: OPEN – BellSouth is still addressing this request.</li> </ul>  |
|              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(12-07-00) BellSouth – Investigate if BellSouth can update text for all requirement dates as “before CLEC testing with BellSouth”. Currently it says “...changes/notifications will be provided ___ days before release implementation date”.<br/>Status: OPEN – BellSouth to address at February CCP Improvement Mtg.</li> </ul>   |
|              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(12-07-00) BellSouth – Investigate getting 120 days notice for final user requirements for implementing a new TCIF map. Notification would be provided 240 days and draft requirements, 180 days. At 120 days, EDI and TAG specs will be provided.<br/>Status: OPEN – BellSouth to address at February CCP Improvement Mtg.</li> </ul>  |
|              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(12-07-00) BellSouth – Investigate adding “sub-team” guidelines – roles/responsibilities and the interaction with Change Control and the CLEC community.<br/>Status: OPEN – BellSouth to address at February CCP Improvement Mtg.</li> </ul>  |
|              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(12-07-00) BellSouth – To add “language” to address all documentation changes, both non-system and system impacting being provided no later than 30 days prior to a release.<br/>Status: OPEN – This request was modified by the CLECs to read “prior to test date”. BellSouth to address at February CCP Improvement Mtg.</li> </ul>   |

January 10, 2001

## CCP Process Improvement Meeting MEETING MINUTES

| Agenda Items | Discussion   |
|--------------|--|
|              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(12-07-00) BellSouth - To investigate documenting an "exception process" separately in the CCP process document.</li> </ul> <p>Status: CLOSED - It was agreed that a separate section was not needed for "Exceptions" as long as text would be added to the "Retirement of Versions". (See General Discussion above)</p>  |
|              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(12-07-00) BellSouth - To provide an example of a re-classified defect in the expedited feature section.</li> </ul> <p>Status: CLOSED - BellSouth initially included an example of this type of defect, however since the expedited feature section is a new process, there is currently no change requests that meet this criteria. The decision was to not include this on the ballot.</p>                  |
|              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(12-07-00) BellSouth - To investigate adding "Emergency Change" into the title for Section 5.0 - Defect Process.</li> </ul> <p>Status: CLOSED - Meeting Consensus was reached that the words "Emergency Change" would be removed from all sections of the CCP document.</p>   |
|              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(12-07-00) BellSouth - To investigate adding "language" to include the following into the definition of a defect - "functional requirements are incorrect even though business requirements/rules match".</li> </ul> <p>Status: CLOSED - Consensus was reached on the new definition of defects which included this language for "functional requirements." This item was added to the ballot for voting.</p> |

