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Thereupon,
WAYNE WEAVER,
having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

## EXAMINATION

BY MR. BECK:
Q. Hi, good morning. My name is Charlie Beck, and $I^{\prime} m$ with the Office of Public Counsel.

Could you please state your name?
A. My name is wayne Weaver.
Q. BY whom are you employed?
A. By Verizon Communications, formally GTE.

MR. WOFFORD: Charlie, I should have mentioned this before, but can we agree that objections to the -- all objections except those to the form of the question are reserved?

MR. BECK: Sure.
MR. WOFFORD: Sorry.
BY MR. BECK:
Q. What is your position with Verizon?
A. I'm a manager in the internal audit
department.
Q. How long have you held that position?
A. I've been a manager for about 18 months now.
Q. What position did you hold before that?
A. Senior auditor.
Q. How long have you worked for Verizon?
A. About four years.
Q. Do you hold any professional
designations?
A. I have a master's degree, but no CPA, CIA or any of those.
Q. A master's degree in business or accounting?
A. It's in accounting with, I guess you'd call it, a minor in internal auditing.
Q. Have you been an internal auditor for the entire four years you've been at Verizon?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you do before that?
A. I was an internal auditor with

NationsBank.
Q. About how long did you do that?
A. Two and a half years.
Q. When did you receive your master's degree?
A. In $\quad$ 94.
Q. I'd like to ask you to take a look at the document that begins at Bates stamped page 17456 and ending at 17462 .
A. Through 17462?
Q. Yes.
A. Okay.
Q. Do you recognize that document?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Could you just briefly describe what the document is?
A. It is a legal memo that we drafted to Thomas parker who was the associate general counsel at the time related to the snyder Direct Services service audit review that we performed back in 1998.
Q. Does this document summarize the results of the internal audit that you conducted?
A. Yes.
Q. What was your role in that audit?
A. I was the lead auditor, the in-charge auditor on that job.
Q. Did you have a number of people working for you in that position?
A. Yes.
Q. Who was working for you?
A. Andrew Timberlake. Yamira Lajara.

MR. WOFFORD: Spell that.
THE WITNESS: It's Y-a-m-i-r-a
L-a-j-a-r-a.
Let's see. Susan North. I believe that was it.

BY MR. BECK:
Q. How did this audit come about; in other words, what caused this audit to occur?
A. There were -- it started with a request from our regulatory legal department. I believe the request came through Karen Smith.
Q. What was the request?
A. The request basically was we've been getting a number of complaints related to different slams from various sources, and they wanted us to do some additional investigations.
Q. Karen Smith is a lawyer?
A. She's in our regulatory department. She was an AVP, $I$ believe, of our regulatory affairs. I'm not sure what her exact title was
at that point in time.
Q. Was it the slamming that had been occurring with the use of Snyder people that led to the audit then?
A. Snyder was one of the focal points, but we had other telemarketing agencies that were doing -- or were selling long distance for us. Snyder was just one of them, was one of the bigger ones.
Q. Were the others audited at the same time that Snyder was audited?
A. No.
Q. This audit was just focused on Snyder and it's relationship to Verizon. Is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. On page 17456 , there are six bullets about halfway down. It says: The scope of the review.

Could you briefly describe what each of those six bullets are and describe how that was -- how that was part of the review that you did?
A. Okay. The sales order processing, basically what we were looking at there was
from the point when customer contact was made through the point when Snyder handed the order off to GTE or its affiliates, whoever that would be; that was the main point there. And what we were doing with those customer orders, we were looking for key attributes. We were looking for whether the proper documentation was maintained on file by Snyder. We were also looking at certain dates as well as far as how orders -- when did they start, when they did leave Snyder, when did they leave different places. We were doing a time line on these as well.

The next one was the sales compensation plans. We wanted to take a high level overview of the sales comp plans to make sure that there was nothing in the sales comp plans that was really incenting the salespeople to slam customers.

The next one was the quality control complaint resolution explanation reporting processes. That was on the back end of their order processing, what controls did they have in place to ensure order quality, order accuracy. Did they have any sort of follow-up
processes in place?
Q. Would that include whether the signatures on authorizations to change long distance companies were authentic?
A. Were they authenticating -- I'm not sure $I$ understand the question.
Q. Well, whether the signatures on authorizations to change long distance company, whether those signatures were actually the persons who they claimed to be?
A. I don't - I don't think that's what their department was there to do. I think they were just there to make sure that there was a valid signature, yes. But $I$ don't know if they were looking at it to see if it was that person's actual signature.

Is that where you were going with that question?
Q. Yes. Let's talk plainly about it.

Were they interested in whether some of the signatures on those forms were forgeries?
A. Yes, they were.
Q. Okay. Was that part of that review or some other part of the review where you looked at that?
A. Where we looked at that was mainly in the sales order processing. We wanted to make sure, if it was a signed delivery or if it was a telephone call, that they had a third-party verifier.
Q. Go ahead, please.
A. The performance monitoring and measurement. This was really internal metrics. How many orders did they bring in? How long did it take to gather those market orders? Which markets they were coming from? Different reporting standards that $S n y d e r$ was supposed to report to us as GTECC, GTE, whatever.

Training, what we wanted to look at here was for human resources. We wanted to make sure that - one of the big concerns that was raised by our regulatory department was if someone, a sales associate, on the Snyder side was caught, that if they had forged a customer's signature or made up a fictitious customer, how were they dealt with from a human resources standpoint? Were they were fired, basically? What disciplinary action was taken? We wanted to make sure that that was actually occurring and we felt was justified, satisfied
us.
The training and business ethics we wanted to make sure that in their training materials they were trained on what the regulations were, what were good ethical sales practices and was that covered, basically, in the training materials.

And the last one was logical system security, which this is kind of a catchall category to look at their systems and how information flowed from when it came in the door until when it left the door.
Q. This letter is signed by Mark R. Smith?
A. Yes.
Q. Who is he?
A. At the time he was the engagement manager on the job, and he was also acting as director for -- we had a director that had just left, and he was about to assume that position. So he was dual rules on their audit.
Q. Was he the person that you reported to?
A. Yes.
Q. How did his responsibilities compare
and contrast to yours in the audit?
A. Typically a manager on the job has a more high level role on an audit. The in-charge of the audit is there in the field. They are doing all of the work, and they are supervising the other staff members aiong with performing the test.
Q. And that latter aspect was your job?
A. Yes, correct.
Q. Did you help draft this letter?
A. I primarily wrote the letter, yes.
Q. So Mr. Smith reviewed the letter and made any changes he might make and then signed it?
A. We -- $I$ wrote the original draft of the letter. He did make some changes; and we did discuss any and all changes before he signed it, yes.
Q. Were there any meetings with Mr. Parker that you know of where this letter was discussed?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you describe what those meetings were?
A. The meeting was we presented the
results of the findings that were contained in this report.
Q. Who was present at that meeting?
A. The one meeting that $I$ 'm recalling was myself, Mark Smith and Tom Parker.
Q. Was it after this letter was sent to him or at the same time it was delivered?
A. When we delivered the hard copy.
Q. Were there any other follow-up meetings other than that one with Mr. Parker?
A. Not with Mr. Parker.
Q. okay. Were there follow-up meetings with someone else?
A. There were meetings with -- once we had the meeting with Tom Parker, there were no more meetings after that. We put that -basically because of the attorney-client privilege at that point in time that we were under, we left it under his control and he was taking it from there.
Q. Did you ever -- subsequent to the meeting with Mr. Parker, did you discuss or present the results of your audit to any other persons at GTE?
A. We had -- no.
Q. Did you -- after the audit did you discuss what you found with others?
A. Yes, we had discussions with other executives.
Q. Could you name who they were and when those discussions occurred?
A. There was one meeting that $I$ was involved with; and that was myself, Mark Smith and George Wieskopf, and $I$ 'm not sure of the last name, but $I$ think it's $W-I-E-S-K-O-P-F$. He was the vice-president of finance at the time and our main point of contact at GTECC.
Q. He was the vice-president of finance at GTECC?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was --
A. I believe that was his title.
Q. What was the scope of the discussion that you had with him?
A. This was a meeting that we had as part of our typical annual planning cycle, and it was a follow-up for -- I guess it was probably in November, December of '98, that time frame.
Q. When you say part of the typical
annual planning cycle, what does that mean?
A. Throughout the year we have - - our audit department does a risk-based audit approach where we speak with the business units and say what are your riskier bases. These are the different audit segments that we want to go do, the different audits that we want to go do. We present that plan to them, and we discuss what they want to include or what they want to throw out. And one of the items that we did talk about in these planning meetings during this time frame was what, if any, work we were going to be doing relating to Snyder Direct Services.
Q. And what was concluded about that?
A. At that meeting it was put basically on hold, was the conclusion of any further follow-up work at Snyder was put on hold.
Q. Why was that?
A. The main reason is our relationship with Snyder was changing and we didn't - at that point in time, no one knew if we were going to even be able to go back in and review Snyder again. And we would have done something in about a year, or something like that, from
the time.
Q. Are you familiar with GTE terminating Snyder with respect to foot sales in florida?
A. I know that it happened, yes.
Q. Was Your meeting with Mr. Wieskopf before or after that event?
A. I'm not sure. I don't know exactly when foot sales ended with Snyder.
Q. Were there any other follow-ups to this audit other than the audit itself and this meeting with Mr. Wieskopf?
A. There was an offshoot of the audit that's mentioned in the report, $I$ believe, related to AFNI financial.
Q. Describe that?
A. The AFNI audit was -- there were concerns raised during the snyder audit that orders were going to AFNI, they were getting stuck kind of in what was called the black hole at the time, and they were not getting processed for $30,60,90$ days. There were a lot of processing delays. And then they would show up at $G T E$ and for various reasons they'd get kicked out, some would get processed. So there were concerns that $A F N I$ was holding up
the process.
Q. Is AFNI an acronym?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. What does it stand for?
A. I believe it's American Financial Network, Inc.
Q. And I'm not -- how were orders getting held up in AFNI?
A. My basic understanding of the process flow was Snyder would take their orders, pass them electronically to AFNI who would process a segment of those orders for Snyder, or actually for GTE, take those orders and change them into -- get them into our systems, into the GTE systems. So they were a middle man, basically, between Snyder and ourselves.
Q. Could you turn to page 17460 of the letter, which is page 5 of the letter?
A. Yes.
Q. One of the recommendations that you made as part of this audit was to institute third-party verification for Snyder orders as was already being done in Florida -- or in California. Is that correct?
A. That was one of our recommendations,
yes.
Q. Could you describe the basis for that recommendation?
A. When we did the testing in California, we felt that the TPB process, how they had it working at that point in time was a best practice; and we felt that they should mirror that in other regions.
Q. How did the amount of slamming that was going on in California compare to other areas?
A. I don't recall the actual statistics, but my general feeling is that it was lower. I'd have to go back do that point in time to see what the actual statistics were.
Q. Let me direct your attention to under the first bullet on page 17460 .
A. $\quad U h-h u h$.
Q. This says: We recommend that Snyder begin using this process to verify all field sales based on a cost benefit analysis. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. What cost benefit analysis were you referring to in your letter?
A. The basic cost to implement the recommendation, what would it take to -- I believe, at the time what they were actually doing with their field sales reps, where they had, I believe, several cell phones that the field sales would take with them. They would call a third-party verifier. The third-party verifier, they would hand the cell phone over to the customer, and the customer would talk to the third-party verifier where you would record the call. Now, you'd have the cell phones, the usage, all those kinds of things that would go along with that. There would also be the training and the additional paperwork. So these are the costs that are related to implementing that sort of recommendation.
Q. And that process was only being engaged in in California for. Snyder sales. Is that $x i g h t ?$
A. Yes.
Q. Have you seen any analyses that determine what the cost of that process was?
A. No.
Q. You were recommending -- were you recommending, then, that such a cost benefit
analysis be undertaken?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know what the results of that recommendation were?
A. Not at this time, no.
Q. Have you known at any time what the results of that are?
A. No.
Q. Do you know whether the company entered into that cost benefit analysis or completed the analysis?
A. Not that $I$ know of at this point in time. Well, not that $I$ know of, period.
Q. The cost would be the actual -- you could actually calculate a dollar cost per sale to engage in the third-party verification like was being done in California, couldn't you?

MR. WOFFORD: Objection, calls for speculation.

Go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: I would assume that you could do that. I have not seen what Snyder's cost structure looks like. Even during this audit, we weren't privy to all that information. So $I$ don't know that $I$
could give an opinion on that. BY MR. BECK:
Q. But your recommendation was that such a study be conducted to determine what that cost would be; was it not?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, you mentioned a cost benefit analysis. What would be the benefit side?
A. The benefit we believed would be less slamming complaints, or less complaints from customer. It's a more secure process, a better controlled process, in our opinion, because you don't have the paperwork having to get passed around.
Q. Did you think that third-party verification would eliminate the forgeries that you had been finding in your investigation of Snyder?
A. Could you -- I'm not sure $I$ understand the question.
Q. Well, there's the benefit, you know, when you look at the cost benefit, the benefit would be valid sales as opposed to invalid ones; would they not?
A. Sure, yes.
Q. And one of the things you discovered in your audit was that snyder employees were forging customer signatures; is that right?
A. I don't think that we concluded that they were forged signatures. I don't remember drawing those conclusions, not to that strength. I know that we had some letters of agreement that we were concerned -- we had definite concerns about that was the name right, was the name wrong, was it a spouse's name or things of that nature, which $I$ think you could see in the testing. But $I$ don't recall it was coining the term "forged signatures."
Q. Did you suspect that there were signatures on -- letters of authorization were being forged?
A. My personal suspicions were probably yes.
Q. But you're saying you didn't test to see if that was true?
A. We tested to see if there were -- if a customer said John Doe, was the signature John Doe. We did not have any way of determining without contacting the customer if

John Doe signs his name with a big J or a little J. We couldn't tell exactly if that signature was Mr. John Doe's signature or not. We just knew that there was a signature on that piece of paper. That's all we could determine because we were not allowed to contact the customer directly about their order. We had to look at historical information.
Q. So you suspected that there were forgeries being engaged in by Snyder, but you didn't check to see if thosesignatures were authentic on authorizations?
A. I don't know how we could have.
Q. How would you determine -- or did you try to determine whether the signatures were actually that of the person whose signature it purported to be?
A. Without contacting the customer, I don't think -- $\quad$ cannot think of a way we would be able to authenticate that signature unless we ask the customer to sign a piece of paper in our presence and then we compared that to the LOA. That's the only way that $I$ could have determined, you know, with reasonable assurance that these two signatures matched; and we did
not have the ability to go back to the customers.
Q. Okay. So did you or did you not as part of the audit determine whether signatures were authentic on letters of authorization?
A. To the extent possible we made sure that they were good signatures, yes.
Q. That was one of the items you tested for, then?
A. We tested whether there was a signature on the forms, yes.
Q. I'm not sure we're getting caught up in semantics or not.

MR. WOFFORD: I think you two are talking past each other.

THE WITNESS: Maybe $I$ can try to explain a little bit. We are seeing a historical document and that this transaction occurred at a distant location and it has been forwarded from a field salesperson up through the ranks and it is -- we have got a photostatic copy of it sitting in front of us right now when we're doing our testing.

And what we can verify at this point
in time is we can verify on that sales order, we can see if it says John Doe and then we can see if John Doe actually signed it, we see if he spelled out his name.

But without contacting that customer and saying can you send me a faxed copy of your signature or can you come down and sign a piece of paper for me so that $I$ can actually compare it to this historical signature, there's no way that $I$ can authenticate that signature by the definition that $I$ think that you're trying to get at. There was no way for us to go about doing that.

I mean, we had one -- one, we had restrictions from both our side and from the Snyder side that were saying that, you know, minimize customer contact at all costs kind of things. And then there were also restrictions from, you know, our side that we needed to get this done within a very short period of time as well.

So with all of those constraints, we did what we could do. For those items
that we did have as concerns, those were forwarded on to both Snyder and to our regulatory affairs people. And the intentions were for them to go ahead and follow up on any of the ones that we had questions or concerns about.

Now, if they subsequently contacted customers and they were asking for independent verification of their signatures by having the customer sign another piece of paper, I don't know. BY MR. BECK:
Q. Okay. In your response you mentioned that you were on very tight time constraints, I believe, in completing this audit?
A. Yes.
Q. Was there a pending business decision that required those tight time constraints?
A. Yes.
Q. What was the pending business decision?
A. I think the continuing relationship with snyder. What our relationship was going to be with snyder was the decision.
Q. Does that mean whether you were going
to fire them or not, in plain language?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. And the higher-ups, the people who caused this audit to happen, wanted the audit results so they could make that determination. Is that right?
A. That was one of the pieces of their -- yes.
Q. Do you know who was responsible for making that decision on whether to terminate the relationship with snyder or not?
A. It would have been the GTE communications corps, GTECC executives. That would have been George Wieskopf, as I mentioned before. I believe -- I'm trying to think who the president was at the time. I think it was Butch Bircher who was the GTECC president at that point in time. They had changed over several times, but those would have been the key players.
Q. Did anybody ask you to discuss whether the relationship should be terminated or not?
A. Not directly. They didn't ask for my opinion of should we terminate with snyder or
not.
Q. Did they do so indirectly?
A. They wanted to know about the general working relationship between Snyder and ourselves and, you know, good points, bad points. They wanted to know those kind of things that were, $I$ think, additional information for them to make their decision.
Q. What was your recommendation on those points?
A. The recommendation, as I remember, from the audit department as a whole, not just mine independently, was that there were problems with Snyder and that, you know, something needed to be done with the relationship, either terminate it or downscale it or change the way we do business with them.
Q. When you say there were problems with Snyder, can you generally state what those problems were?
A. Well, going into the audit, we had -I mean, before we even kicked off that, when regulatory and GTECC had brought us in to actually prepare us for going to snyder and doing some of the audit work and whatnot, they
had -- we had a large meeting of different people, a big conference call, basically. And one of the things that was discussed was they realized that there were -from the field sales standpoint, there were some control weaknesses that were causing fraudulent or inaccurate LOAs to come through from the sales side, and that was kind of agreed upon.

Snyder folks were on the phone, GTECC folks were on the phone, regulatory and audit were all there together. And this is kind of a pre-planning meeting. So field sales was one of those items that was a known problem, and that was one of the main focuses of the review before we even really got started in the audit. When we started in the audit, we wanted to make sure we looked at field sales because that was such a problem. But because everybody agreed it was a problem and Snyder was doing fixes as we were in doing the audit, they had changed their process, they were doing massive number of things, we didn't go out and look at the Snyder field sales probably as much as we would have done had this been not agreed
upon to begin with.
Q. Agreed upon as a problem, you mean?
A. Yes. It was -- it's a known risk. And if everybody agrees it's a risk, why spend limited resources going after a known risk that everybody knows and is trying to fix? That was kind of the thinking.
Q. The known risk being the fraudulent sales?
A. By field sales, Yes.
Q. Let me return a little bit to the cost benefit analysis for third-party verification. You communicated that to Mr. Parker; did you not?
A. Yes.
Q. What was his response to your recommendation on that?
A. I believe it was positive.
Q. That he thought that that was something that should be done?
A. Yes.
Q. How about, did you mention that to Mr. Wieskopf in your meeting with him?
A. Yes, the whole report we discussed at length with different people in the regulatory
and in the executive levels of GTECC. Like I said, George Wieskopf was our primary contact at that; but the distribution on the report was fairly small.
Q. Let me ask you what the distribution was on the report?
A. I don't know what Mr. Parker did with it, but he asked us to discuss that with George Wieskopf.
Q. How to distribute your audit?
A. No. He asked us to go over the findings, make sure that we had discussed that with GTECC personnel.
Q. Was that at or about the time of your letter to Mr. Parker?
A. Yes.
Q. So your discussion with Mr. Wieskopf was somewhere around the May lith, 1998, time frame?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was his response to the recommendation on third-party verification?
A. Mr. Wieskopf?
Q. Yes.
A. Again, generally agreeable and that
sounds like a good thing to do, is the overall opinions that $I$ remember.
Q. You said you had meetings with various regulatory people and others concerning your audit?
A. We had -- part of our normal process for going through an audit or a review of this nature is that whenever we have any kind of finding or concern or whatever it might be, an observation, we will kind of leave it in draft form, not the report or anything like this, this is a very finalized document, we'll go discuss it with key personnel. And werll do that throughout the audit and make sure we have the finding right, make sure that we didn't miss something or we misunderstood something. So we call that our clearing process. We will clear those findings with them.

And part of that, we would have weekly status meetings that were requested not only by snyder but also by the GTECC folks and also regulatory. Regulatory meaning Karen Smith, primarily; she was our key contact. At those meetings we discussed our status of the audit.
Q. So you had weekly meetings while you were conducting the audit. Is that right?
A. I think there were two meetings, that's my general recollection, because of the short time span of this audit.
Q. And do you recall was Karen Smith at these meetings?
A. I know she was at one of them, but I'm not sure if she was at all or both.
Q. Who else attended these meetings?
A. I'm not sure of the exact names. I know that, generally speaking, the audit team was there. There was usually a representative from Snyder, a representative from GTECC and a representative from regulatory.
Q. Do you know who the GTECC representatives were at the meetings?
A. Not specifically. I know who the major players were, but $I$ don't know if they're always the ones that came to the meeting or not.
Q. Karen $\operatorname{Smith}$ is a major player?
A. On the regulatory side, yes.
Q. How about on the non-regulatory side, the business side?
A. That would have been -- I mean, our key players would have been -- I believe his name is Michael Lyons, and the other person was Ted Gilmore.
Q. Now, besides Mr. Parker and Mr. Wieskopf, with whom else did you discuss your recommendation concerning third-party verification?
A. The recommendation was discussed at these meetings and before it was finalized in the report that you see. And that included the same, somebody from Snyder, somebody from GTECC, somebody from -- audit was there and usually regulatory as well.
Q. You mentioned that Mr. Parker responded favorably to your recommendation?
A. Yes.
Q. And Mr. Wieskopf responded favorably to your recommendation. Is that right also?
A. Yes.
Q. Did anybody ever respond negatively to your recommendation?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. Did anybody ever respond any way other than positively?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. Besides Mr. Wieskopf and Mr. Parker, do you recall any other persons who you discussed that recommendation with?
A. Other than the ones that had already been mentioned? I mean, somebody --
Q. Karen Smith?
A. Karen Smith. Somebody I - I could speculate who we talked with at Snyder, but I know we probably had that conversation with him, but $I$ don't remember it specifically. I also remember talking with different people in the audit organization. I mean, we talked with Jolene Modean who was the incoming vice-president of audit. She was the top person in audit. Also Mark Smith and the audit team as well. But from an outside standpoint, I think those were the key players.
Q. Do you know whether Karen Smith is still with GTE, Verizon?
A. I believe she is. That's -- I'm not 100 percent sure.
Q. You don't know what her position would be now?
A. No, I really don't.
Q. And I'm sorry. She was the vice-president in regulatory?
A. She was an AVP or a VP. I'm not sure which at that point in time. And she was in the regulatory -- it was either regulatory compliance, regulatory affairs, something like that, but $I$ don't know specifically.
Q. And what was her particular interest in the audit of Snyder?
A. They had a number of complaints that had come through, and a lot of them had Snyder's name on them. And because of the number of complaints that had happened, she felt that we needed to go do an audit of them. Again, she was kind of the driving force; herself and Tom Parker were working together to kind of be the driving force behind the audit.
Q. To your knowledge, your
recommendation concerning third-party
verification was never implemented.. Is that true?
A. To my knowledge, no.
Q. Do you have any idea why?
A. I believe that we were ending our relationship with Snyder. And to implement
something of, you know, a process change nation-wide like this, it wouldn't just take a -- it would take several months to get it rolled out, get it up and working in all locations. And $I$ don't - and from the discussions that we had with Mr. Wieskopf in the November, December time frame, again, we were kind of put on hold for stuff. And subsequent to that we found out that we were ending our relationship with snydex.
Q. Your recommendation was made no later than May 11th of 1998 ?
A. Right.
Q. Which is the date of your letter to Mr. Parker; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. And your relationship with Snyder foot sales wasn't terminated for at least another six months. Isn't that right?
A. I don't know when it was terminated. I don't know when the Snyder foot sales was terminated. I don't know the exact date of that.
Q. Other than what you've already described, is there any other reason you
believe that your recommendation was never implemented, that you know. of?
A. Not that $I$ know of, no.
Q. As part of the audit, you performed a series of mystery shoppers at Snyder field sales events. Is that right?
A. We performed some, yes.
Q. Could you describe what the purpose of that was?
A. The primary purpose of the mystery shops was to get us acquainted with what was going on at a snyder field sales location.
Q. And by mystery shoppers, someone would appear but it would be unknown to salespeople that you were actually auditing?
A. Yes.
Q. You actually conducted one of them, didn't you?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. We'll get to that later. Other than what you've already discussed, were there any other follow-ups to this audit of Snyder?
A. There was not a follow-up audit of Snyder, no.
Q. But were there any other processes other than what you've already discussed?
A. Not that $I$ remember, no.
Q. Did you discuss the results of your audit with Snyder as well?
A. Yes. As part of the clearing process, we were talking with Snyder. They were at those clearing meetings.
Q. Let me ask you to turn to page 6 of the letter which is Bates stamped page 17461?
A. Okay.
Q. You have a number of bullets on this page --
A. Uh-huh.
Q. -- that describe the results of a substantive test of Snyder sales orders. Is that right?
A. Are you talking -- page 6, I mean, you were just looking at a different page than I was.
Q. Right, the bottom of page 5 that leads into page 6?
A. Yes.
Q. And then on page 6 you have some of the results of those. You describe some of the
results of some of those substantive tests. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. For example, the fourth bullet says that on 38 of 68 , or 56 percent, of the orders did not have one of the following identifiers on the LOA, Social Security number, driver's license number or date of birth. Is that right?
A. Right.
Q. Of those field sales?

Was that - $I$ mean, is that a problem? Didn't you think that was kind of unusual to have that kind of failure rate?
A. That high failure rate, yes, $I$ would have said that that was noteworthy. And again, their processes were changing and that's why the identifier was -- that was supposed to be a new fix, but their processes had only been in - the new processes had only been in place for a short period of time.
Q. Let me ask you to turn to page 17672, which is a different document.
A. 17672 . Are we done with this one here?
Q. Yes, for now.
A. Okay. I'll just keep it off to the side, then.
Q. Do you recognize this document?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Could you state what it is?
A. It is a planning memo. It is the document that we prepare for before we go out and do an audit that kind of lays out the logistics: What are we going to cover, how are we going to do it, where are we going to be staying, basic planning information for the audit.

MR. WOFFORD: Charlie, just so we know were talking about the same document, can you give me the inclusive Bates numbers of the documents?

MR. BECK: We've -- I was about to ask that.

BY MR. BECK:
Q. The planning memo, does that go through Bates stamp 17683 ?
A. One second.

It goes through 683 is the typed document, yes. And then there were supporting
documents that go into it.
Q. So the Bates stamps subsequent to 17683 are, what, support for the planning memo?
A. Some of them, yes. Let me just kind of thumb through here.
Q. Sure.
A. They would have stopped at 17707 . That would have been the end of the supporting materials for the planning memo.
Q. Is the planning memo something that you prepared?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Could you turn to Bates stamped page 17677 ?
A. 677 , yes.
Q. Could you turn your attention to the place where it says special note?
A. (Witness nods head.) okay.
Q. Okay. You see where it says: This review involves a number of big players, and the term "big players" is in quotes?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you mean by big players?
A. I listed the following names, those being the key players or the big players,
meaning that there was -- this was a high profile audit and a lot of people were watching; therefore, we need to maintain, you know, high levels of professionalism.
Q. George Wieskopf, you've already mentioned; he was one of the big players?
A. Yes, he was. He was our key contact at GTECC.
Q. And you've mentioned Tom Parker who is with the legal counsel?
A. Yes.
Q. How about Bill Edwards, what was his role with respect to the audit?
A. At this point in time $I$ think he was the controller of GTE, of the GTE telephone operations at that point in time. He was administratively internal audit's boss. That's who internal audit reported up to, ultimately.
Q. Was he involved in any way in the audit?
A. He knew of the audit, and he had been in discussions with Tom Parker and Karen Smith to kind of get things kicked off.
Q. Do you know whether the results of the audit were provided to him?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Did you have any meetings with him?
A. Not me personally.
Q. Do you believe that if there were, they would be with either Karen Smith or Tom Parker, then, would have discussed this with him?
A. Yes.
Q. Who is Larry Zydou?
A. Larry Zydou.
Q. $\quad \mathrm{Zydou}$ ?
A. At the point in time, he was our acting assisting controller, auditing. He was the top person in auditing, and he was also an audit director. He was fairly new to the department, but --
Q. What role did he play in the audit?
A. Fairly minimal. I mean, he was fairly new. He came in, I think, during the audit, as $I$ remember. He was put on as acting during the middle of it. And his was more of just a review. He knew of the audit, what the findings were, had seen a copy of the legal letter that was sent out.
Q. Did you ever discuss the audit with
him?
A. Yes.
Q. What were your discussions with him about the audit?
A. Just like with the other remaining audit department members. We just talked about what we found, what we did, those kind of things, what our recommendations were.
Q. What was his response to that?
A. I don't remember specifically. But, you know, generally, you know, if he had a problem with it he wouldn't have let the report go out the door. I mean, that's just generally their role, so.
Q. Did you discuss your recommendation concerning third-party verification with him?
A. I'm sure we did. I don't remember it specifically; but, $I$ mean, we discussed the whole report with him.
Q. And do you recall his response?
A. Not -- not specifically, no.

Are we done with the planning memo?
Q. I think for now. I don't want to guarantee it, but.
A. Okay. I'll set it aside, then.
Q. Let me ask you briefly about a document Bates stamped 18274 .

MR. WOFFORD: Just the one page, Charlie?

MR. BECK: The document that goes through -- or this is a letter that's three pages long going through Bates stamped 18276 .

BY MR. BECK:
Q. I'd like to ask you if you recognize that document?
A. I do.
Q. Could you briefly describe what it is?
A. Is it an audit report from an audit of GTE Long Distance in 1997.
Q. Were you personally involved in that audit?
A. No.
Q. That's an audit different than the one you conducted on snyder; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. But as part of your audit at snyder did you review this audit?
A. We reviewed the report for the
findings as part of our planning process.
Q. Let me ask you on the first page of this letter, toward the bottom, it says: In our opinion the controls addressed within the scope of our audit are inadequate?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you familiar with that -- that opinion that's in the letter?
A. That's our typical opinion for - that's our worst opinion for when we issue a report.
Q. And when you did your audit of Snyder, you were aware of that opinion that had been made in this earlier audit of GTE Long Distance. Is that right?
A. I was aware of it, yes.
Q. What impact did that have on your audit of Snyder, if any?
A. I don't know of any. I don't know that it had any impact, really. I know that we looked at this audit as a reference tool to help us understand the process, to help us make sure that werre testing the right things, because they had done a lot of the preliminary work back in June of '97 or even earlier that
we used again as a reference source.
Q. Let me ask you to turn to Bates stamped page 18483 .

MR. WOFFORD: What's the full range?
MR. BECK: I'm not sure.
MR. WOFFORD: It begins with 18483 .
BY MR. BECK:
Q. Do you recognize the document that's Bates stamped page 18483?
A. Generally, yes.
Q. And it says Lead Memo at the top; does it not?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you describe generally what a lead memo is?
A. A lead memo is our base document, our work paper. It's where we document our testing, a specific piece of the testing, let's say.
Q. And is this part of a larger document? $I$ was wondering if you could identify the pages that would consist --
A. It has two pages. With this lead memo there are two pages, 83 and 84 .
Q. That's 18483 and 18484 ?
A. Yes. Those are the two that really go together. And then there would be -- if there would be anything it would be B-11 dot anything else at the top of the page here.
Q. All right.
A. And then there would be -- those would be associate documents. But $I$ don't see that on the next set of Bates stamps, so I don't know if they're out of order or whatnot. But these are the only two that really kind of go together.
Q. All right. At the bottom of the page under Findings, Condition Issue, it states that: No standardized and formalized process is in place for the forwarding and handing of complaints to Snyder. Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Could You describe in a little bit more detail what the problem is that that addresses?
A. That we found at that point in time?
Q. Yes.
A. The basic finding that we had was that complaints would come in from various sources and there was no central point to take
those in, handle them and make sure that they got resolved adequately. That was our biggest concern, biggest problem. There were multiple places, people, whatnot. I mean, there was -Snyder had a complaint piece, GTECC had a complaint piece, so on and so forth.
Q. On the top of the next page, which is Bates stamped paged 18484 , there's an area that says "risk high". Are there various descriptions of risk; are there various categories of risk that you can ascribe to a practice?
A. Yes. Low, medium and high.
Q. Okay. And the high then is the highest risk?
A. Correct.
Q. And it says: Lack of formality may result in either untimely resolution or lack of correction of unethical sales practices. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you agree with that?
A. That is the risk of not being able to track some of these things.
Q. Let me ask you to turn to page 18495?
A. Yes.
Q. This is a lead memo for a section of the audit described as B-12. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you recognize this, this lead memo?
A. Generally, yes.
Q. And then: The objective of this memo is to ensure that customer complaints are being handled properly and in a timely manner; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And then under Source there are a number of what look like subsections to me, is that what you could describe that? Or what would you describe that as?
A. The B-12.1 through B-12.10, these are supporting documents that support this document or would be referenced in this document.

And if you look at 18499 .
Q. Yes.
A. Just as an example, the way we cross-reference our -- the work papers, B-12.1 would be the summary of test work. And up at the top of this document you'd see handwritten

B-12.1. That would show that these are the two documents that the two are pointing towards or referencing each other.
Q. Okay. Okay. Let me go back again to those lists of the subpoints?
A. Yes.
Q. B-12.1 is a summary of test work?
A. Yes.
Q. B-12.2 is a log of all complaints for unauthorized switching on hand at Snyder?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. How did you determine, you the auditors, complaints of unauthorized switching on hand at Snyder?
A. If a customer would call in to Snyder and say that $I$ had been slammed or $I$ have a complaint or whatnot, they would log it; and it was supposed to make it on this log.
Q. Let me backtrack again here to B-12.1, which is the summary of test scores?
A. Yes.
Q. And you referred me earlier to page 18499 as a place where that summary of test work starts. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And to which page does that extend, the summary of test, or B-12.1?
A. I think that's the only one. Let me just double check.

That's what it looks like. It's just one page.
Q. What would be on the next page, then, on Bates stamped page 18500 ?
A. B-12.2, which would be the next cross -referenced document, which would be the log of all complaints for unauthorized switching on hand at snyder.
Q. How do these relate, the 12.1 and 12.2?
A. I believe 12 point -- let me just make sure, hold on.
12.2, B-12.2 was the Snyder listing of complaints, and that was used to pick a sample for testing.
Q. Is the sample on 12.1?
A. Yes.
Q. So 12.1 is a sample of those that are listed on 12.2?
A. Correct. We took a sample of 25 items.
Q. Let's look at the sample, which is on Bates stamped page 18499?
A. Yes.
Q. There are a number of -- or one of the first columns is BTN?
A. Yes.
Q. What does BTN stand for?
A. Billing telephone number.
Q. And there are a number of 305 area code numbers listed there; is that right?
A. I see about five, yes.
Q. Are there six?
A. I'd have to count them, one - I got seven. Item number 5 and then items 13 through 18.
Q. Okay. Seven area code 305 s?
A. Yes.
Q. And also one item 19 in the area code 407; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And all those area codes are in Florida; are they not?
A. Ism not sure.
Q. Well --
A. I just don't know.
Q. All right. Well, in any case, if we combine 305 and 407 , we have eight of those that are in either of those area codes --
A. Yes.
Q. -- out of your 25?

Now, let's just take one, just take the first one, for an example. All right. That's line 5 for the 305-651-6513?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. This, again, comes from a subsection of all those complaints that were received by Snyder?
A. Yes.
Q. And are these the only complaints about unauthorized changing?
A. I don't remember exactly. I don't
know if they were. I don't remember specifically if it was all just complaints of slamming or complaints of any nature. I don't remember.
Q. Let me ask you to direct your attention back to 18495 , that page?
A. Yes.
Q. Doesn't under section B-12.2 say: Log of all complaints for unauthorized
switching on hand at Snyder?
A. Yes.
Q. So these would only be complaints for unauthorized switching. Is that right?
A. That's what I'm thinking, yes.
Q. Okay. Let's go back to 18499. Could you just read across and tell me what each of those columns mean with respect to that item, as an example?
A. Give me just a minute, please, so I can just make sure $I^{\prime} m$ familiar with this.
Q. Sure.
A. (Witness reviews document.)

Okay. The first, it looks like four columns which include $B T N$ trans date, required date and rep I.D. Those are basic identification so we know what the key time frames were, what the customer phone number was and who was the actual one processing.
Q. Is the transaction date the date that the switch purportedly occurred or was purportedly authorized?
A. I'm not 100 percent sure but I - I don't know for sure, but $I$ would say yes.
Q. How about the required date; is that
what you call that?
A. It may be request date. It may be the date the request got processed.
Q. Go ahead.
A. Again, I'm not sure what each of the dates actually represent at this point in time. I'm sure when we were doing the test we did, but $I$ just don't have anything that shows me what they are, what they mean today.

The next one is the action plan, which on this one says Written warning/invest.
Q. What does that mean?
A. Well, looking at the original B-12.2, looking for that item, the action plan, what Snyder was going to do with it, I assume, is that they were going to issue a written warning to the rep or to someone and then they were going to investigate the change at a further date.
Q. And that's for the complaint of unauthorized switching that that action plan was taken?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. Go ahead.
A. The action plan date was the next
date is when that was supposed to happen or when it did happen.

Audit by $Q A$ was their $Q A$ department. Did someone take a look at it from their side? Step A, Test Work Steps A. If you reference down below: The following tests were performed for the columns listed.

Do you want me to continue?
Q. In other words, I just look to the bottom of the page for those columns A through D to say what they are?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay.
A. And each of the columns will tell you what they verified. And if we had -- in this case you'll see that we had -- there was an E-1 in column $A$.
Q. Yes.
A. E-1 being that that was an exception that we took. It says see B-12.

Field personnel did not resolve complaint within 72 -hour time line. That was an internal metric that Snyder had that if a complaint came through that their field sales personnel would have to resolve it within 72
hours. That's what the E-1 referenced.
And then going across, the different tick marks are, again, down here at the bottom on the right-hand side of that that says: Tested with no exceptions, blah, blah, blah.
Q. All right. Now, on the page of the 12-2 pages, which $I$ take it are eight pages, beginning at Bates stamp 18500 through 18507?
A. 18507? Yeah.
Q. And these are a log of all complaints for unauthorized switching on hand at Snyder we discussed earlier. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. What was the time frame covered by - -
A. Well, just a second. I want to make sure that they're all the same.
Q. Sure.
A. Yes, it looks like they are all the same.
Q. What was the time frame covered by this?
A. I don't know for sure. I can tell you what the report shows. I don't remember specifically.
Q. All right. Go ahead and tell me what
the report shows?
A. Up at the top there's a marker that says: CRC complaints (1/1 through 4/8). So.
Q. So would that indicate to you that these are the complaints received by Snyder about unauthorized switching during that period January 1 through April 8th of 1998?
A. It could be. I mean, those are the only dates that $I$ see. I mean, I don't have anything that tells me one way or the other.
Q. Okay. And, of course, this doesn't include any of the complaints received by GTE about slamming; these are only the ones received by snyder. Is that right?
A. I believe so, yes.

I don't know if there are duplicates or if this is an independent log; $I$ just don't remember specifically.
Q. And if we wanted to know what complaints had been received by Snyder, we could look at the area code of the BTNs to see which ones are florida, relating to florida. Is that right?
A. I would assume so, yes.
Q. Going forward in the documents now,
leaving those behind, page 18519?
A. 519 Ism sorry.
Q. Yes.
A. Okay.
Q. This is one of the supporting worksheets. Is that right?
A. Let me just familiarize myself.
Q. Please tell me what this page shows?
A. Give me just a minute, please.
Q. Sure.
A. What $I$ believe these to be is the actual detailed documents that support the report starting on 500, 18500. Looking at complaint investigation form sent to GSM and returned from GSM with action plan.
Q. So these are a portion of the complaints received by Snyder that - -
A. Yes.
Q. -- that you looked at as part of the audit?
A. I believe so. I'm trying to just find one and cross reference it.

I believe what they are -- I believe what they are is they are supporting documents of the actual action plans that were sent from
the field up to snyder headquarters personnel for summarization in this report.
Q. This report referring to?
A. 18501 - $\quad$ mean, 500 .
Q. All right. Let me see if I
understand correctly what this is an example of. These are three - there are three 305 area code numbers listed here. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And all of them have transaction dates in January, late January of 1998?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that right?

And these are complaints that were received by Snyder of unauthorized switching. Is that right?
A. That $I^{\prime} m$ not sure of. I can tell you what's on here, but $I$ don't remember what specifically this was used for. It looks like this is - we send this out the door to say here are your complaints that go to your region, and then it's listed by these people up here. That's my understanding.
Q. Well, by complaints, wouldn't that be a complaint of unauthorized switching?
A. I would assume. I don't know. I really don't know. I just don't remember specifically or not.
Q. Well, what other complaints did you look at? Were there others other than unauthorized switching?
A. No. I think most of them were all about switching. I just don't remember specifically about this one. If I had to guess, $I$ would say that's what specifically this is. I just -- it doesn't have much on there to give me any indications one way or the other. I'm sorry.
Q. I'm just trying to understand what it shows myself.
A. But if you - on 519 you can cross reference item 14, which is handwritten there; and you can cross reference it to page 18502 by the $B T N$, billing telephone number.
Q. And in fact, the 14 means that this is one of the items that was selected for testing?
A. Correct. Yes.
Q. And we would find this on page 18499 , which shows, as $I$ understand it, the subpart
portion of the complaints received by Snyder about unauthorized switching that you actually tested for?
A. Correct. And it is on there.
Q. Okay.
A. It's just all the supporting documentation for how we did the test.
Q. And just as one more example on the next page, which is 18520 .
A. Yes.
Q. This lists three instances of where the transaction date is in february of 1998 and it involves either the area code 407 or 305?
A. Yes.
Q. And these are instances where there are complaints of unauthorized switching that Snyder received. Is that right?
A. Again, based upon what $I$ see here, $I$ think that that's -- I guess so, yes. I'm not 100 percent sure. I'm sorry.
Q. Well, again, though, let me -- let's try to tie this down. These are items that you tested for, and it's shown on page 18499, right?
A. When we tested we selected from the
log, which was starting at 18500 .
Q. Right.
A. That log is a log of complaints.
Q. Complaints of unauthorized switching, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Yes.
A. Yes. And then from there, these are the supporting detail that make up that log. So, yes, those would be the supporting logs that were sent to the field to the general sales managers and that included their action plans and what they were going to do with them, that would, again, be the follow-up to what got put into this log.
Q. okay. Let me ask you to turn to page 18533 ?
A. 18533 . I think that's in the next set.
Q. I think it goes for three pages, if I'm reading it right.

MR. WOFFORD: 18533 through what?
MR. BECK: Through 535 .
BY MR. BECK:
Q. I'd like to ask you what this
document is?
A. Give me just a second, please.

It is a log of escalated complaints sent to snyder by someone in the GTE Network Services post Sales Fulfillment Area, Liz Smith.
Q. So this is a different area, or these are different complaints than the ones we looked at earlier? These are complaints received by GTE as opposed to Snyder?
A. Correct, that's my understanding.
Q. And these are the -- this is a log of escalated complaints that were used as the test to see whether all escalated complaints had been received by Snyder. Is that right?
A. I believe there was -- just give me a second.

Looking back through what this -- can you repeat the question? I'm sorry. I just want to make sure I'm answering the right question.
Q. Is it correct that these are the - these are escalated complaints for snyder that were received at GTE, and they were used to test whether all escalated complaints had been
received by Snyder?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, these were received by Liz Smith's group. Is that right?
A. Based on the information -- that's who we got this from. I don't know how they came in the door, but Liz Smith was the keeper of this log.
Q. And. Liz Smith works for which company?
A. At that point in time, by looking at the source information on here, the handwritten note says: We got this from Liz Smith, GTE Network Services, Post Sales Fulfillment, LD Complaints.
Q. And this, I take it, is not a complete list of all complaints; it's only those used for testing?
A. That, I don't know. I don't know if it's a complete listing or not. I don't know if it was a snapshot or we took a couple - I mean, there's -- the date is cut off -- start at $2 / 5 / 98$ and go through 4/7/98. So there could be more before that $2 / 5 / 98$ date. There could be more after 4/7. I don't know if we
took a sample mid course or what. we did. I'm just saying this is -- I think this is what we used for testing, yes; but $I$ don't know if it's a complete report.
Q. Let me ask you to go through and identify columns with me, if $I$ could. Let's take about the tenth one down, Nadine Frezen. It starts on 2/26 1998?
A. Yes.
Q. $2 / 26 / 98$ refers to what?
A. The date -- it says date received. I would assume that's the date the complaint was received.
Q. And right now we're discussing, just for the record, Bates stamp 18533; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And then that's the person's name that follows that?
A. Yes.
Q. And that person's telephone number?
A. Yes.
Q. It says Florida there, for 305 area code; doesn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. Next it says OOF. What does that stand for?
A. Out of franchise.
Q. What does that mean?
A. It means it is -- an in-franchise customer is a customer that is already a GTE local phone service customer, that is, in the GTE franchise area. An out of franchise customer would mean that $G T E$ does not have local services or is not the primary. ILEC in that area. It's outside of our region.
Q. What does the next date, January 15 , 1998, mean?
A. Date signed. I think it's the date that the LOA was signed.
Q. The LOA stands for Letter of Authorization?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know what the following columns represent?
A. Not really. I can speculate, but that's it.
Q. Okay. Let me ask you about the -- do you know what the event column, the Event I.D. column means?
A. Again, $I$ could speculate; but $I$ don't know for sure.
Q. The next column is Fraud. Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And then the response under there is either $N$ or $Y$ is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And here we have a $Y$. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. I guess that means yes for fraud; is that right?
A. That would be a fair assumption, yes.
Q. How was it determined on this page whether or not there was fraud?
A. I don't know how they made that determination.
Q. Who would have made it?
A. Liz Smith or somebody in her group or whoever took the investigation.
Q. So these three pages, 18533 through 535 came from Liz Smith's group and already had on there yes or no to the column on fraud?
A. Yes. This was prepared by her, and we just took this document. These were
complaints that had already come in the door. The test that we were looking to do was to make sure that these got forwarded to Snyder accurately.
Q. And do you know when this document was provided?
A. By Liz Smith?
Q. Yes.
A. Not a specific date, no; but it was within the audit time frame.
Q. The last event listed is, for date received at least, is April 7, 1998. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And there are marks at the top of the work paper on the first page of 4/14/98. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. So it would be somewhere in that time frame, between the 7 th of April and the 14 th of April; would it not?
A. I would say it's probably even earlier than that.
Q. Well, it couldn't be earlier than April $7 \mathrm{th}, \mathrm{could}$ it?
A. Well, $I$ see a $4 / 8$ in here. There's one 4/8. There's a 4/7. I mean, there could be --
Q. Okay. So it couldn't be any earlier than April 8 th of '98; is that right?
A. I would think not, no.
Q. Otherwise, you wouldn't have an April 8 th entry?
A. That's good.
Q. But we also had a date on the first page of April $14 t h, 1998$, that's handwritten. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. That's an auditor's mark. Is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. So isn't it fair to conclude that somewhere in the time frame April 8 to April 14th, 1998 , is when this report was generated? A. Yes.

MR. WOFFORD: Well; are you asking when the report was generated or when it was provided to the audit team? BY MR. BECK:
Q. Well, let's do both. It would have
to be generated on or after April $8 t h$ and on or before April 14 th , wouldn't it?
A. I would think that's reasonable. Because to be able to include an item from 4/8, it would have to be generated on that date or after, and we would have had it before the auditor signed off on it and put the date of 4/14/98 on there. That would have been -- they were done with that piece of testing.

MR. BECK: Are we okay? I mean, I
know this is tedious. Do you want to take a short break?

MR. WOFFORD: I'd like to take a short break.
(A recess was taken at this time.
BY MR. BECK:
Q. Can $I$ ask you to turn to Bates stamp page 18536 ?
A. I don't think $I$ have that one. It should be in the next series, should be the top one. okay.
Q. Could you tell me what this document represents?
A. Okay. It's a document prepared by the auditor, Susan North. It is test results
for tracing of non-escalated complaints, sent to -- sent by GTECC to Snyder.
Q. So she was seeing how well Snyder was receiving non-escalated complaints that GTE was sending to them?
A. Yes.
Q. And does this show that 28 complaints was sent by GTE to Snyder on March 10, 1998?
A. Yes.
Q. Eight of those 28 did not involve unauthorized switches, Is that right?
A. From reading the document, yes.
Q. Which means that 20 of them did involve unauthorized switches. Is that right?
A. By doing the math, yes, it looks like there were 20.
Q. And that's for one day in March of 1998; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And it says 43 percent of the complaints -- of these complaints were not received on March 10, 1998. Is that right?
A. Yes. There's a slight -- it says: Percentage of complaints no received by Snyder on $3 / 10 / 98$. I would assume that that's a typo,
meaning not.
Q. And the purpose of this test was simply to trace one day's worth of complaints on hand at GTE and trace to see whether they were in Snyder's log. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And what this found is that 43
percent of the complaints were not making their way into Snyder's log. Is that correct?
A. 43 percent of the non-escalated complaints, yes.
Q. Okay. Let me ask you to turn to Bates stamped page 18537?
A. Okay.
Q. Do you recognize this?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you briefly describe what was tested as reflected on that Bates stamped page?
A. As $I$ remember, at the point in time that we were doing the work, we were only -Snyder was only contracted to do residential orders, not small business orders. And we had gotten communication from Karen smith that there were some small business orders coming through and they wanted us to investigate them.

And that's the nature of this document, to research and determine cause of small business orders taken before signing of contract with Snyder.
Q. Let me ask you to look at that e-mail that's on Bates stamped page 18539 .
A. Yes.
Q. This is an e-mail from Karen Smith. Is that right?
A. There's several E-mails here. But, yeah, it's from -- at the top it starts: from Karen Smith to MRS Smith, which was Mark R. Smith. It was sent from Karen Smith to Mark Smith.
Q. Then we get down -- this forwarding of e-mails gets down to one that was -- let me get to the substance of the forwarded e-mail, if we could.
A. Okay.
Q. There are roughly 600 business orders at a time when Snyder wasn't supposed to be doing business orders; is that right?
A. Let me just --
Q. Sure. Please read that e-mail, if you would. In fact, could you also read the
next Bates stamp as well and then we'll discuss them all.
A. Okay. So on the next two pages, 539 and 540, were the ones you wanted to look at?
Q. Yes, please.
A. Okay.
Q. And $I$ want you to describe basically what test you did and what the event is that you were looking at as part of the audit.
A. From reading this and just my general recollections, what happened in this time frame were we had business orders coming through Snyder that shouldn't have been. They shouldn't have been selling to business customers.

Looking at the other information in here, they seem to think that these customers were walk-in customers and they were -- they had business numbers and stuff like that. And the customers through additional follow-up, you know, were -- I'm not sure exactly how they came in the door.

Their general contention is that these customers were, one, they shouldn't have been sold by snyder because they were business
customers; and, two, they are indicating several places that it's slamming.
Q. There are about 600 orders that were purportedly for businesses. Is that correct?
A. According to the memo, yes.
Q. And on page 18539 it says that: The first 30 contacted all were slammed. Is that right? You, being GTE.
A. That's what the memo says.
Q. And $I$ take it during that time of these 600 business orders, Snyder wasn't even supposed to be selling to businesses?
A. Well, $I$ mean, just looking back at some of our documentation, they sold these customers residential plans on business lines. Meaning that you have a $B-1$ line, a business line versus an $R-1$ line which is a residential line. And certain plans can be sold on an R-1 line that can't be sold on a B-1 line.

Without going back into all the details of that, $I$ don't know that $I$ can remember anyway. That, $I$ know, was one of the distinctions. Because we state that in the lead memo on Bates stamp 18537: Were processed with residential plans on business lines. That
was the defining point there.
Q. But, in fact, these were all-- these were mostly slams, at least; is that correct?
A. According to the memo, yes, that's definitely the indication.
Q. And by slam, that means the businesses didn't authorize any of these changes?
A. Reading further in the e-mail, that's definitely what the results conclude from this e-mail.
Q. And you did tests to determine the cause of small business orders taken before signing of contract. Is that right?
A. Let me glance back through this again.

What this -- just reading through this e-mail, it's basically documenting what we knew of this problem is what we are doing. It's not really any individual test that we're going through other than just interviewing individuals. If you're looking at the scope, it talks about I.D., which is internal audit. The internal audit department interviewed various individuals to explain the cause and
action plan of the orders processed in the e-mail. I.D. spoke with the following people. And we tried to get to the root cause and why they were rejected and any result in customer complaints and what was basically being done about this. This was kind of a follow-up just to make sure that something we knew of is somebody on the Snyder side, is somebody on the GTE side taking care of it.
Q. Okay.
A. I mean, if you can read on -- if you read on through the memo, you see basically it says, the bottom of that page: Based on conversations with GTE and Snyder personnel the exact cause of this problem is unknown and is likely a combination of both customer and rep fraud. A trend analysis. on these orders was completed by Snyder which did not find any significant trends by rep I.D. or location to pinpoint the problem.
Q. There's one other e-mail on Bates stamped 18541 through 18542?
A. Yes.
Q. And this simply describes the results of the 30 test calls made with respect to that
problem with the business versus residential. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. There are a number of Florida customers listed there in the group; are there not?
A. I see a couple, yes. There are several in here that have the florida state code, $F$ L, listed on them.
Q. And they all say slam or likely slam, do they not, for Florida at least?
A. All the ones listed with the florida State code have likely slam listed next to them.
Q. Okay. Let's move on. Let me ask you to turn to Bates stamped page 18795 . I'd like to ask you about the table that's in the middle of that page and ask you to describe what it means?
A. Can I get 18794 ? It should be the first page of that narrative.

MR. WOFFORD: It's blank.
THE WITNESS: I'm just looking at the -- there's a Narrative E-2, page 2 of 6 is what's - -

793 is the first page. 794 is a blank page. Do you want to keep it in there?

BY MR. BECK:
Q. Yeah.
A. Okay. Give me just a second to familiarize myself.
Q. Sure.
A. Okay.
Q. What I'd like for you to do is describe what the chart shows on page 18795?
A. Well, the table provides detailed information regarding payments that GTE has made to Snyder for the months of January through March of '98.
Q. Snyder gets paid only when GTE accepts one of its sales; is that right?
A. According to the memo, yes. Yes.
Q. And this shows that during the period of January through March of $1998,48.44$ percent of the sales snyder sent to GTE were not accepted. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you generally describe what the cause is of GTE not accepting a sale sent from

Snyder to GTE?
A. Generally, there could be numerous reasons for why a sale would be rejected. You could have missing customer information. A big one would be, like, the billing telephone number would be wrong. If you miss one digit, if a four looks like a nine, or vice versa, that could throw off your processing because it's very -- billing telephone number is the big key field the system would go off of. If the name and address don't match up with the billing telephone number, if different key fields were off. If you left off -- you could leave off something of what carrier code should be processed with this. If you were switching from AT\&T to GTE, you know, if you left off the GTE PIC code, you know, you wouldn't know which -- from a system standpoint, you wouldn't know which one to change it to. A simplistic example.
Q. So if an order comes in and has any one of those problems, it won't be accepted by GTE. Is that right?
A. Among other things, yes.
Q. Don't they get fixed and resubmitted?
A. There are places where orders will be recycled. They will be kicked back to snyder or whoever originated the order and say we don't have enough information to process this order. There could also be other holdups, systematic or otherwise that could be contributing to that number as well.
Q. Is this number of 48.44 the -- the 48.44 percent unacceptable rate, is that the net number? In other words, that's the number that don't get fixed and are just never accepted?
A. It doesn't really say. I wouldn't know for sure. I mean, to say that they've never been fixed or would not be fixed, I don't know if they would get recycled back through or not.
Q. On page 18803 ?
A. Let me get there.
Q. Okay.
A. okay.
Q. These are just other charts showing the same information; are they not?
A. It looks like a summary of the activity.
Q. And it shows -- at one place it describes them as GTE rejects of Snyder orders. Is that right, one of the charts?
A. Yes.
Q. Does this help you in being able to answer whether this is the amount that are never, never accepted or not, if you know?
A. Not just by looking at it, no. I mean, because it - I'm just looking at it, and it doesn't say if these ever get reprocessed or not. I mean, if -- for example, the January number of 2,789 rejects of those, did they get recycled or is that 2000 number incorporated into the february number? I don't know, you know. Are there duplicates there and is it just a billing total or what, or is this a continuation of old orders dropping off and new numbers coming on? I don't know.
Q. Okay. Let me switch topics a little bit and ask you about the mystery shopper review.
A. Where?
Q. Let's start at page 18866 .
A. I don't think $I$ have it. I stop at 849 .

You said 18886?
MR. WOFFORD: 866 .
THE WITNESS: 886?
BY MR. BECK:
Q. It's one of them.

And is this your audit program for the mystery, for looking at the mystery shoppers?
A. Yes.
Q. And what you did as part of this audit is you actually appeared at the field, the sales events that snyder was attending and you reported back what you saw, basically, is that right, what happened?
A. Right. The mystery shops were intended just to get us familiar with what was happening at field events.
Q. And I'll just skip around a little bit. Let me ask you about the documents 18893 through 18896.
A. Okay. I'm looking at 890.
Q. Okay. 18893 through 896 .
A. Okay.
Q. Please describe your guidelines for the mystery shopper inspection, if you would
call it that. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Or the mystery shopper guidelines?
A. Yes.
Q. And on page, the third page of those, which is 18895 , there's a mystery shopper checklist explanation. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And the first part is Image and Appearance. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. The first one is that: The Snyder sales associates should identify themselves as agents of GTE or representatives of GTE. Is that correct?
A. Yes, that's what it says.
Q. And so one of the things you're looking for is to make sure the Snyder people represent themselves as GTE and not as snyder employees?
A. That is one of the things we were looking for.
Q. And in fact, it specifically states they should not be identifying themselves as Snyder employees. Is that right?
A. Right.
Q. And the second thing says: The sales rep should be wearing a name tag with a GTE name and/or logo. Is that right?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. So that's another thing you would look for as a mystery shopper?
A. Right.
Q. And the third thing says: The sales rep should be wearing Docker style pants with a GTE logo shirt or a plain white and blue shirt that should be appropriate for the event. Is that right?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. okay. And that's another thing that you looked for in your mystery shopper inspection. Is that right?
A. Generally speaking, yes. Those are just. some general guidelines that we had.
Q. Let me ask you to turn to page 18880 .
A. It's right before this.
Q. Sorry.
A. Okay.
Q. Do you recognize page 18880 ?
A. Give me just a second to get
organized a little bit.
Q. Sure. Sure.
A. Yes.
Q. You prepared this document; did you not?
A. Yes.
Q. And this was a mystery shopper inspection in Chicago?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you go to Chicago just for this purpose?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And you - - one of the things is you looked to see whether the representatives were identifying themselves as a representative of GTE Long Distance, and you answered yes. Is that right?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And in fact, that's what happened? I mean, you went and looked and saw that they represented themselves as GTE?
A. I went up and talked to this gentleman.
Q. And he had a GTE logo on his shirt?
A. I believe he had a jacket -- a shirt
on, and then he had kind of like a light windbreaker is what $I$ remember. But. I have written down GTE logo shirt with jacket cover.
Q. Okay. And anyhow, this page and -is it a two-page report of your inspection of this person?
A. Yeah, I believe the checklists were all of two pages.
Q. So it's pages 18880 and 18881 for your inspection of this person in Chicago. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. As part of your audit, other people did these in Florida as well; did they not?
A. Yes, they did.
Q. And on 18882 , we have one in Miami. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And in that case your auditor determined that the representative - or the Snyder employee was identifying themselves as a representative of $G T E$ Long Distance. Is that right?
A. They circled yes.
Q. Okay. And they were wearing a name
tag with a GTE name on it. Is that correct?
A. They circled yes again to that question.
Q. So was your answer yes to my question?
A. Yes.
Q. And on page 18886 , we have another mystery shopper in Miami. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And again, during this inspection, they found that the representative identified themselves as representatives of GTE Long Distance and they were wearing a name tag with a GTE name on it. Is that correct?
A. That's how they indicated on this sheet, yes.
Q. Let me ask you about Bates stamped page 18919 through 18920.
A. 919, you said?
Q. Yes, 919 through 20 .
A. Okay.
Q. Is this more backup to your audit concerning the mystery shoppers?
A. I believe what we're looking at here is we're looking at mystery shops performed by
another company. I think it was Wells Fargo, but $I$ would have to go back and look.
Q. Oh, okay. They had done some mystery shopping for Snyder themselves; had they not?
A. Yes.
Q. And you were reviewing the results. of Wells Fargo's mystery shopper events?
A. Whoever was doing it. I think it was Wells Fargo. I would have to go back and double check. But somebody was doing -- an outside company was doing mystery shops; that's where we got kind of the idea to do it ourselves. They were doing it in different places. The particular document you referenced I believe was in Florida.

And what we were looking at them for was to get an idea of what was going on, what other people were seeing, what the other company was seeing. It was just general information more for our understanding, again, reviewing what would have already been done.
Q. This document indicates that during this inspection in Homestead, Florida, the Snyder employee was wearing a name tag with a GTE name. Is that right?
A. Which number again?
Q. 18919 .
A. Representative wearing name tag with company name. Yes.
Q. By company name, it means GTE; does it not?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. All right. Let's change topics a bit.
A. Are we done with the mystery shopper stuff?
Q. Well, those documents.
A. Okay.
Q. And the next document $I^{\prime} m$ going to ask you about is Bates stamped 17819 .
A. 17819 ?
Q. Yes. Do you recognize that?
A. I've seen it before, yes. I generally recognize it.
Q. Is this one of the documents you reviewed as part of your audit?
A. I know we looked at their training manuals, and that's where this looks like this comes from. Like $I$ said, it does look familiar.
Q. And their training manual says that they must wear clean and appropriate GTE sales associate shirt; does it not?
A. Yes.
Q. And they must always wear a visible GTE I.D. badge. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And those are two things that you checked on your mystery shopper analysis that you did as part of your audit. Is that right?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. And were you trying to see whether they were doing the things that their training manual says they're supposed to do?
A. One of the tests, yes.
Q. And this is confirmed on Bates
stamped page 17845?
Do you have that one? It's coming.
A. In process.
Q. Is this again from the training manual of - I'm sorry.
A. Based on the footer, it.appears so. It appears to be from the same manual.
Q. This is the Snyder training manual?
A. The training and performance
development manual, yes.
Q. And again, this says the mystery shopper evaluates whether the Snyder employees are wearing an I.D. name tag. It doesn't say it, but $I$ assume it means with GTE name tag and also wearing GTE approved attire. Is that right?
A. Yes.

Snyder Direct Services, Inc.,
Consumer Field Markets, Training and Performance Development.
Q. Let me ask you to turn to page 18259 .
A. I don't have that one. what was the number again?
Q. $18259 . \quad Y o u$ should.
A. The first one $I$ have is 256 , 275 .
Q. You can look at mine, if you like.

MR. WOFFORD: These must have gotten out of order.

THE WITNESS: Well, we've got several
pulls from different places; but $I$ don't see it generally in here.

BY MR. BECK:
Q. Let me just ask you to look at Bates
stamped 18259 and ask you if you recognize it? A. I do.
Q. What is it?

MR. WOFFORD: Here, I've got it.
THE WITNESS: It's a preliminary
scope that the internal audit department and $I$ put together when we were doing our original planning for the audit.

BY MR. BECK:
Q. Okay.
A. Thank you.
Q. This just describes preliminarily what your audit was designed to accomplish. Is that fair to say, or not?
A. When we had our initial discussions with the key players, which would have been the people I've already named, Karen Smith, George Wieskopf, Ted Gilmore, what did we want the audit to accomplish. These were a brain dump of activities that we would want to take a look at when we were there.
Q. Let me ask you to turn to page 18262 and 18263 . Ask you if you recognize that document?
A. I do.
Q. Could you describe what it is?
A. It is a letter from Chris Owens, who is the president of GTECC Consumer Markets to four individuals at GTECC related to business ethics/c̣ompliance.
Q. Let me first ask you about Chris Owens who was then president of consumer markets. What does that encompass, consumer markets?
A. At this point in time consumer -GTECC was broken up into a couple different units, and one of them was consumer,markets, which was primarily residential sales. Consumer markets were closely assigned with small businesses and residential lines.
Q. Is this only GTECC? He's the president of consumer markets for GTECC?
A. Yes, I believe so. That was -- it's on the GreCC letterhead, and that's what my recollection is.
Q. And that includes Long Distance, does it not, for that segment?
A. I don't know how LD, Long Distance, rolled up underneath this at this point in time, March 10, 1998.
Q. And there are four people this was sent to. Could you identify each of those four people and what their positions were with the company?
A. I'll do what $I$ can. G. Allen, $I$ do not know. J. Bilney would be Jody Bilney; she was in the sales area.
Q. Of GTECC?
A. Of GTECC.
Q. Okay.
A. Ted Gilmore which was -- he was for, again, he was in the sales area but he was in -- I believe he was the head of Snyder on the GTECC side. I think he was VP/GM was his title.
Q. VP would be vice-president and general manager?
A. Yeah. I've got it listed someplace in one of these other documents. In the planning memo $I$ know there was a listing of what his exact title was. I could find it if you'd like.
Q. Well, it's not necessary right now.

Who's the last person --
A. Ted --
Q. Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead, then.
A. Ted Gilmore VP/GM, LD Division, Snyder liaison was what we had him as the title.
Q. Okay. And LD Division is Long Distance?
A. Yes.
Q. And he was one of the people in charge of liaison with Snyder?
A. Yes, that's how we had him listed.
Q. Okay. And who's J. Havens?
A. John Havens, again, $I$ think he's in the sales organization. I doubt. know his exact title, but $I$ recognize the name.
Q. Why is this letter in your -- first of all, is this letter in part of your audit work papers?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. Why is it there?
A. It was planning materials to give us an understanding of what the environment was like, give us an understanding of the regulatory concerns related to these issues related to Snyder.
Q. You see there some handwritten notes
on the right side of page 18262?
A. I do.
Q. Could you read them?
A. I'll give it my best shot. It starts off, says: Copy to: There's some scratching that looks like a TKE slash. I'm not sure, it could be a Steve or something, I'm not sure.
Q. Do you know what the TKE would stand for?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Can you read the rest of the handwritten notes?
A. See note something. I don't know what that word is. We need to look at. And then $I$ can't make out what the rest of this says. I really can't make it out.

MR. BECK: At the end of this I'm going to ask for a legible copy of this with the note so $I$ can read it.

MR. WOFFORD: I can't read it either. I'm not sure.

THE WITNESS: I don't know if we have one. This was -- I remember, from the work papers that this is a copy of a copy.

I don't know if anybody still has the original. I don't know. I just know why it was in here was because of the -- the subject matter was related to Snyder and telemarketers as a whole, again, setting us up for what the environment was like for planning information for us.

BY MR. BECK:
Q. Now, Mr. Owens who was the author of this letter, was he provided the results of your audit?
A. I don't remember specifically.
Q. Okay.
A. He could have had knowledge of it, but I don't know.
Q. All right. Let me ask you to turn to the document that starts at page 20907 .
A. I know $I$ don't have that one.
Q. And it's entitled Snyder

Communications, Inc., GTE Policies and Procedures Manual. Do you recognize the document that begins at page 20907 ?
A. Generally, yes. I know that we had a couple of Snyder manuals in our work papers that we used as reference material.
Q. Where does this document stop, at what Bates stamped page?
A. I'll just have to see if they have an index up at the front. I show on 20908 that it has 14 items listed on the table of contents, and that would take us all the way up to 20958 , which would be the end, which would be the last end tab is what it looks like. So I would assume that that would probably be, if the numbers are concurrent, that it would be -I think that would be the end point.
Q. Okay. All right. And this is part of your audit backup because it's something you used as part of the audit or at least reviewed?
A. It is. When were originally doing the planning for the audit, you know, one of the things we always request is we ask for policies and procedures of what are you supposed to be doing. And this is, for Snyder, one of the backup materials that we obtained.
Q. Let me ask you about Bates stamped page 20914?
A. Yes.
Q. This page covers their policy with respect to representation, is that right, their
representation policy?
A. That's what it says on the top, yes.
Q. What I'd like to ask specifically about is under the operating process on that page, there's a bullet, seventh bullet under Snyder's responsibility. It says: Enforce a dress code that includes usage of GTE branding. And then it lists a series of items. And $I$ was wondering if you could discuss the type of branding that snyder used that's shown there that would show GTE?
A. I don't know the specifics. I could tell you when $I$ did the mystery shop and when we saw different articles around the Snyder offices.
Q. Okay. Please do?
A. They used the small GTE bug, which is -- it's just the logo.
Q. What bug?
A. Let me use this for a second.

MR. WOFFORD: No, I don't think he
wants you to draw.
THE WITNESS: Oh, I'm sorry.
BY MR. BECK:
Q. Just describe it. There's a bug
that's the GTE logo?
A. It's our logo. It's a little
circular, oval picture that has GTE written on it. It's blue and white. That's just what they call it, the GTE bug. I'm sorry.
Q. Go ahead.
A. Sorry. When we saw that, it was the standard GTE logo that we had on there. It was either blue or white was the standard colors.
Q. And where would Snyder use that?
A. On the I.D. badge that I remember, I believe that there was a small logo on that badge. They had some promotional materials also that had the GTE logo on it as well.
Q. Did the shirt Snyder employees wear have the GTE logo on them?
A. The one that $I$ remember from the mystery shop, yes.
Q. In fact, their policy says that. That's the first one listed under GTE branding shirts. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. How about caps, have you ever seen Snyder people wear a cap with a GTE logo?
A. No.
Q. How about shirts or advertisements, did they have a GTE logo that you've seen?
A. I did see some promotional materials that, again, had the small GTE logo on them.
Q. Any other items listed here where you recall seeing GTE logos?
A. The sales booths, Item J. They also had - they would have banners that would list, you know, have the GTE logo on there and say GTE Long Distance, something like that, when they would set up their booths.

MR. BECK: Okay. That's it. Thank
you very much.
Do you have any?
MR. FORDHAM: No questions.
MR. WOFFORD: Give me just about five minutes, and $I$ may have a few questions. MR. BECK: Okay. Go right ahead. (A recess was taken at this time.) MR. WOFFORD: Back on the record. EXAMINATION

BY MR. WOFFORD:
Q. Mr. Weaver, $I$ have a few questions. I want to try and clarify some of your earlier testimony.

Can you look at the document that that's been labeled 18536 , please?
A. Yes.
Q. The first line of that document underneath the heading talks about the number of complaints on hand at GTECC sent to Snyder on March 10 , 1998 , doesn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. Does that document say anything about the number of complaints received by GTECC on any particular day?
A. It's ambiguous. It does not say that specifically.
Q. Do you see anything on here that indicates to you affirmatively that any number of complaints were received by GTECC on a. particular day?
A. It says it was sent to Snyder on 3/10/98. It doesn't show how many, if that was from previous days or not. It just shows that they sent 28 documents -- or 28 complaints. I'm sorry.
Q. And there's a little asterisk next to that legend, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And the description of the number of documents sent to Snyder on a particular day is further explained as a day's worth of complaints, right?
A. For testing purposes, comma, a day's worth of complaints on hand at GTE (28 on 3/28) was traced to Snyder's log.
Q. And that language you've just read refers to the number of complaints sent to Snyder on a particular day, right?
A. Again, it's -- they sent 28 , and it says it was a day's worth of complaints on hand, but it doesn't say if it was from previous days other than $3 / 10 / 98$.

MR. WOFFORD: All right. That's all
I've got.
MR. BECK: Let me follow up on that.

## EXAMINATION

BY MR. BECK:
Q. You're saying that you would interpret a day's worth of complaints as possibly including more than one day's worth?
A. I don't know if they batched complaints and then sent them on a daily, weekly, monthly basis to Snyder. I don't know
if this was all from $3 / 10$ or if it included 3/9, 3/8, 3/7, other dates.
Q. Well, if you were sending a week's worth of complaints, would you call them a day's worth?
A. I don't.-- again it's -- it says a day's worth of complaints on hand. Now, does that mean it's -- on hand is, I guess, the piece that's a little puzzling. It doesn't clarify specifically.

MR. BECK: All right. That's all. MR. WOFFORD: That's all I've got. He wants to read. And we'd like to designate the testimony as confidential. (Thereupon, the deposition was adjourned at 1:35 p.m.)
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Pursuant to Rule $30(7)(e)$ of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure andor Georgia Code Annotated 81A-130(B) (6) (e), any changes in form or substance which you desire to make to your deposition testimony shall be entered upon the deposition with a statement of the reasons given for making them.

To assist you in making any such corrections, please use the form below. If supplemental or additional pages are necessary, please furnish same and attach them to this errata sheet.
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STATE OF GEORGIA: COUNTY OF FULTON:

I hereby certify that the foregoing deposition was reported, as stated in the caption, and that the questions and the answers thereto were reduced to the written page under my direction, that the preceding pages represent a true and correct transcript of the testimony given by said witness.

I further certify that $I$ am not $o f$ kin or counsel to the parties in the case, am not in the regular employ of counsel for any of said parties, nor am $I$ in any way financially interested in the result of said case.

Dated this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ , 2000 .
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dapartrant.
    Q. How long have you held that position?
    A. I've been a nanager for about 18
nonths nou.
    a. What position did you hold before
that?
    A. Senior auditor.
    Q. How long have you worked for Verizon?
    A. About four years.
    Q. Do you hold any professional
desimnatlons?
    A. I have a nester's degree, but no CPA,
CIN or any of those.
    Q. A naster's degree in business or
sccountIng?
    A. It's in accounting with, I guess
you'd call it, a ninor in internal auditing.
    Q. Have you bean an internal auditor for
    the entlre four years you've been at verizon?
    A. Yes.
    Q. What did you do before that?
    A. I wes an Internal audltor vith
Nat Ionsgank.
    a. Nbout how long did you do that?
    A. Two and a half years.
```

Q. How long have you held that position? nonths now.
Q. What position did you hold before that?
A. Senior auditor.
Q. Hou long have you worked for Verizon?
A. About four years.
Q. Do you hold any professional desimnatlons?
A. I have a nester's degree, but no CPA, CIA or any of those.
Q. A naster's degree in business or accountIng?
A. It's in accounting with, I guess you'd call it, a ninor in intarnal auditing.
Q. Have you bean an internal auditor for the entire four years you've been at verizon?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you do before that?
A. I was an Internal audltor vith Nat IonsHank.
a. About how long did you do that?
A. Iwo and a half years.

## working for you in that position?

A. Yes.
Q. Who was working for you?
A. Andrev IInbariake. Yanira Lalara.
 IHR UITHESS: It's Y-a-n-1-r-a
L-a-J-a-r-a.
Let's see. Susan North. I belleve
that uas it.
EY MR. BECK:
Q. How did this audit cone about; In other words, uhat caused this audit to occur?
A. There vare -- it started with a request fron our regulatory legal departnent. I belleve the requast care through Karen Snith.
a. What vas the request?
A. The request basically was we've been getting a nunber of complaints related to different slass fron varlous sources, and they vanted us to do sone addltional investigations.
a. Karen Snith is a lawyer?
A. She's In our regulatory departmant.

She was an ANP. I belleve, of our resulatory
affairs. I'n not sure what her exact title uas
Q. When did you recelve your naster's degree?
A. In ' 94 .
Q. I'd like to ask you to take a look at the docurent that begins at Bates stanped page 17456 and anding at 17462.
A. Through $17462 ?$
Q. Yes.
A. Okay.
Q. Do you recognfze that document?
d. Yes, I do.
a. Could you just briefly describe that the docursant is?
A. It is a legal mano that ve drafted to Thonas Parker who was the assoclate general cousel at the time related to the Snyder Direct Services service audit revieu that ve perforned back in 1898.
Q. Does this doctuant surnariza the results of the internal audit that you conducted?
A. Yes.
Q. What vas your role in that audit?
A. I was the lead eaditor, the in-charge auditor on that Job.
at that polnt In tine.
Q. Vas it the slaming that had been occurring ulth the use of Snyder people that led to the audit then?
A. Snyder vas one of the focal points, but we had other telenarkating agencles that vere dolng -- or were selling long distance for us. Snyder was Just one of than, vas one of the blgger ones.
Q. Were the others audled at the sane time that Snyder ues audited?
A. No.
a. Ihls audit vas Just focused on Snyder and it's relationship to verizon. Is that correct 7
A. Yes.
Q. On page 17456, thare are six bullets about halfuay doum. It sass: The scope of the ravieu.

Could you briefly describe what each of those $s$ ix bullets are and describe hou that uas - how that was part of the revieu that you did?
A. Okay. The sales order processing, basically that ve vere looking at thers uas
fron the point uhen custoner contact was nade through the point uhen Snyder handed the order off to Gre or Its affillates, whoever that would be; that ues the nain point there. And uhat we were doing uith those custoner ordars, ve vere looking for key attributes. We vare looking for whether the proper documantation was naintalned on file by Snyder. We vare also looking at certain dates as vell as far as hou ordars -- when did they start, when they did leave Snyder, uhen did they leave different places. We were doing a tine line on these as vell.

The next one vas the sales conpensat lon plans. We uanted to take a high level overvleu of the sales conp plans to nake sure that there was nothing in the sales conp plans that vas really Incenting the salespeople to slan custoners.

The next one was the quality controi complalnt resolut ion explanation reporting processes. Ihat was on the back end of their order processing, what controls did they have In place to ensure order quallty, order accuracy. Dld they have ans sort of follow-up
A. Where wa looked at that was nainly in the sales order processing. We wanted to nake sure, if it vas a signed dellvery or if it uas a telephone call, that they had a third-party verlfler.
Q. Go ahead, please.
A. The perfornance nonitoring and measurenent. This vas really Internal netrics. How nany orders did thay bring inf How long did It take to gathar those narkat orders? Which narkets they were coning front Dleferent reporting standards that Snyder ves supposed to report to us as GIECC, GIE, unatevar.

Iraining, what we wanted to look at here uas for human resources. We wanted to rake sure that -- one of the big concerns that was raised by our regulatory departhent was if soneone, a sales associate, on the Snyder side uas caught, that if they had forged a custonar's simnature or nade up a flctitlous custoner, hou uere they dealt uith fron a huran resources standpoint? Were they vere fired, basically? What disciplinary action was taken? We wanted to nake sure that that uas actually occurring and we felt uas Justified, satisfied

## processes in place?

Q. Hould that inciude uhether the signatures on authorizations to change long distance companies were authentic?
A. Here they authenticating -- I'n not sure I understand the question.
Q. Well, uhether the signatures on authorizations to change long distance cormany, Whethar those slgnatures were actually the persons who they clained to be?
A. I don't -- I don't think that's uhat their departnent vas there to do. I think they were just there to make sure that there was a valld signature, yes. But I don't know If they were looking at it to see if it was that person's actual signature.

Is that where you ware golng with that question?
Q. Yes. Let's talk plainly about It. Uere they interested in uhether some of the simatures on those forms vere forgerles?
A. Yes. they were.
Q. Okas. Was that part of that revieu or sone other part of the revteu uhere you looked at that?

## Us.

The training and business ethics we wanted to nake gure that in their iraining naterials they vere tralned on what the regulations vere, what were good ethical sales practices and vas that covered, basically, in the tralning naterials.

And the last one was logical gysten security, which this is kind of a catchall category to look at thelr systens and hou Information floued fron than it cane in the door unt 11 uhen It left the door.
Q. Thls lettar is signed by Mark R. Snith?
d. Yes.
a. Who is he?
A. At the tlre he vas the engagenent nanager on the Job, and he ves aleo acting es director for -- we hed a director that had Just left, and he was about to essure that position. So he was dual rules on their audit.
Q. Was he the parson that you reported 107
A. Yes.
a. How did his responsibllities compare

yes.
Q. Could you describe the basis for that reconinandation?
A. Whan ve did the testing in Callfornia. Ue felt that the IPB process, hou they had it vorking at that point in tine yas a best practlce; and we folt that they should nirror that in other regions.
Q. How did the anount of slaphing that was going on In Callfornia compare to other areas?
A. I don't recall the actual statistlcs, but ins general feeling is that it ues lower. I'd have to go back do that point in time to see uhat the actual statistics vare.
a. Let ne direct your attention to under the ffrst bullet on page 1745n.
A. Un-huh.
Q. This says: He reconnand that Snyder begin using this process to verify all field sales based on a cost benefit analysis. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. What cost benefit analysis vare you referring to in your letter?
the process.
a. Is APNI an acronyn?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. What does it stand for?
A. I belleve it's Merican Financial Metuork, Inc.
Q. And I'n not -- how were orders getting held up in AFNI?
A. In basic understanding of the process flow was Snuder would take their orders, pass then electronically to AFNI who uould process a segnent of those orders for Snyder, or actually for GIE, taks those orders and change them into -- get then Into our systens, into the GIE systers. So they were a niddle nan. basically, betueen Snyder and ourselves.
Q. Could you turn to page 17468 of the letter, which is pase 5 of the letter?
A. Yes.
a. One of the recomrendations that you nade as part of this audit uas to institute third-party varification for Snyder orders as vas already being dona in Florida -- or in Californla. Is that correct?
A. That was one of our recommendatlons,
A. The basic cost to Inplemant the reconnendation, what would it take to - - I belleve, at the time uhat they vere actually doing with their field sales reps, where they had. I belleve, several cell phones that the fleld sales would take ulth then. They would call a third-party verifier. The third-party verifler, they would hand the cell phone over to the custoner. and the custoner would talk to the third-party verifier where you would record the call. Nou, you'd have the cell phones, the usage, all those kinds of things that vould go along with that. There would also be the training and the additional papervork. So these are the costs that are related to inplementing that sort of reconmendation.
Q. And that process uas only being engaged in in Californla for Snyder sales. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you seen any analyses that deternine uhat the cost of that process was?
A. No.
a. You vere recormanding -- vare you reconsendins, then, that guch a cost benefit

```
analys1s be undertatcen?
    A. Yes.
    Q. Do youl knou what the results of that
recorrandation vere?
    A. Not at thls time, no.
    Q. Have you known at any tine uhat the
results of that are?
A. No.
Q. Do you know yhethar the conpany entered into that cost beneflt analusis or completed the analusis?
A. Not that I know of at inls point in tire. Well, not that I knou of, period.
Q. The cost uould be the actual -- you could actually calculate a dollar cost par sale to engage in the third-party verification like was being done in california, couldn't you? YR. HOFFORD: Objection, calls for speculation.
```


## Go ahead and ansuer.

```
THE UITMESS: I would assune that you could do that. I have not sean that Snsder's cost structure looks like. Even during this audit, ve veren't privy to all that information. So I don't know that I
```

a. And one of the things you discovared In your audit was that Snyder arployees vare forging custonar simnatures; is that richt?
A. I don't think that we concluded that they vere forged signatures. I don't renenber drauing those conclusions, not to that strength. I knou that ue had song letters of agreanent that ve vere concerned -- we had definite concarns about that was the name right, was the nare wrong, was it a spouse's nare or things of that nature, uhich I think you could see in the testing. But I don't recall it was coining the tern "forged signatures."
a. Dld you suspect that there vare signatures on -- lettars of authorization were belng forged?
A. My personal suspicions were probably yes.
Q. But you're saying you didn't test to see If that was true?
A. We tested to see if there vere -- if a customer said John Doe, vas the sigmature John Doe. We did not have any uay of deternining ulthout contacting the customer if
could glve an opinion on that.日Y RR. BECK:
Q. But your recorrendation was that such a study be conducted to deternine uhat that cost uould be; was it not?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, you nentioned a cost beneflt analysis. What vould be the benefit side?
A. The benefit we belleved uould be less slaning complaints, or less complaints fron customer. It's a nore secure process, a better controlled process, in our opinion. because you don't have the paperwork having to get passed around.
a. Did you think that third-party verlfication would elininate the forgeries that you had been finding in your investlgation of Snyder?
A. could you - I'n not sure I understand the question.
Q. Well, there's the beneflt, you knou, uhen you look at the cost benefit, the benefit would be valld sales as opposed to Invalld ones; would they not?
A. Sure, yes.

John Doe slgns his nave uith a big J or a little J . We couldn't tell exactly if that signature vas hr. John Doe's signature or not. Me Just kneu that there was a slgnature on that plece of paper. That's all we could determine because we vere not allowed to contact the custoner directly about their order. He had to look at historical infornation.
Q. So you suspected that there ware forgerles being engaged in by Snyder, but you didn't check to see if those signatures vare authentic on authorizations?
A. I don't know how ve could have.
Q. How would you deternine -- or dld you try to deternine uhether the signatures vere actually that of the person whose slgnature it purported to be?
A. Without contacting the custoner, I don't think -- I cannot think of a uay we would be able to authenticate that slgnature unless we ask the customer to sign a plece of paper in our presence and then ve conpared that to the LOA. That's the only way that $I$ could have determined, you know, ufth raasonable assurance that these tuo slgnatures natched; and ve did
not have the abillty to go back to the custoners.
Q. Okay. So did you or did you not as part of the audit deternine whether slgnatures were authentic on letters of authorlzation?
A. To the extent possible ve nade sure that they vere good slmatures, yes.
a. That was one of the itens you tested for, then?
A. He tested whether there was a slgnature on the forms, yes.
Q. I'n not sura ve're cetting caught up in senantics or not.

MR. UOFFORD: I think you tuo are
talking past each other.
THE UIFIESS: Kaybe I can try to explain a little bit. We are seelng a historical docurant and that this transaction occurred at a distant location and It has been forwarded fron a field salesperson up through the ranks and it is -- ue have got a photostatic copy of it sitting in front of us right now uhen we're doing our testing.

And what we can verify at this polnt
that ue did have as concerns, those vara forvarded on to both Snyder and to our regulatory affairs people. And the Intentlons vera for then to go ahead and follow up on. any of the ones that ve had questions or concerns about.

Now, if they subsequantly contacted customers and they were asking for Independent verlfication of their signatures by having the custoner sign another plece of paper, I don't knov. BY MR. BECK:
Q. Okay. In your response you nentioned that you were on very tight tine constraints, I belfeve, in completing this audit?
A. Yes.
Q. Uas there a pending business decision that required those tight tine constraints?
A. Yes.
Q. What was the pending business declsion?
A. I think the continuing relat Jonship with Snyder. What our relationship uas golng to be with Snyder was the decision.
Q. Does that mean whether you vere coing

In tine is ue can varify on that sales order, we can see if it says John Doe and then ve can see if John Doe actually signed it, we see if he apelled out his nane.

But ulthout contacting that custoner and saying can you send ne a faxed copy of your signature or can you cone doun and sign a plece of paper for ne 80 that $I$ can sctually compars it to this historlcal signature, there's no way that I can authenticate that signature by the definltion that $I$ think that you're trying to get at. There ues no vay for us to go about dolna that.

I nean, we had one -- one, we had restrictions fron both our s!de and fron the snyder side that were saying that, you know, nininize custonar contact at all costs kind of things. And then there uere also restrlctions fron, you know, our slde that we needed to get thls done ulthin a vary short period of time as uell.

So ulth all of those constralnts, ve did uhat we could do. For those itens
to fire then or not, in plain language?
A. I belleve so, yes.
a. And the higher-ups, the people tho caused this audit to happen, uanted the audit results so they could nake that deternination. Is that right?
A. That was one of the pleces of their -- yes.
Q. Do you knov tho uas responslble for naking that decision on thether to terninate the relationship uith Snyder or not?
A. It would have been the GIE conrumications corps, GIECC executives. That would have been George Wieskopf, es I nentloned before. I belleve -- I'n trying to think uho the president was at the time. I think it was Butch Bircher uno was the GIECC president at that point in tire. They had changed over several tínes, but those vould have been the key players.
Q. Dld anybody ask you to dlscuss uhether the relationship should be terninated or not?
A. Not directly. They didn't ask for ny opinion of ahould ue terminate ulth Snyder or

not.
Q. Did they do so Indirectly?
A. They wanted to know about the general working relationshlp between Snuder and ourselves and, you know, good points, bad polnts. They uanted to know those kind of things that vere, I think, additional Information for then to nake thelr decision.
Q. What uas your reconsendat lon on those
A. Ithe reconmandation, as I ramarbar, fran the audit dapartmant as a whole, not Just mine independently, was that there vere problans ulth Snuder and that, you knou, something needed to be done ulth the relationship. elther terninate it or dounscale t or change the was we do business with ther.
a. then you say there uere problens with Snyder, can you generally state what those problans were?
A. Well, going into the audit, we had -I nean, before we even klcked off that, then atory and GTEcce had brought us in to dolng sone of the audit vork and uhatnot, they
upon to begin with.
a. Acreed upon as a problan, you nean?
A. Yes. It was -- it's a known rlsk.

And If everybody agrees it's a risk, why apand llaited resources going after a known risk that everybody knous and is trying to fixf That was kind of the thinking.
Q. The known risk belng the fraudulent sales?
A. Ey fleld sales, yes.
Q. Let ne return a little blit to the cost benafit analysis for third-party verification. You commicated that to Mr. Parker; did you not?
A. Yes.
Q. What was his response to your reconmendation on that?
A. I belleve it uas positive.
Q. Inat he thought that that uas sonething that should be done?
A. Yes.
Q. Hov about, did you mantion that to

Mr. Wieskopf in your meeling uith hin?
A. Yes, the whole report ve discussed at length with different poople in the regulatory
had -- we had a large neating of different people, a blg conference call, baslcally. And one of the thlings that vas discussed vas they reallzed that there ware -fron the fleld sales standpoint, there vere sone control weaknesses that were causing fraudulent or Inaccurate Loxs to cone through fron the sales side, and that uas kind of agreed upon.

Snyder folks vare on the phone, GIECC folks vere on the phone, regulatory and audit were all there together. And this is kind of a pre-planing neeting. So field sales was one of those itars that vas a known problen, and that vas one of the nain focuses of the revieu before ue even really got started in the audit. When ve started in the budlt, ve uanted to nake sure we looked at fjeld sales because that yas such a problen. But because evarybody agreed it vas a problen and Snyder uas dolng fixes as ve vere in dolng the audit, they had changed their process, they were dolng nassive number of things, we didn't go out and look at the Snyder field sales probably as nuch as we would have done had this been not agreed
and In the exacutive levels of GTECC. Like I said, Georye Wleskopf was our prinary contact at that; but the distribution on the report wes fairly suall.
Q. Lat ne ask you that the distribution uas on the report?
A. I don't know what Mr. Parker did ulth It, but he asked us to discuss that with George HIeskopf.
Q. Hov to distrlbute your audit?
A. No. He asked us to go over the findings, nake sure that we had discussed that ulth GIECC perṣonnel.
a. Was that at or about the ilne of your Letter to Mr. Parker?
A. Yes.
Q. So your discussion Uith Mr. Heskopf was sonewhere around the Hay 11th, 1999, tine fraxe?
A. Yes.
Q. And uhat was his response to the recomandation on third-party verification?
A. Mr. Wleskopf?
Q. Yes.
A. Again, generally agreeable and that

A. . That uould have been -- I mean, our key players would have been -- I belleve his nane is Michael Lyons, and the other person was Ied Gilmore.
Q. Nou, besldes Mr. Parker and Mr. yieskopf, vith whon else did you discuss your recomandatlon concerning third-party varificatlon?
A. The recommendation was discussed at these neatings and before it was finalized in the report that you see. And that Included the sane, sonabody fron Snyder, sonabody fron GIECC. sonebody fron -- audit was thare and uaually regulatory as vell.
Q. You nantioned that Mr. Parker responded favorably to your reconmendation?
A. Yes.
Q. And Mr. Wleskopf responded favorably to your reconsendation. Is that rlght also?
A. Yes.
Q. Did anybody evar respond negatlvely to your recomsendation?
A. Not to ns knouledge.
a. Did anybody ever respond any vay other than positively?
Q. So you had yeakly meetings uhlle you were conducting the audit. Is that right?
A. I think there were two neet Ings, that's ny general recollection, because of the short tine span of thls audit.
a. And do you recall was Karen saith at these neetings?
A. I know she was at one of then, but I'n not sure if she was at all or both.
Q. Tho else attended these neetings?
A. I'n not sure of the exact nares. I know that, generally speaking, the audit tean was there. There vas usually a represantative fron Snyder, a rapresentatlve fron GIFCC and a representative fron regulatory.
a. Do you know uho the GIECC representatives ware at the neat Ings?
A. Not specifically. I know who the najor players uare, but I don't knou if they're aluays the ones that cane to the moeting or not.
Q. Karen Snith is a najor player?
A. On the regulatory side, yes.
a. How about on the non-resulatory side, the business side?
A. Not to ny knouledge.
Q. Besides Mr. Wleskopf and Mr. Parker. do you recall any other persons tho you discussed that recommendation ulth?
A. Other than the ones that had already been rentloned? I nean, somebody --
Q. Karen Snith?
A. Karan Snith. Sonabody I -- I could speculate uho we talked Uith at Snyder, but I know we probably had that conversation with hin, but I don't remenber it specifically. I also renenber talking with different people In the audlt organization. I nean, ye talked ulth Jolene Modean tho was the inconing vice-president of audit. She was the top person in audit. Also Hark Snith and the audit tean as vell. But fron an outside standpoint, I think those vere the key playars.
Q. Do you know whether Karen Snith $1 s$ still with GIE, Verizon?
A. I belleve she 18. That's -- I'n not 198 percent sure.
Q. You don't know that her position vould be nou?
A. No. I really don't.

1 Q. And I'h sorry. She was the vice-president in regulatory?
A. She vas an AVP or a VP. I'n not sure which at that polnt in time. And she vas in the regulatory -- it uas elther regulatory compliance, regulatory affairs, sorething like that, but I don't know specifically.
Q. And uhat was her particular interest In the audit of Snyder?
A. They hed a nunber of complainfs that had cone through, and a lot of then had Snyder's name on then. And because of the nunber of conplainis that had happened, she felt that ve needed to go do an audit of then. Again, she uas kind of the driving force; herself and Ion Parker were woriking together to kind of be the driving force behind the audit.
a. Io your knowledge, your reconsendation concerning inird-party verlfication was never inplenented. Is that true?
A. To ny knouledge, no.
Q. Do you have any Idea thy?
A. I belleve that we vere anding our relatlonshlp with Snyder, And to inplanent
belleve that your reconsendatlon was never implesented, that you knou of?
A. Not that I knou of, no.
Q. As part of the audit, you perforned a series of nystery shoppers at Snyder fleld sales events. Is that right?
A. We perforned sone, yes.
Q. Could you describe what the purpose of that vas?
A. The prinary purpose of the mystery shops was to get us acqualnted with uhat vas golng on at a Snuder fleld sales location.
a. And by nustary shoppars, soneone would appear but it would be unknoun to salespeople that you vere actually auditing?
A. Yes.
Q. You actually conducted one of than, didn't you?
A. Yes, I did.
a. Ne'll get to that later. Other than what you've already discussed, were there any other follou-ups to this audit of Snyder?
A. Thare was not a follou-up audlt of Snyder, no.
something of, you know, a process change natlon-ulde like this, it uouldn't Just take a
-- it would take several months to get It
rolled out, get it up and vorking In all
locations. And I don't -- and fron the discussions that we had ulth Mr. Wleskopf in the Novenber, Decenber time frane, again, we ware kind of put on hold for stuff. And subsequant io that we found out that ve were ending our relatlonship with Snyder.
Q. Your recommendation vas nade no later than Hay 11th of 1998?
A. Right.
Q. Which is the date of your letter to Mr. Parker; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. And your relationship with Snyder foot sales uasn't tarminated for at least another six months. Isn't that right?
A. I don't know uhen it was terninated. I don't know when the Snyder foot sales was terninated. I don't knou the exact date of that.
Q. Other than uhat you've already deacrlbed, 18 there any other reason you
Q. But were thare any other processes other than uhat you've already alscussed?
A. Not that I renember, no.
a. Did you discuss the results of your audit uith Snudar as vell?
A. Yes. As part of the clearlng process, ue vere talking yith Snyder. They vere at those clearing neetings.
Q. Lat ne ask you to turn to page 6 of the letter uhich Is Bates stanped page 17461 ?
A. Okay.
Q. You have a nurber of bullets on thla
page --
A. Un-huth.
Q. -- that describe the results of a substantlve test of Snyder sales orders. Is that rlght?
A. Are you talking -- page 6, I nean, you vere Just looking at a different page than I vas.
Q. Rlght, the botton of page 5 that leads into page $6 ?$
A. Yes.
Q. And then on page 6 you have sone of the results of those. You describe sone of the


EY MR. BECR:
a. Do you recognize the docurent that's
Bates starped pace 18493?
A. Ganarally, yes.
Q. And it saus Lead Heno at the top;
does it not?
A. Yes.
a. Can you deacribe genarally that a
lead namo 18?
A. A lead nars is our base docurant, our
work paper. It's uhere ue docunent our
testing, a specific plece of the testing, let's
say.
Q. And is this part of a larger
docunent? I vas wondering if you could
Identlfy the pages that vould consist --
A. It has two pages. With this lead
mano there are tuo pages, 83 and 84.
Q. Inat's 18483 and 18484?

```
we used agaln as a refarence source.
```

we used agaln as a refarence source.
a. Lat ma ask you to turn to Bates
a. Lat ma ask you to turn to Bates
starped pase 18483.
starped pase 18483.
MR. WOFFORD: What's the fUll range?
MR. WOFFORD: What's the fUll range?
MR. BECX: I'n not sure.
MR. BECX: I'n not sure.
M. YOFFOAD: It begins with 18403.

```
    M. YOFFOAD: It begins with 18403.
```

A. Ganarally, yes.
Q. And it says Lead Heno at the top;
A. Yea.
a. Can you describe senerally that a lead namo 18?
A. A lead nars is our base docurant, our work paper. It 's where ve document our testing, a specific plece of the testing, let's say.
Q. And is this part of a larger document? I uas wondering if you could Identlfy the pages that vould consist --
A. It has two pages. Hith this lead navo there are tuo pases, 83 and 84 .
D. Inat's 18483 and 18494 ?
A. Yes. Those are the two that really go together. And then there would be -- if thare would be anything it would be B-11 dot anything else at the top of the page here.
a. All right.
A. And than there would be - those would be ssacilate docluents. But I don't see that on the next set of Bates stamps, so I don't know if they're out of order or thatnot. But these are the only two that really kind of go together.
Q. All right. At the botton of the page under Findings, Condition Issue, it states that: No standardized and formalized process is In place for the forwarding and handiling of complalnts to Snyder. Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Could you describe In a little bit nore detall what the problen is that that addresses?
A. That ve found at that point in tine?
a. Yes.
A. The basic pinding that ve had vas that complaints would cone in from various sources and thare uas no central point to take
those in, handle than and nake sure that thay got resolved adequately. That was our blggest concern, blggest problen. There vere rultiple places, people, whatnot. I mean, there uas -Snyder had a conplaint plece, GTECC had a complaint plece, so on and so forth.
Q. On the top of the next page, which is Hates stamped paged 18484, there's an area that saus "rlsk hlgh". Are there various descriptions of risk; are there varlous categaries of risk that you can ascribe to a practice?
A. Yes. Loy, nedith and high.
a. Okay. And the high then is the hlghest risk?
A. Correct.
a. And It says: Lack of formallty nay result in elther untinely resolution or lack of correction of unethical sales practices. Is that rlght?
A. Yes.
a. And do you agree with that?
A. That is the rlak of not being able to track sone of these things.
a. Let me ask you to turn to page 18495?

日-12.1. That would shou that these are the tuo docments that the two are polnting tovards or referencing each other.
Q. Okas. Okay. Let ne 90 back agaln to those lists of the subpoints?
A. Yes.
Q. 日-i2.1 is a suntary of test work?
A. Yes.
Q. E-12.2 18 a log of all conplaints for unauthorizad sultching on hand at Snydar?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. How did you deteraine, you the auditors, complalnts of mauthorized sultching on hand at Snuder?
A. If a custonar vonld call in to Snyder and say that $I$ hed bean slanned or I have a complaint or uhatnot, they uould log it; and it yas supposed to nake it on this log.
a. Let ne backtrack agaln here to B-12.1, which is the sursary of test scores?
A. Yes.
Q. And you referred ne earller to page 18499 as a place uthere that suntary of test work starts. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's look at the sample, which is on Bates stanped page 18499?
A. Yes.
Q. There are a nurber of -- or one of the first colums is BTN?

A: Yes.
Q. What does ETN stand for?
A. Billing telephone nunber.
Q. And thers are a number of 305 area code nunbers listed there; is that right?
A. I see about flve, yes.
Q. Are there six?
A. I'd have to count then, one - I got seven. Itan number 5 and then itens 13 through 18.
Q. Okay. Seven area code 3ass?
A. Yes.
a. And also one lien 19 In the area code

4g7: is that right?
A. Yes.
a. And all those area codes are in

Florlda; are they not?
A. I'n not stre.
Q. Mell --
A. I Just don't know.
Q. And to which page does that extend, the surnary of test, or 8-12.17
A. I think that's the only one. Let rea Just double check.

That's what it looks like. It's Just one page.
a. What would be on the next page, then, on Bates stanped page 185al?
A. B-12.2, which would be the next cross-referenced docunent, whlch vould be the log of all complalnts for unauthorized sultching on hand at snyder.
a. How do these relate, the 12.1 and 12.2?
A. I belleve 12 polnt - let ne Just make sure, hold on.
12.2, B-12.2 was the snyder listing of complaints, and that was used to pick a sample for testing.
Q. Is the sarple on 12.1 ?
A. Yes.
Q. So 12.1 is a sample of those that are 11sted on 12.2 ?
A. Correct. We took a sample of 25 1tems.
a. All right. Well, in any case, if we corbine 3 and 487, we have elght of those that are in alther of those area codes --
A. Yes.
Q. -- out of your 25 ?

Nou. let's Just take one, Just take the first one, for an exanple. All right. Ihat's line 5 for the 365-651-6513?
A. Yes.
Q. OKay. Inls, again, cones fron a subsection of all those complaints that were recelved by Snyder?
A. Yes.
a. And are these the only conplaints about unauthorlzed changlng?
A. I don't ranenber exactly. I don't knov if they vere. I don't remenber specifically if it vas all Just complaints of slaming or complaints of any nature. I don't remenber.
Q. Let ne ask you to direct your attention back to 18495, that page?
A. Yes.
Q. Doesn't under section $\mathrm{B}-12.2$ say:

Log of all conplalnts for unauthorlzed

the report shous?
A. Up at the top there's a narker that says: CRE corplaints $11 / 1$ throuch 4/日). So.
a. So yould that indicate to you that these are the conplaints recelved by snyder about unauthorized suitching during that period January 1 throush April 8ith of 19se?
A. It could be. I rean, those are the only dates that I see. I nean, I don't have anything that tells me one yay or the other.
Q. Okay. And, of course, thls doesn't include any of the complaints received by GIE about slanning; these are only the ones recelved by snyder. Is that right?
A. I belleve so, yes.

I don't know if there are duplicates or If this is an Independent log; I Just don't renarber specifically.
Q. And if ve wanted to know uhat conplalnts had been recelved by Snyder, we could look at the area code of the BTNs to see which ones are Florlda, relating to Florida. Is that right?
A. I vould assure so, yes.
Q. Going forvard in the docurents nou.
the field ip to Snyder headquarters personnel for surinarization in this report.
a. This raport refarring to?
A. 18591-I nean, 590.
Q. All rlght. Let me see If I

## understand correctly uhat this is an exanple

 of. These are three -- there are three 305 area code nurbers listed here. Is that rlght?A. Yes.
Q. And all of than have transaction dates in Jenuary, late January of 1998?
d. Yes.
Q. Is that right?

And thess are conplaints that vere recelved by Snyder of mauthorizad sultching. Is that right?
A. That I'n not sure of. I can tell you what 's on nere, but I don't renenber what specifically thls vas used for. It looks like this 18 - we send this out the door to say hare are your complaints that go to your reglon, and then It's listed by these people up here. That 's ny understanding.
Q. Well, by complaints, vouldn't that be a complaint of unauthorized suitching?

## leaving those behind, page LBS13?

A. 5197 I'n sorry.
Q. Yes.
A. Okay.
a. This is one of the supporting
worksheets. Is that rignt?
A. Let ne Just fanlliarlze nuself.

- Q. Please tell me what this page ghous?
A. Give ne just a ninute, please.
a. Sure.
A. What I belleve these to be is the actual detalled docunents that support the report starting on 5ea, 185se. Looking at complaint investigation forn sent to GSM and returned fron GSM uith action plan.
Q. So these are a portion of the complalnts recelved by Snyder that --
A. Yes.
Q. -- that you looked at as part of the audit?
A. I belleve so. I'n trying to just find one and cross raference it.

I believe that they are -- I belleve what they are is they are supporting docurants of the actual action plans that uere sant fron

PACE 64
A. I would assurse. I dan't knou. I really don't know. I Just don't rananber specifically or not.
Q. Well, what other conplalnts did you look at? Were there others other than unauthorlzed sultching?
A. No. I think nost of then vere all about suitching. I Just don't remenber specifically about this one. If I had to guess, I yould say that's uhat specifically this is. I Just -- it doesn't have nuch on there to glve ne any Indications one vay or the other. I'n sorry.
Q. I'n Just trying to understand what it shous nuself.
A. But If you -- on 519 you can cross reference litan 14, uhlch is handuritian there; and you can cross reference it to page 185ec by the BTN, bllling telephone number.
Q. and in fact, the 14 neans that this is one of the itens that was selected for testing?
A. Correct. Yes.
a. And we would find this on page 18499, thich shous, as I understand it, the subpart

 PAEE 71
took a sanple nid course or uhat we did. I'n Just saylng this is - I think thls is what ve used for testing, yes; but I don't know if it's a complete repart.
a. Let ne ask you to go through and Identify colums with re, if I could. Let's take about the tenth one doun, Nadlne Frezen. It starts on 2/26 1939?
A. Yes.
Q. 2/26/98 refers to uhat?
A. The date - it sars date recelved. I uould assurs that's the date the conplaint vas recelved.
Q. And right now we're discussing, just for the record, Bates stanp 18533; Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And thien that's the person's nare
A. Yes, I do.
a. And then the response under there is elthar $A$ or $Y ;$ is that correct?
A. Yes.
a. And here we have a Y. Is that rlant?
A. Yes.
Q. I guess that neans yes for fraud; is that rlght?
A. That would be a fair assumption, yes.
a. Hou uas it deternined on this page whether or not there vas fraud?
A. I don't know how they made that determination.
a. tho would have nade It?
A. Liz Snith or somabody in her group or uhoever took the investldation.
a. So these three pages, 18533 through 535 cane fron Liz Snith*8 group and already had on thare yes or no to the colurn on fraud?
A. Yes. This was prepared by her, and we Just took this document. These were

PNEFE 78
complalnts that had already cons in the door. The test that we ware looking to do was to make sure that these got forwarded to Snyder accurately.
Q. And do you know when this docunent was provided?
A. 时 Liz Salth?
Q. Yes.
A. Not a speclfic date, no: but it was vithin the audit tire frame.
Q. The lest event listed ls. for date recelved at least, is April 7, 19s8. Is that rtght?
A. Yes.
Q. And there are marks at the top of the work paper on the first page of $4 / 14 / 98$. Is that rlght?
A. Yes.
a. So it uould be somuhere in that time frame, betusen the 7th of Aprll and the 14th of Aprll; would it not?
A. I vould say 1t's probably even earlter than that.
Q. Well. it couldn't be earlier than April 7th, could it?



|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | action plan of the ordars processed in the emall. I.D. spoke with the folloulng people. And ue tried to get to the root cause and uhy they vere rejected and any result in custoner complaints and what was basically belng done about this. This was kind of a follou-up Just to nake sure that sonathing ve kney of is somebody on the Snyder side, is somebody on the GIE side taking care of it. <br> Q. Okey. <br> A. I mean, If you can read on -.. if you read on through the namo, you see basically it says, the botton of that page: Based on conversatlons with GIE and Snyder personnel the exact cause of this problen is unknoun and is l!kely a conblnation of both customer and rep fraud. $A$ trand analysis on these orders vas conpleted by Snyder uhich did not find any significant trands by rep I.D. or locat lon to pinpoint the problen. <br> Q. Thare's one other e-nall on Bates 8tamped 18541 through 18542? <br> A. Yes. <br> Q. And this simply describes the results of the 39 test calls nade ulth respect to that |

action plan of the orders processed In the enall. I.D. spoke with the folloulng peopie. and ue tried to get to the root cause and uhy they ware rasected and and result in custorar about this. This was kind of a follou-up Just to nake sure that sonathing ve kney of is somabody on the Snyder side, is somebody on the GIE side taking cara of lt.
Q. akay.
A. I mean, If you can read on --. if you read on through the namo, you see basically it says, the botton of that page: Based on conversatlons With GIE and Snyder personnel the cause of this problen is unknown and is d!kely a cortination of both custorar and rep completed by Snyder uhich did not find any simificant trands by rep I.D. or locat lon to pinpoint the problen.
a. Thare's one other e-nall on Bates 8tamped 18S41 through 18542 ?
A. Yes.
Q. And this simply describes the results of the 39 test calls nade ulth respect to that

793 Is the first page. 794 is a blank page. Do you vant to keap it in there?

## BY MR. BECK:

Q. Yeah.
A. Okay. Glve ne Just a second to fanlllarlzo nuself.
Q. Sure.
A. Okay.
Q. What I'd llke for you to do is describe that the chart shous on page 18795?
A. Well. the table provides datalled Infornation regarding paynents that GIE has nade to Snyder for the months of January through harch of 'sg.
Q. Snyder gets paid only uhen GIE accepts one of lts sales; is that right?
A. According to the nero, yes. Yes.
Q. And this shous that during the perion of January through March of 1998, 49.44 percent of the sales Snyder sent to GIE vere not accepted. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you generally descrlbe what the cause is of GIE not eccepting a sale sent fron
problen ulth the business versus residential. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. There are a number of Florlda custoners llsted there in the group; are there not?
A. I sea a couple, yes. Thare are several In here that have the Florlda State code, FL, listed on then.
Q. And they all say slan or likely slan, do they not, for Florlda at least?
A. All the onee listed with the fiorjda State code nave llkely slan llated next to ther.
Q. Okay. Lat's nove on, Let re esk you to turn to Bates stamped page 18795. I'd Ilke to ask you about the table that's in the niddle of that page and ask you to describe what It neans?
A. Can I get 18796 It should be the flrst page of that narrative.

MR. HOFFARD: It's blank.
IHE UITNESS: I'n Just looking at the

- there's a Marrative E-2, page 2 of 6 is uhat's -


## Snyder to GIE?

A. Generally, there could be numarous reasons for uhy a sale vould be rejectad. You could have missing custoner information. A Dig one would be, llke, the bllling telephone number would be urong. If you niss one diglt, If a four looks like a nine, or vice versa, that could throu off your processing because it's very -- billing telephone nunber is the blg key fleld the systen would go off of. If the name and address don't natch up uith the bllling telephone number, if different key flelds were off. If you left off -- you could leave off someth!ng of what carrler code should be processed uith this. If you were sultching fron AIsY to GIE, you know. if you left off the GTE PIE code, you knou, you wouldn't know which -~ fron a systen standpoint, you vouldn't knou which one to change it to. A simplistic example.
Q. So if an order cones in and has any one of those problers, it won't be accepted by GEE. Is that rlght?
A. Arong other things, yes.
Q. Don't they get fixed and resubaltted?
 or unoever orlginated the order and say ve don't have enough infornation to process this order. Ihare could also de other holdups, sustenatic or otherulse that could be contributing to that nurber as uell.
Q. Is this nunber of 48.44 the $-\rightarrow$ the 49.44 percent unacceptable rate, is that the net number? In other vords, that's the nurber that don't get fixed and are Just never accepted?
A. It doesn't really say. I uouldn't knou for sure. I nean, to say that they've never bean fixed or would not be flxad, I don't knou if they uould get recycled back through or not.
Q. On page 188637
A. Let ne get there.
Q. akay.
A. Dkay.
Q. These are Just other charts shoulng the sane infornation; are they not?
A. It looks like a sumary of the activity.

You sald 188867
MR. WITFPRR: B66. THE UITNESS: 886?
BY MR. BECK:
Q. It's one of then.

And is this your audit progran for the nystery, for looking at the nustery shoppers?
A. Yes.
A. And uhat you did as part of this audit is you actually appeared at the field, the sales events that snyder uas attending and you reported back what you sau, basically, is that right, what happened?
A. Right. The mustery shops uere Intended just to get us fanillar with what was happening at field events.
Q. And I'll Just sklp around a little bit. Let ne ask you about the docunents 18839 through 18996.
A. Okay. I'n looking at 896 .
Q. Okay. 18893 through 896.
A. Okay.
Q. Plaase describe your guldelines for the nystery shopper inspection, if you uould
a. And it shous -- at one place it describes then as GIE rejects of Snyder orders. Is that right, one of the charts?
A. Yes.
Q. Does this help you in being able to ansver whather this ls the anoumt that are never, never accepted or not. If you know?
A. Not Just by looking at it, no. I mean, because it -- I'n Just looking at it, and It doesn't say if these ever get reprocessed or not. I mean, if -- for example. the January nuruber of 2,789 rejects of those. d! d thay get recycled or 18 that 2900 nubber incorporated Into the February nurber? I don't know, you know. Are there duplicates there and is it Just a bliling total or uhat. or is thls a cont Inuation of old orders dropping off and new nurbers coning on? I don't knov.
Q. Okay. Let mesultch topics a little Dit and ask you about the mustery shopper ravieu.
A. there?
Q. Let's start at page 18866.
A. I don't think I have It. I stop at 849.
call it that. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. or the nystery shopper guidelines?
A. Yes.
Q. And on page, the third pase of those, which is 18885, there's a nystery shopper checklist explanation. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And the first part is Inage and Appearance. Is that rlant?
A. Yes.
Q. The first one 18 that: The Snyder sales assoclates should Identify therselves as agents of GIE or representatlves of grte. Is that correct?
A. Yes, that's uhat it says.
Q. And so one of the in!ngs you're looking for ls to make sure the Snyder people represent thenselves as GIE and not as Snyder enployees?
A. That is one of the things we were looking for.
Q. And in fact, it specifically states they should not be identifylng therseives es Snyder enployees. Is that rlght?

| 89 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A. Right. |
| 2 | Q. And the second thing says: The sales |
| 3 | rep should be vearlng a nape tag ulth a fre |
| 4 | nare and/or logo. Is that right? |
| 5 | A. Yes, it 18. |
| 6 | Q. So that's another thing you vould |
| 7 | look for as a mystery shopper? |
| 8 | A. Rlight. |
| 9 | Q. And the third thing says: The sales |
| 18 | rep should be wearing Docker stule pants vith a |
| 11 | GIE logo shirt or a plain white and blue shirt |
| 12 | that should be appropriate for the event. Is |
| 13 | that right? |
| 14 | A. Yes, it does. |
| 15 | Q. akay. and that's another thing that |
| is | you looked for in your nustery shopper |
| 17 | Inspection. Is that right? |
| 18 | A. Genarally speakins, yes. Those are |
| 19 | Just sone genaral guidelines that ve had. |
| 29 | Q. Lat no ask you to turn to page 18880. |
| 21 | A. It's right before this. |
| 22 | a. Sorry. |
| 23 | A. Okay. |
| 24 | Q. Do you recognlze page 18889? |
| 25 | A. Glve ne Just a second to get |

on, and then he had kind of llke a llght windbreaker is what I remenber. But I have uritten down GIE logo ahirt with Jacket cover.
Q. Okay. And anyhow, this page and -is It a two-page raport of your inspection of this person?
A. Yeah, I belleve the checklists were all of two pages.
Q. So it's pages 18880 and 18881 for your Inspection of this person in chicago. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. As part of your audit, other people did these in Florlda as vell: did they not?
A. Yes, they did.
Q. And on 18882, ue have one in Miand. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And in that case your auditor deternined that the representative -- or the Snyder employee vas Identifying thenseives as a representatlve of GIE Long Dlatence. Is that rlght?
$\lambda$. They clrcled yes.
Q. Okay. And they were vearing a name

tas with a GIE name on it. Is that correct?
A. They circled yes again to that question.
Q. So was your answar yes to ns question?
A. Yes.
a. And on pase 18886, we have another nustery shopper in Mlanl. Is that right?
d. Yes.
Q. And again, during this Inspection, they found that the representatlve identifled thensalves as representatives of GIE Long Distance and they were wearling a nars tag uith a GIIE nane on it. Is that correct?
A. That's how they indicated on this sheet, yes.
Q. Let ne ask you about Bates stanped page 18919 through 18929.
A. 919, you sald?
Q. Yes, 919 through 29 .
A. Okay.
Q. Is this nore backup to your audit concerning the nustery shoppers?
A. I belleve uhat we're looking at here Is te're lookins at nustery shops performed by


```
starped 1825s and ask you if you recogniza it?
    A. I do.
    Q. What 1s 1t?
        Hin. LOFPCRD: Here, I've got it.
        THE #ITNESS: It's a prellninary
    ecope that the Intemal mudit departrent
    and I put together whan we vere dolng our
    original plamning for the audit.
BY YR. BECK:
    Q. Okay.
    A. Thanik you.
    Q. This Just describes prellninarily
uhat your mudlt was designed to accomplish. Is
that fair to say, or not?
    A. When we had our inltial discussions
ulth the key players, which would have been the
people I've already nared, Karen Snlth, George
Uleskopf, Ted Gllnore, that did we want the
zud!t to accomplish. These vere a brain ding
of activitles that ve vould vant to take a look
at when we were there.
    Q. Let ne mak you to turn to page 18262
and 18283. Nsk you if you recognize that
docurent?
    A. I do.
starped 18259 and ask you if you recogniza it?
A. I 10 .
Q. What is It?
MR. WOFPCRD: Hare, I've got it. THE EITNESS: It's a prellainary
ecope that the Internal audit cepartrent and I put together when we uere doing our original planning for the audit.
日Y YR. BECK:
Q. Okay.
A. Ihanik you.
Q. This Just deacribes prellninarily what your audlt was designed to acconplish. Is that falr to say, or not?
A. When we had our inltial discussions ulth the key players, which would have been the people I've already nared, Karen Snlth, George Uleskopp, Ied Ellnore, what did we want the eudit to eccomplish. These uere a brain dinp of activitles that ve vould want to take a look at uhen we were there.
a. Let ne ask you to turn to page 18262 and 18233. Asik you if you recognize that docurant?
A. I © .
```

Q. And there are four people this uas sent to. Could you identify each of those four people and what their positions vere with the company?
A. I'll do that I can. G. Allen, I do not knou. J. Bliney would be Jody Bllney; she uas in the salos area.
Q. of arecc?
A. of GIECC.
Q. Okay.
d. Ted Gllmore which vas - he vas for, agaln, he uas in the sales area but the was in -- I belleve he was the head of Snuder on the GIECC side. I think he was VP/GM was his title.
Q. VP would be vice-president and general nanager?
A. Yeah. I've got it listed soneplace in one of these other docurxents. In the planning meno I know there was a listing of. what his exact title was. I could find it if you'd like.
Q. Well, it's not necessary right nov. Who's the last person --
A. Ied -
a. Could you describe what it is?
A. It is a lettar fron Cirls Ouens, who is the president of ETECC Consumar Markets to four individuals at arecc related to business ethics/compliance.
Q. Lat ne first ask you about Chris Ouens tho vas then president of consurer narkets. What does that anconpass, consuner narkets?
A. At this point In tire consurer GIECC vas broken up into a couple different unlts, and one of then uas consunar narkets, which was primarlly residential sales. Consunar narkets uere closely assigned uith sinall businesses and residential lines.
a. Is this onil EIECC? He's the president of consunar narkets for Grecc?
A. Yes, I bellave so. That vas - It's on the GIECC Letterhead, and that's what ny recollection ls.
Q. And that includes Long Distance, does it not, for that segrent?
A. I don't know how LD, Long Distance, rolled up underneath thls at this point in tIne, March 10, 1998. title, but $I$ recogntze the name.
Q. Why is this lettar in your -- first of all. is this letter in part of your audit work papers?
A. Yes, it vas.
Q. Why is it thare?
A. It uas planning naterlals to give us an uderstanding of uhat the environment was like, glve us an understanding of the regulatory concerns related to these issues related to Snyder.
Q. You see there some handuritten notes

```
On the right side of page 282gr?
```

A. I ©
a. Could you read then?
A. I'll give it mu best shot. It starts off, says: Copy to: Thara's sone scratching that looks llke a TKE 8lesh. I'n not sure, it could be a Steve or sonething, I'n not sure.
Q. Do you know what the IKE would stand Por?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Can you read the rest of the handuritten notes?
A. See note sonething. I don't know what that word is. We need to look at. And then I can't make out what the rest of this says. I really can't nake it out.

MR, 日ECK: At the end of thls I'n golng to ask for a legible copy of thls with the note 80 I can read it.

KR. HarFard: I can't read It elther.
I'n not sure.
THE UITNESS: I don't know If we have one. Thls was - I renanber, fron the work papars that this is a copy of a copy.

1
9
1911
Q. Where does this docurent stop, at Uhat Bates stamped page?
A. I'll Just have to see if they hava an index up at the front. I shou on 2009 that It has 14 Itens listed on the table of contents, and that would teke us all the way up to 2035 , which would be the end, which would be the last end tab is what it looks like. So I would assune that that would probably be, if the nunbers are concurrent, that it would be -I think that would be the end point.
Q. Okay. All right. And this is part of your audit backup because it's sonething you used as part of the audit or at least revieved?
A. It is. When verre orlalnally dolng the planning for the audit, you know, one of the things ve alvays request is we ask for policies and procedures of uhat are you supposed to be dolng. And this 18, for Snuder. one of the backup naterlals that we obtalned.
a. Let ne ask you about Bates starped paga 20914 ?
A. Yes.
Q. Inls page covers thelr policy with respect to representation, is that right, thelr

I don't know if anybody still has the original. I don't know. I Just knou uhy It uas in here was because of the - the subject natter was related to Snyder and telanarketars as a whole, again, setting us up for what the environment uas like for plaming infornation for us.
BY MR. BECK:
Q. Nov, Mr. Ouens who uas the author of this letter, was he provided the results of your audlt?
A. I don't remenber specifically.
Q. Okay.
A. He could have had knowledge of it, but I don't knou.
a. All right. Let ne ask you to turn to the docunent that starts at page 29907.
A. I know I don't have that one.
Q. And it's antitled Snyder Comunlcations, Inc., GIE Policies and Procedures Kanual. Do you recognlze the docurent that begins at page aoser?
A. Generally, yes. I know that we had a couple of Snuder nanuals in our work papers that ue used as referance naterial.

PAGE 104

## representation policy?

A. Ihat's that it says on the top, yes.
Q. What I'd like to ask specifically about is under the operating process on that pase, there's a bullet, seventh bullat under Snyder's responsibillty. It says: Enforce a dress code that includes usage of Gite branding. And then it lists a serles of itens. And $I$ was wondering if you could discuss the type of branding that Snyder used that 's shown there that uould show GEE?
A. I don't know the specifics. I could tell you then $I$ did the mustery shop and when ue sau different articles around the Snyder offices.
Q. Okay. Please 00 ?
A. They used the anall GIE buy, which is -- it's Just the logo.
Q. What bus?
A. Let ne use this for a second.

YR. YOFFORD: No, I don't think he
wants you to dray. IHE WIINESS: oh, I'n sorry.
EY MR. BECK:
Q. Just describe it. There's a bug
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# EXHIBIT TO DEPOSITION TRANSCRIPT 

## OF

## WAYNE WEAVER

(Bates Stamped Order)


May 11, 1998
Mr. Thomas R. Parker
Assistant Vice President-Associate General Counsel
GTE Business Development and Integration
600 Hidden Ridge, HQE03J43
Irving, TX 75038
Dear Mr. Parker.
We have completed our review of Snyder Direct Services, Inc. (Snyder). The objectives of our review were to evaluate the adequacy of operational controis over the Sales Order Processing (Refer to Attachment One for a Summary of Snyder's Process) and other related functions within Snyder, and to evaluate selected GTE: Communications Corporation (GTECC) processes which would impact the Snyder processes.

The scope of our review included, but was not limited to:

- Sales Order Processing;
- Sales Compensation Plans;
- Quality Control, Complaint Resolution/Escalation and Reporting Processes;
- Performance Monitoring and Measurement;
- Human Resource Functions, Training and Business Ethics; and
- Logical System Security.

For each of the scope items noted above, we reviewed policies and procedures, observed the processes, and in most cases directly tested the controls within each
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function. The following items provide a general overview of the major testing performed for this review:

- For the Sales Order Processing functions, we selected a random sample of orders, including both field and telemarketing sales, and performed specific attribute testing to ensure the orders were completed accurately and in a timely manner. For each sample item, we obtained the Letter of Authorization (LOA) or the Third Party Verifier (Ensol) recording and compared that information to Snyder's Sales Order and Account Processing System (SOAPs). Also, for each order we determined the average number of days it took the order 1) to be passed to GTE and 2) for the order to be completed by GTECC and communicated back to Snyder. As a separate test, we performed a series of "Mystery Shops" at Snyder field sales events to gain an understanding of the field environment and the sales process.
- We reviewed the sales compensation plans for the Snyder sales force up through the District Sales Manager to ensure plans were reasonable and did not promote unethical sales practices. Additionally, we tested the monthly payment process between GTECC and Snyder to ensure the calculations and payment amounts were in accordance with the contract.
- For the Quality Control and Complaint Resolution processes, we selected a sample of complaints and ensured that all were resolved accurately and in a timely manner. Also, we selected a sample of GTE complaints and compared those items to Snyder's database to ensure all complaints were received and logged by Snyder.
- Related to the Performance Monitoring section, we reviewed specific contract provisions for both GTE and Snyder to ensure proper vendor management and overall contract compliance.
- Finally, we performed a high level process review of the remaining scope items - Human Resources, Training, and Logical Security.

As a result of our information gathering and specific testing, we made several observations which should help tighten controls and/or improve processes, both at Snyder and within GTECC.

Mr. Parker
May 11, 1998
Page 3

## General Observations

We wanted to discuss several positive items we noted during our review. Overall, the audit team was grateful for the cooperation and support of both Snyder and GTECC personnel. Without this support, we would not have been able to complete our' work within a responsible time frame. Additionally, we noted several Snyder processes which we felt deserved recognition, including:

- We were impressed with Snyder's level of system automation and integration. These integrated systems allowed Snyder to record, track and report on their sales in an on-line real time environment.
- Further, Snyder is very responsive to both GTE's needs and the changing environment in which they are currently operating. They were able to respond quickly and change their systems and processes in mid-March to address the additional complaint volumes.
- We noted that Snyder's telemarketing sales process was very secure and effectively prevented most occurrences of unauthorized account conversions. They currently use a random assignment dialer and an electronic voice and data transfer system which provides them with a highly automated, controlled and efficient system for processing telemarketing sales.
- Finally, through our review of their training materials, we noted that their training curriculum was very detailed and provided a good base of knowledge to the sales associates. Also, we noted that Snyder is consistently disciplining all employees who have had complaints against them.


## Vendor Management

GTE Communications Corporation (GTECC) is responsible for the actions of any third party vendor which is being used to market and/or provision service for GTE products. As an agent of GTECC. Snyder and other vendors represent GTE's brand name in the marketplace. As such, GTECC should be continuously monitoring vendor activities to ensure they are conducting themselves in accordance with GTE's compliance standards and the vendors have appropriate controls in place to prevent unauthorized account conversions or other violations. With that in mind, we noted several items where GTE could improve their vendor management processes. Specifically, we noted the following:
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- There does not seem to be a comprehensive Complaint Resolution and Tracking Process between Snyder and GTECC. We noted, through interviews and attempts to compile a complete listing of all Snyder related complaints, that there was not one source which was responsible for compiling, tracking and ensuring timely resolution of Snyder complaints. In our testing at Snyder, we noted that complaints sent to Snyder were not received in a consistent manner (some were faxed, some were e-mailed, some communicated verbally, etc.). Additionally, our test results showed that 15 of 112 (13\%) escalated complaints obtained from GTECC files were not maintained in Snyder's complaint tracking database. For non-escalated complaints, our testing showed that for one day 12 of 28 (43\%) complaints obtained from GTECC were not on hand at Snyder. For those complaints received by Snyder, we noted that 11 of 25 (44\%) were not resolved and reported back to GTECC within five business days. GTECC needs to ensure processes are formally defined, documented, and communicated which can record, track, and report the status of all Snyder related complaints.
- The Marketing and Operating Policies and Procedures Manual (Schedule 3 of the Marketing Agreement) indicates that Snyder will have as their goal an average monthly billing of equal to or greater than $\$ 45$ per Snyder-sourced customer for the first twelve months. The contract goes on to state that GTECC will measure at the sixth and eleventh months the average monthly billing for Snyder-sourced customers. However, GTECC does not have the reporting capabilities to produce a report which identifies all the Snyder-sourced customers and their billing totals for the month. Through discussion with GTECC personnel, they are working on the reports, but they are having problems getting the Customer Billing Service System (CBSS) to produce the necessary information. The need for this information was identified when the contract was signed in mid-November 1997. However, as of April 24, 1998, GTECC still does not have an accurate and reliable report which can be used to comply with the above contract provisions. GTECC needs to increase their efforts to obtain this information through their vendor management group from GTE Network Services, the billing agent for GTECC and owner of CBSS.
- Based on observations made during this review and other. work performed by GTE Internal Audit over the past year, we have noted that the order provisioning process has been unreasonably lengthy, sometimes 30 or more days. These delays have been attributed, in part, to processes performed by Anderson Financial (AFNI), a third party vendor of GTE Network Services. We recommend that GTECC work with GTE Network Services and ensure AFNI's processes are
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reviewed and monitored on an on-going basis to ensure GTECC's orders are processed in accordance with agreed upon quality and timeliness standards.

## Sales Order Processing

Snyder's sales process can be broken down into two primary channels, field or foot sales (approximately 60-70\%) and telemarketing sales (approximately $30-40 \%$ ). For each of these sales channels, we selected completed orders and traced them through Snyder's processes to the hand off to GTECC. As part of our testing, we wanted to ensure that controls were in place to prevent and detect unauthorized account conversions. Our testing revealed that in response to the increasing number of unauthorized switching complaints, Snyder made several changes to their processes which occurred during the mid-March time frame. These process changes improved the overall controls within Snyder's processes, and should have the downstream effect of reducing the overall number of Snyder related complaints. However, we noted areas where Snyder and GTECC could improve the overall sales process. Specifically, we noted the following:

- As part of our testing, we noted that California field sales due to regulatory requirements must be verified and recorded by an independent third party. Basically, the process requires the customer to complete and sign the LOA and then speak with the third party verifier via a cellular telephone prior to leaving the sales site. We recommend that Snyder begin using this process to verify all field sales based on a cost/benefit analysis. By having both a signed LOA and a voice record verifying the sale, Snyder and GTECC should benefit by having improved order accuracy, reduced number of customer misrepresentations and fewer complaints. Additionally, these controls would go beyond the regulatory requirements, in most states, and could be used to mitigate any penalties. The added controls would help prove that a comprehensive program was in place to avoid and minimize the number of unauthorized switching complaints. By having more accurate order and customer information from the beginning of the process, both Snyder and GTECC should realize some downstream processing cost savings.
- Our next observations related to the substantive testing of Snyder sales orders. As mentioned above, we selected a random sample of orders for testing from all transactions which occurred from mid-March to the first week in April. This sampling period aliowed us to view orders which were-processed before, during and after the process changes made by Snyder. Our sample of 89 total orders
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was representative of the overall population and was broken down as: 1) 68 field or foot sales and 21 telemarketing orders; 2) 73 out-of-franchise and 16 infranchise; and 3) 44 Spanish, 34 English, and 11 Asian. Our observations are:

- On 18 of $84(21 \%)$ orders the contact name and billing name did not agree 17 Field Sales and one Telemarketing order. An authorized party may not be signing the form, and thus making the order invalid and possibly indefensible in the event of a complaint.
- On 60 of $81(74 \%)$ of the orders tested were sent to GTECC after the agreed upon four day tumaround. NOTE: All 60 orders noted above were Field sales. Per the marketing agreement, Snyder should forward orders to GTECC within four days. In our sample, it took Snyder an average of fourteen business days to forward an order to GTECC.
- On 13 of $34(38 \%)$ of the orders which were forwarded to GTECC were not completed by GTECC within the agreed upon ten days. In our sample, the thirteen orders took an average of fourteen business days to complete. NOTE: Only 34 of the original 89 orders were sent to GTECC for processing, refer to Attachment Two for a breakdown of the final disposition of the orders.

4 On 38 of 68 ( $56 \%$ ) of the orders did not have one of the following identifiers on the LOA: social security number, driver's license number, or date of birth. NOTE: These were field sales only.

NOTE: Five orders were not included in the testing because they were telemarketing calls in which the customer did not want to be recorded for verification purposes. Also, for the second bullet item there were three orders in which the customer canceled the order in the call back or TPV process. With these items in mind, we excluded these sales orders from our analysis.

- For our "Mystery Shops", we visited Los Angeles, Chicago, and Miami and had a total of eight observations. From these site visits, we noted a couple of areas needing improvement. First, we noted that Snyder did not have "Take Aways" (for example, GTE Plan Brochures, information cards, etc.) at any of the locations we visited. This was also noted in our review of "Mystery Shops" performed by Wells Fargo on Snyder's behalf. Secondly, we noted that for various reasons the Snyder Sales Representatives were not at several identified sales location. In each of the three cities we visited, we were unable to find Snyder sales
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associates at the sales locations. Again, this was confirmed in our review of the Wells Fargo documentation.

In conclusion, we understand and acknowledge that the Snyder and GTECC relationship has been evolving over the past four months, and overall the processes are operating in a very dynamic environment. The changes that are currently underway or that have already been made on both sides should help strengthen controls and contribute to the prevention of unauthorized account conversions.

If you have any questions regarding the results of the review, please contact Wayne Weaver at 972/550-6620 or me at 972/751-5297.

Very truly yours,


Mark R. Smith
MRSNEW:tlm
Attachments (2)
c: D. Gudino - HQK03B67 - Irving
L. Zidow - HQA06A30 - Irving

## GENERAL

We are performing a four week review with field work beginning April 6, 1998. Our targeted closing meeting is April 30, 1998. This review will not be a traditional TFA audit and will not result in a traditional audit report. Our goal is to issue a AttorneyClient Letter at the closing meeting.

## Address:

GTE Communications Corporation Snyder Communications, Inc.
6665 N. MacArthur Blvd.
lrving, TX 75033

Two Democracy Center 6903 Rockledge Drive, 15th Floor Bethesda, MD 20817 Main Switch Board - (301) 468-1010 (See Directions Attachment HH.1)

## Main Contacts:

| GTECC | Ted Gilmore, <br> VP/GM LD Division - Snyder Liaison <br> GTECC | $972 / 465-5184$ |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
|  | Michael Lyons, <br> Manager LD Division - Snyder Liaison | $972 / 465-4642$ |
| GTECC | Ed Miller | $972 / 465-5198$ |
| GTE BDI | Director - Marketing LD <br> Toni Kubly <br> Director Regulatory <br> Snyder | George Wolfand <br> VP Operations |

Audit Team:

| Yamira Lajara | $\frac{\text { entone Number }}{813 / 221-8610 \times 323}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Susan North | 813/221-8610 $\times 326$ |
| Andrew Timberlake | 972/550-6647 |
| Wayne Weaver | (972)550-6620 |
| Mark Smith | (972)751-5297.. |
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Planning Memo
HH
Snyder Communications Legal Review
Irving, TX \& Bethesda, MD
In-charge: Wayne Weaver
Wayne Weaver
Audit No. 98:00:025
Manager: Mark Smith
The opening meeting will be held at 9:30am (Local Time) on April 6, 1998 at Snyder Communications Headquarters in Bethesda, Maryland. We will be arriving at Snyder's Headquarters at 9:00am. Per discussion with George Wolfand, Snyder VP - Operations, Snyder's normal work hours are 9:00am to 6:00pm. We will adjust to their schedule as best as possible.

## OVERVIEW

## General:

We will be performing an investigation of Snyder Communications, Inc. per the request of GTE Legal counsel - Tom Parker. As such, all materials produced or acquired during this review will be confidential and remain under Attorney-Client Privilege. (Refer to Interoffice Memo Requesting Audit Services @ HH. 4.

## GTE Communications Corporation (GTECC)

GTE Communications Corporation (GTECC) is GTE's Competitive Local Exchange Carrier or CLEC. CLEC refer to companies that have been approved by a state regulatory commission (usually the PUC) to provide local telephone service in competition with an Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier (ILEC), like GTE Telops or Southwestern Bell. State Utility Commissions began approving CLEC applications in late 1994.

GTECC objective is to provide a full range of services to their customers, including wired and wireless local service, wired and wireless data transmission, intra and inter LATA voice and data, Internet access, messaging, paging, and video services.

Currently, GTECC is providing long distance services to customers in all 50 states through a resale arrangement with WorldCom. GTECC is marketing their long distance packages in a number of ways, including in and out bound telemarketers, retail store sites (GTE Phone Mart \& GTE Wireless Stores, etc.), and through direct sales. One of the telemarketers that GTECC is currently using is Snyder Communications, Inc. who is one or our authorized agents. However, Snyder is being used to target specific segments of the population, as described below.

Refer to Exhibits HH. 5 - HH. 7 for various Flowcharts which represent the Order Processing Systems for GTECC, GTE LD Fulfillment, and GTE LD detailed.
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## Snyder Communications, Inc.

Snyder Communications was established in 1984 as a telemarketer who specialized in marketing for specific industries and to specific market segments. They are a publicly traded company with approximately $\$ 200$ million in revenues last year, and they employ approximately 2800 people nationwide. They work primarily for Fortune 500 companies like Enron (Energy Company), GTE \& AT\&T (Telecommunications), Proctor \& Gamble (Household goods), and Merck (Pharmaceuticals).

Snyder's other products include product sampling and Wallboards - informational posters for placement in hospitals, recreation areas, and transportation centers.

Starting January 1998, Snyder's Direct Services Division (Organizational Chart @ HH.2) began marketing GTE Long Distance services to multilingual customers. Specifically, they are marketing to Asian and Hispanic markets throughout the US. These customer groups have been targeted because of the potential for high usage rates both internationally and domestically. Additionally, these groups have very close family units who like to remain in contact with one another which again produces high usage rates. Currently, the Hispanic market represents approximately $70-80 \%$ of Snyder Sales, and as such we will give this group added attention in our sampling.

Snyder sells GTE LD through 1.) Face-to-Face sales at fairs, festivals, carnivals, malls, store fronts, and street corners ( $60-70 \%$ of sales), and 2.) Telemarketing outbound calling to customer within their database ( $30-40 \%$ of sales). Whichever sales method is used, certain conditions must be met before a sale can be finalized.

Refer to Flowchart of Snyder's Sales Order Processing @ HH.8-HH.10.

## Regulatory Environment

The following paragraphs are taken from a message by Illinois Attorney General Jim Ryan explaining some of the details behind Slamming and what regulations are currently being imposed. This article is a general overview of Slamming and regulations to prevent it.

17674
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## Slamming

Today consumers are free to choose their own long distance company. However, some long distance companies engage in illegal marketing and promotional campaigns to switch consumers' long distance service. These companies engage in the activity that has come to be called "slamming." Slamming occurs when one long distance company takes a consumer's account from another long distance company without the consumer's full knowledge and consent. Slamming is most often done through the use of a disguised or inconspicuous "letter of agency" purportedly authorizing the switch in service or through deceptive telemarketing campaigns.

## Letters of Agency

Many long distance companies sign up new customers previously served by other long distance companies by getting them to sign letters of agency (LOA's), which are documents in which the consumer states that he understands and authorizes the change. However, some long distance companies, in an attempt to confuse consumers, combine LOAs with promotional material, such as a contest entry form or a solicitation to contribute to a particular charity. A common scam is for companies to send or give consumers a form to fill out with the chance to win a large sum of money, an automobile, or some other valuable prize. When the consumer signs the form, he or she often is not aware that they are authorizing the company to switch their long distance company.

The Federal Communications Commission has adopted rules designed to prevent slamming through LOAs. Under the rules, the general form and content of LOAs must be as follows:

- Any promotional material, such as contest entry invitations and charitable solicitations, must be separate or severable from LOAs;
- Checks used to solicit a consumer to change his or her long distance carrier may include the LOA on the check itself, but may not contain any promotional language;
- The LOA can only be used to authorize a change in long distance service -- prize promotions and charitable solicitations cannot be mentioned in the LOA;
- The LOA cannot contain small, difficult to read print;
- The LOA must be signed and dated by the ac̣count holder; and
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- The LOA must be written in clear and unambiguous language and contain the following information:

1. the customer's name, address, and all telephone numbers to be switched;
2. the names of both the former and new long distance companies;
3. a statement informing the customer that he or she may designate only one long distance company to handle switching requests; and
4. a statement informing the customer that a fee may be imposed for switching long distance companies.

- The LOA must provide a full translation if any part of the LOA is written in another language;
- The LOA cannot require or suggest that the consumer take any action to keep his or her current long distance carrier. Therefore, long distance companies are prohibited from sending you promotional material and then switching you if you don't respond to the promotional material.


## Telemarketing Solicitations

Some long distance companies contract with teiemarketing firms to contact consumers for the purpose of soliciting them to switch their long distance service. The telemarketing firms receive a commission for each new customer they convince to change their service. The Federal Communications Commission allows long distance companies to solicit new customers by telemarketing if they adhere to specific rules. However, several unscrupulous long distance companies and marketing firms have started a campaign to slam consumers by engaging in the following illegal practices:

- Switching consumers without their authorization.
- Representing themselves as the consumer's current long distance carrier and then switching the consumer from his or her carrier without the consumer's knowledge.
- Switching consumers after they have declined the company's service.
- Switching consumers without obtaining proper verification. (See below)

Before a consumer may be switched to another long distance company, the Federal Communication Commission requires a long distance company (which has switched a consumer through a solicitation by phone) to verify the switch by:
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- Obtaining the customer's written authorization; or
- Obtaining the customer's electronic authorization; or
- Obtaining the customer's oral authorization by use of an independent third party rather than the company soliciting your business; or
- Sending each new customer an information packet which contains the following information:

1. the customer's name and current long distance company;
2. the name of the new long distance company;
3. description of all terms, conditions and charges related to the service;
4. the name of the person who authorized the switch;
5. postcard which the customer can use to deny, cancel or confirm a switch; and
6. disclosure stating that the customer must return the postcard within or the customer's long distance service will be switched.

PIC Freeze
For your protection and to ensure that your long distance telephone service is not switched without your knowledge, you should consider requesting a "PIC Freeze." A PIC Freeze consists of you completing and signing a written document instructing your local telephone company, e.g., Ameritech, GTE, Illinois Consolidated, etc., not to change your long distance service unless authorized by you. The actual form can be obtained from your local telephone company.

Special Note: Just some insights as to the special nature of this review. First, this is a legal review of another company, we must maintain a high level of professionalism at all times. Second, this review involves a number of "Big Players" namely George Weiskopf, VP - Finance GTECC; Tom Parker, GTE Legal Counsel; Bill Edwards, Controller; Karen Smith, AVP BDI Regulatory; and Larry Zidow, Acting Assistant Controller - Auditing. Finally, we are being asked to complete this review as soon as possible but no later than the end of April due to a pending business decision.

Because of these factors, I am expecting, as is Mark, that we will be working late and possibly on the weekends to attend certain marketing events and complete the work ASAP. Also, we will be taking Sunday flights to arrive at our work sites early Monday morning, and we will be taking later flights out on Friday (No later than 5:00 PM) to avoid $1 / 2$ days.

## OBJECTIVE

The objectives of this review are to evaluate the adequacy of operational controls over the Sales Order Processing functions within Snyder Communications, and to evaluate selected GTE Communications Corporation processes which may aid in our review of Snyder Communications.

## SCOPE

The scope of this review will include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Sales Order Processing:
- Review of Customer Contact procedures including Authorized Sales Plans and Promotions, Sales Representative Training and Forms Utilized;
- Select a sample of orders and ensure they are processed accurately and in a timely manner. Specifically, ensure:
- Selection of the sample is according to percentage of Face-to-Face Orders versus Telemarketing Orders, Market Segmentation, and by State sales figures. Will include monitoring of calls for Telemarketing sales and visits to Face-to-Face Sales sites;
- Letter of Agency (LOA) is completed and maintained according to agreed upon standards;
- Third Party Verification is occurring as intended;
- Determine Time to Complete order through Hand-off to DMSS;
- Weicome / Fulfillment Packages are sent out for all and only completed and approved orders; and
- NOTE: Orders will be traced from origination through Quality Outbound Calling (QOC) to hand-off to DMSS.
- Evaluate the adequacy of the Sales Compensation Plan and ensure it does not encourage unethical / questionable sales practices;
- Evaluate the adequacy of the Quality Control, Problem Resolution / Escalation, and Reporting Processes;
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- Review Performance Monitoring / Measurement to ensure adequate management information. Specifically, looking for Management Span of Control, Coaching Practices, and Sales Representative Statistics.


## Personal Preferences:

I am not a very picky person when it comes to documentation. I'm more of a substance over form kind of person, but all standard workpaper documentation requirements per the audit manual are in effect with one notable change.

We will be modifying the Audit Process as follows:

- Complete High Level Narrative and Flowchart which document the main controls within the area being reviewed. (This part hasn't really changed much.) Each controls technique should be underlined for easy reference on the Narrative.
- Cross reference each control technique to the Audit Program step(s) which will test the effectiveness of the control. (This is major departure from the Audit Manual because we are eliminating the TFA Matrix Document. However, the substance of our review is still documented in the Narrative - only the form has changed. This should save us some time and effect.). I have an example of this documented at HH.3.
- Complete lead memo as usual to document the test results.
- All Documents, Exhibits, and test items included in the workpapers MUST have a pre-printed label or printed directly on the document the following:
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If you have any questions regarding exactly what this statement means or how it effects our work, your not alone but l'il do my best to explain what I think it means.

## AUDIT ASSIGNMENTS:

Audit Assignments will be determined at a later date.

17679
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## ADMINISTRATIVE ASSIGNMENTS:

| Responsiblepersph (s) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| All | Bring any personal supplies you will need (i.e. Post-it <br> notes, pens, pencils, highlighters, notepads, etc.) |
| WW \& AT | Printer, Paper, Ink Cartridge Refill, etc. |
| WW | Opening / Closing Meeting Materials |
| TBD | Opening / Closing Meeting Minutes \& Attendance |
| All | Report Write-up \& Finding Summary |
| WW \& MS | Post Review Performance Appraisals |
|  |  |

## LOGISTICS:

- We will be working at various locations, including Bethesda, Maryland and possibly event sites in California, Florida, New York and Texas (these are yet to be determined)
- Bring your ID badge and plenty of business cards.
- Review Operating Procedures Prior to Beginning of Fieldwork - I will be providing Training Materials as well as Policies and Procedures from Snyder
- Make your travel arrangements - only for the first week or until I know where we will be going and when. Sidetrips may not be practical for the first couple of weeks so I would not plan anything that you couldn't cancel quickly and with minimal cost to you. Sidetrip forms must be submitted for approval at least a week in advance.
- Snyder Communications is Professional Dress (Men = Suit and Tie; Ladies = Suits, Dresses, Professional Pants Suits, etc.). You may want to get these items cleaned and out of storage. I know l'll be unwrapping my suits, unfortunately. They are Business Casual on Fridays, so you will need to take some casual clothes as well.
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- Please turn in expense reports every Monday morning.
- Back up the files related to this audit daily onto a removable disk.
- As issues come up, please inform me as soon as possible. I will be keeping a running Findings Summary.
- If you are finished with your section, run into some problems or are dealing with difficult people, LET ME KNOW ASAP.
- Turn in your completed work, as soon as its finished. This will speed up my review and allow Mark to be more flexible with his review.
- 



- Please complete the Work Paper Cleanup Checklist
- Complete all Expense Forms
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| SCHEDULE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |
| 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 <br> Make Travel Plans For Week \#1 | 28 |
| 29 | 30 <br> Planning Week | 31 <br> Planning Week |  |  |  |  |
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| 12 | 13 <br> Fieldwork - <br> Possible Site Visits to local events | 14 <br> Fieldwork <br> Status Meeting with GTECC | 15 <br> Fieldwork - <br> Possible Site Visits to local events | 16 <br> Fieldwork Possible Site Visits to local events | 17 <br> Fieldwork Possible Site Visits to tocal events | 18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 | 20 <br> Fieldwork Possible Site Visits to local events | 21 <br> Fieldwork Possible Site Visits to local events | 22 <br> Fieldwork - <br> Possible Site Visits to local events | 23 <br> Fieldwork - <br> Possible Site Visits to local events | 24 <br> Fieldwork - <br> Possible Stie Visits to local events | 25 |
| 26 | 27 <br> Fieldwork / Wrap-up <br> Closing | 28 Wrap-up <br> Meeting | $29$ <br> Wrap-up <br> Sometime | 30 Wrap-up This Week? |  |  |
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## Dress Code



- Must wear clean/appropriate GTE Sales Associate shirt
> Must wear visible GTE ID badge
- Must wear clean dark blue/ black/ khaki pants
- Cannot wear thongs or any other opened toe shoe
- Must be well-groomed and clean shaven


## MYSTERY SHOPPER

Definition - To review the quality of our field sales representatives and evaluate their sales presentations. Mystery Shoppers visit undisclosed locations and provide feedback to GTE and Snyder concerning performance.

## Mystery shopper will evaluate the following areas:

$>$ Sales associate visibly wearing ID name tag
$>$ Wearing GTE approved attire
$>$ Friendly, courteous and informative behavior

## Did sales associate ask the following questions:

$>$ Which long distance company do you use?
$>$ Are you authorized to sign?
$>$ Do you make long distance calls?
$>$ Which states or countries do you call?
$>$ How much do you spend on your monthly bill?
sャ8L1
$>$ When do you call most?
$>$ Was mystery shopper offered a plan or promotion?


> GTE Service Corporation - Internal Audit Preliminary Scope for Snyder Communications Review March 19, 1998

Our objective is to evaluate the adequacy of financial and operational controls over the Sales Order Processing functions within Snyder Communications. The following items represent Internal Audit's Preliminary Scope:

- Sales Order Processing - Snyder Communications:
- Review of Customer Contact procedures including Authorized Sales Plans and Promotions, Sales Representative Training and Forms Utilized;
- Select a sample of orders and ensure they are processed accurately and in a timely manner. Specifically, ensure:
- Selection of the sample is according to percentage of Face-toFace Orders versus Telemarketing Orders. Will include monitoring of calls for Telemarketing sales and visits to Face-toFace Sales sites;
- Letter of Agency (LOA) is completed and maintained according to agreed upon standards;
- Third Party Verification is occurring as intended;
- Determine Time to Complete order through Hand-off to DMSS;
- Welcome / Fulfillment Packages are sent out for all and only completed and approved orders; and
- NOTE: Orders will be traced from origination through Quality Outbound Calling (QOC) to hand-off to DMSS.
- Evaluate the adequacy of the Sales Compensation Plan and ensure it does not encourage unethical / questionable sales practices;
- Evaluate the adequacy of the Quality Control, Problem Resolution / Escalation, and Reporting Processes;
- Review Performance Monitoring / Measurement to ensure adequate management information. Specifically, looking for Management Span of Control, Coaching Practices, and Sales Representative Statistics.


A particularly important point in Steve's presentation was that violations committed by agents of GTE. (i.e., Teletech, Snyder, LD Telemarketers, etc.) are the responsibility of GTE. The penalties associated with a violation can be substantially mitigated, however, if (1) the company surfaces the violation and (2) the company can prove that they had a comprehensive program in place to attempt to avoid or minimize violations.

Given our increasing use of outside partners, we must be certain that they conduct business in a fashion that is consistent with GTE's compliance standards and have appropriate controls in place to prevent violations.

Id like to begin a review of our partners' "quality control/compliance processes" as soon as possible. In fact, we recently completed a review of Snyder Communications' processes and procedures and likely will conduct an onsite review to verify that the processes are working as designed. Id like each of you to work with your partners to document and summarize their current quality control/compliance standards and processes. At this point, no onsite review is

G．Allen，J．Bilney，T．Gilmore．J．Havens
March 10． 1998
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necessary．Ted or Gwen can provide you examples of the work we＇ve done with Snyder if you＇d like．I＇d like these reviews completed as quickly as possible but no later than March 31． 1998.

Let me know if you have any questions or comments．

Christopher D．Owens
President－Consumer Markets

CDO：gjh
Attachment
c：C．Bercher－HQB17A14－Irving．TX（w／o attachment）
F．Kinder－HQK03E 13 －Iving，TX（w／attachment）
S．Skogen－HQLO6B62－Irving，TX（w／o attachment）

# GTB 

## GTE Service Corporation

Toni S. Kubly
Regional Director - Auditing

Intemal Audit Department 5615 High Point Drive, Suite 600 Mail Code HQA06A30 Irving, TX 75038 972/751-5292

June 19, 1997
Mr. Robert G. McCoy
President
GTE Long Distance
P.O. Box 152211 MC HQL14A07

Irving, TX 75015-22119
Dear Mr. McCoy:
We have completed our Order and Fulfillment Audit of GTE Long Distance, located in Irving, Texas. Our Audit Report No. 97:55:051 is attached.

The objective of the audit was to evaluate the adequacy of operational and financial controls and determine whether the controls in place were functioning effectively and in accordance with established Company practices and policies.

The scope of the audit included, but was not limited to, a review of the following areas:

- Order Creation and Entry;
- Vendor/Contract Administration;
- Sales Channel Interfaces;
- Sales Fulfillment;
- Systems Order Interfaces; and
- Performance Monitoring.

In our opinion, the controls addressed within the scope of our audit are inadequate. Our audit did not disclose any significant internal control weaknesses. However, we noted 21 areas where controls should be improved.

Our observations and related recommendations, along with management comments, àre included in the attached audit report. For your convenience, we have identified within the Table of Contents, the functional area(s) with primary responsibility for each observation and a summary of each finding. .

During the 4th quarter of 1996, Internal Audit completed a Phase I Process Review of the entire GTE Long Distance environment. The scope of the review examined the design of the process controls and assessed the relative risk of the business processes. The review did not include any testing of processes. The Order and Fulfiliment audit expanded on the Phase I Process Review and performed detailed testing, where possible, of the functions performed. Additionally, afthough management comments were not required, we performed follow up and testing of the Phase 1 observations and have noted conditions that have remained unchanged within this report.

We recognize that the GTE Long Distance business processes are in a dynamic and rapidly changing environment. We also acknowledge the significant accomplishments and efforts by management to achieve "speed to market" and, at the same time, to establish business processes consistent with business objectives. Additionally, we acknowledge the continual efforts by management to implement the required controls and understand they are an ongoing continuous improvement.

However, based on our audit observations, there are 3 pervasive control issues; no defined procedures, no communication of procedures and the lack of an integrated business process. We recommend the implementation of the following controis to heip minimize the problem currently experienced:

- Improve systems/applications to perform the proper check/balances and up front edits;
- Mechanize the manually intensive processes;
- Improve the lines of communication within all responsible parties;
- Provide the appropriate training and instruction to all personnel to perform the proper functions;
- Develop effective tracking and control mechanisms; and
- Clearly define, communicate and execute policies and procedures.

Throughout the audit report, there will be examples of control weaknesses that correlate to the above noted pervasive issues and related recommendations.

We appreciate the courtesy and assistance extended to us during the audit.

Mr. Robert G. McCoy
June 19, 1997
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If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact Mark Smith at (972) 751-5297 or me at (972) 751-5292.

Very truly yours,

$$
\text { Non } 1 \text { Keble }
$$

TONI S. KUBLY
TSK/MRS/BDA:pjw/97051AUDLTR

## Attachment

cc: R. J. Bigler - Irving
M. C. Bolduc - Irving
C. L. Brinkley - Irving
T. Burroughs - Irving
D. L. Crockett - Irving
A. Farrell - Irving
B. Geller - Irving
R. Gray - Irving
M. Harness - Irving
J. M. Havens - Irving
P. Kuhar - Irving
D. E. McCracken - Irving
N. A. Radvanczy - Irving
R. M. Taguchi - Irving

OBJECTIVE: Audit Step(s): B-10\#1
To Ensure that policies and procedures are complete and in compliance with contractual guidelines and GTE's approval.

## SOURCE:



SCOPE:
IAD obtained policies and procedures for Quality Assurance complaint resolution/escalation and reporting. IAD also interviewed Michael Lyons, GTECC LD Complaints Manager, Liz Smith, GTENS - Post Sales Fulfilment LD/Complaints and Elliot Glover, Snyder - Quality Control Manager. In order to verify communication of Snyder/GTE policies and procedures, IAD also obtained Snyder's Quality Assurance Overview used in training (B-111) and a memo from Liz Smith describing Snyder's complaint process ( $B-1112$ ) $\sqrt{ } I A D$ reviewed these documents and interviewed personnel involved to ensure that policies and procedures are complete and in compliance with contractual guidelines and GTE's approval.

## TEST RESULTS:

Based on the testwork above, IAD found issues in the following:

- No formalized complaint process at GTE
- No confirmation or reconciliation performed by GTE to ensure all complaints are received and forwarded


## FINDINGS:

| CONDITION/ISSUE | Dispo <br> sition |
| :--- | :--- |
| No standardized and formalized process is in place for the forwarding and handling <br> of complaints to Snyder. | RP |
|  | Standard:A formalized process should be in place for the forwarding and handling <br> Of complaints to Snyder |
| Cause: Complaints are forwarded to Snyder by fax and Email, during all times and <br> from a variety of personnel. Further, Michael Lyons organization does not keep a <br> log of the complaints forwarded to Snyder. Snyder also receives non-unauthorized <br> switch complaints forwarded to them which they cannot handle. |  |

## Lead Memo

GTE Communications Corp. - Snyder Communications Review Bethesda, MD

Audit No. 98:00:025
Risk:HIGH - Lack of formality may result in either untimely resolution or lack of correction of unethical sales practices
Recommendation: GTE and Snyder develop together a formalized complaint process to allow for an efficient resolution of complaints.
Clearing Comments: Cleared with XX on $\quad / \quad / 9 \mathrm{X}$

## CONDITION/SSUE



Dispo risition
There is no consistent way of reporting and tracking complaints to ensure 1) \%hati all RP complaints have been received from all the organizations within GTE or 2) thatall complaints have been sent to Snyder

Standard: A process should be established to track complaints received into GTE and forwarded to Snyder
Cause: Lack of documented and defined procedures
Risk:HIGH - If a complaint is not received by Snyder this may result in lack of correction of unethical sales practices
Recommendation: Define, document and communicate procedures for tracking, reconciling and reporting complaints each month.
Clearing Comments: Cleared with XX on $1,19 \mathrm{X}$
Conclusion: Based on the results of the audit tests performed, as outlined above, it appears the controls are adequate but need improvement.

## Lead Memo <br> GTE Communications Corp. - Snyder Communications Review Bethesda, MD <br> Audit No. 98:00:025

OBJECTIVE: Audit Steps): B-10\#2
To ensure that customer complaints are being handled properly and in a timely manner.

## SOURCE:



## SCOPE:

IAD obtained listing of all customer and PUC/FCC complaints maintained by both GTE (B-12.9) and Snyder (B-12.2), and performed the following tests:

Selected a haphazard sample of 25 complaints $(B-12.1)$ for unauthorized, $3-12.3$ switching from the listing and traced to supporting documentation Sample 12.4 was picked from the following offices: Queens, Brooklyn, Houston \& Miami. 12.6 The majority of complaints chosen were escalated complaints.

For each complaint researched:

1. Traced to supporting documentation showing action plan taken to resolve complaint (step a. on B-12.1),
2. Determined if the complaint was resolved in a timely manner (step b. on B-12.1); See B, 12.8


The following tests were performed for the columns listed:
Tickmarks:
a) Verifled the receipt of aclion plan (rec'd date) was within 72 hours per Snyder \& GTE policy.
b) Traced to supporting documentation.
c) If the action plan was listed as termination, verified the rep. was listed as inactive in CAPS with description of termination listed as unauthorized sales. CAPS is the payroll system.
d) If the actlon plan was listed as termination or suspension, but rep. was listed as active in CAPS, ran a production report on the representative to see if they are inactive
e) If action plan was re-training, traced rep. ID to entire log to ensure was only 1 complaint and if action -plan was wiften warning ensured that there was no more than two complaints.
[ Tested with no exceptions
O Obtained verbal verification from manager that rep. participated in re-tralning.
[ For confldentlality reasons, did not want to give us terminatlon formis; HR mgr. verified that these reps. were teminhafaiks s.
8 This rep: offy recetved re-training after ist complaint and was later fired after Investligation of 2nd complain:


[^2]

## CRC Complaints－（ $1 / 1$－4／8）

|  | OTM／FLD | BTN | TranDate | QC Req＿Date | Response Date | Classifaction | Domint | Repld | Status | Off | Requestor | Action Plan |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | OTM | 2013848885 | 19980302 | 3／25／98 | 4／1／98 | 100 | 1 | 16753 | Active | SNY | MM | Retraining |  |
|  | Field | 2025443035 | 19980228 | 4／8／98 | 4／8／98 | 100 | $1 / 0$ | 3727 | WDC | Inactive | MP | Terminated－4／6／98 |  |
|  | Fiold | 2025443035 | 19980228 | 4／8／98 |  | 100 | $1 / \mathrm{D}$ | 3727 |  |  | MP |  |  |
|  | Fiatd ．－ | 2026670905 | 19980302 | 3／26／98 | 4／1／98 | 100 | $1 / 0$ | 3689 | WDC | Inactive | EG | Terminated－3／30／98 |  |
|  | Field | 2068705002 | 19980222 | 3／27／98 | 4／2／98 | 100 | $1 / \mathrm{D}$ | 10012 | SEW | Inactive | PF | Terminatedd－ $3 / 11 / 98$ |  |
|  | Field | 2068783977 | 19980225 | 3／30／98 | 4／2／98 | 100 | $1 / 0$ | 10012 | SEW | Inactlve | EO | Terminated－3／11／98 |  |
| Sumple | Field | 2123271047 | 19980206 | 4／3／98 |  | 100 | $1 / \mathrm{D}$ | 6032 |  |  | BW |  |  |
|  | Fleld | ｜2124273227 | 19980128 | $3 / 42 / 98$ $3 / 23 / 98$ | 3／24／98 | 100 | $1 / \mathrm{D}$ | 2380 | Acitve | NNY | MM | Coaching／Supervision／Refresher Training | 324 |
| 1 | Fleld－ixat | 2124273312 | 19980225 | 3／23／98 | 4／6／98 | 100 | $1 / \mathrm{D}$ | 6866 | Active | BKN | TS | Terminated $3304 \%$ Suspradred |  |
| 2 | Fleld Field | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 2124273312 \\ & 2125352395 \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} 19980318 \\ 19980227 \end{array}\right\|$ | $3 / 23 / 98$ $3 / 30 / 98$ | 4／6／98 | 100 100 | I／D | 6866 | Active BKN | BKN | TS | Terminated $3 / 30 / 91$ susperided |  |
|  | Fleld | \％125459547 | 19980217 | 3／25／98 |  | 100 | I／D | 6026 | Active | QNY | 8W | Just Received，Responses will appear on next week＇s report |  |
|  | Fleld | 2126630735 | 19980213 | 3／25／98 | 4／1／98 | 100 | $1 / 0$ | 5501 | Active | QNY | PF | Writen Waming |  |
| 3 | Fleld $*$ | 2127693963 | 19980211 | 3／23／98 L |  | 100 | $1 / 0$ | 6883 | Active | BKN | 8W | JustRecetved－Responses－will－eppear－on－next－week＇s Teport | －Suspenrlot |
|  | Fleld | ，2127722501 | 19980209 | 47／98 |  | 100 | I／D | 3677 |  |  | $\mathrm{T}^{\circ}$ |  |  |
|  | Fleld＊ | － 2128758502 | 19980228 | 4／8／98 |  | 100 | UD | 6866 |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
|  | Fleld | 2129270183 | 19980203 | 4／6／98 |  | 100 | I／D | 4559 |  |  |  | 或 |  |
|  | OTM | 2132276898 | 19980217 | 3／5／98 | 3／13／98 | 100 | 1 | 9665 | Active | SNY | 18 | ¢ |  |
|  | OTM | 2132338936 | 19980121 | 3／5／98 | 3／19／98 | 100 | 1 | 16936 | Active | SNY |  | © 0 © 0 ching／Supervision／Refresher Training |  |
|  | OTM | 2135600351 | 19980226 | 3／17／98 |  | 100 | 1 | 20232 | Acitve | SNY | $10$ | No Response from Field |  |
|  | Field v | 2143500428 | 19980118 | 3／27／98 |  | 100 | 10 | 9255 | DAL | Active | 18 | 윾 |  |
|  | Field | 2152251448 | 19980220 | $4 \pi / 98$ | 4/8/98 | 100 | 1／D | 11006 |  | PHL |  | ¢0 ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ |  |
|  | Field | $2539310793$ | $19980220$ | ＝ $3 / 2719 \%$ | －4／2198 | $100$ | $1 / \mathrm{D}$ | ， 9133 | SEW | Active | $\bigcirc$ | Observation－4／2／98 |  |
| 4 | Field－ 1 | 2814969474 | 19980130 | － $3 / 28198$ | 4／8／98 | 100 | 1／D | ＇ 11210 | HOU | Actlve |  | T § Terminated－4／8／98 |  |
|  | OTM | 3036668631 | 19980209 | 3／23／98 | 4／1／98 | 100 | 1 | 13650 | Active | SNY |  | Retraining |  |
|  | Field | －3052256997 | 19980213 | 4／6／98 |  | 100 | 1／D | 18378 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Field | 3055533331 | 19980218 | 3／26／98 | 4／6／98 | 100 | $1 / \mathrm{D}$ | 377 | MIF | Inactive |  | 亿边 Refresher Training |  |
|  | Field | 3055567838 | 19980120 | 4／8／98 |  | 100 | ，1／0 | 9563 |  |  |  | ¢ 0 |  |
|  | Fleld | 13056496103 | 19980220 19980227 | 4／8／98 <br> $3 / 20 / 98 \mathrm{I}$ | 4／8／98 | 100 | －1／D | 6038 | MIF | Active |  | S 0 Investigation ${ }_{0}^{0}$ | alning $\alpha$ |
| 5 | Fiold | $\begin{aligned} & 3056516513 \\ & 3058267543 \end{aligned}$ | 19980227 | 3／20／98 | : | 100 | － 110 | 10176 | Active | MIF |  | NOREsponse fromitald－ | $\text { biningos } \Delta$ |
|  | Field | 3058600128 | 19980228 | 4／8／98 |  | 100 | 1 | 6289 |  |  |  | HiO |  |
|  | OTM | 3103988571 | 19980204 | 4／1／98 |  | 100 | 1 | 13049 | SNY | Active |  |  |  |
|  | OTM－ | 3186456298 | 19980217 | 3／11／96 | 3／19／98 | 100 | 1 | ， 13449 | Active | SNY |  | jaching／Supervision／Refresher Training |  |
| ） | Fiold：－ | 3489898056 | 19980207 | 3／27／88 | ， | 100 | 110 | 9992 | HOU | Active | DW | peprisher oraining 4／17／， | 80 |
|  | OTM | 3196452437 | 19980317 | 3／25／98 | 4／1／98 | 100 | 1 | 10187 | Active | SNY | EG | Retraining． |  |
| $\infty$ | OTM | 4128240410 | 19980130 | 3／16／98 |  | 100 | 1 | 20395 | Acilve | SNY | MM | No Response from Field |  |
| 8 | OTM | 4198369872 | 19980204 | 4／1／98 |  | 100 | 1 | 9098 | SNY | Active | ML |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ | OTM | 4404283239 | 19980126 | 3/5/98 | 3／13／98 | 100 | 1 | 14191 | Active | SNY | TS | Rep recelved a coaching |  |
|  | OTM | 5016324863 | 19980312 | $3 / 24 / 98$ | 4／1／98 | 100 | 1 | 16905 | Active | SNY | MM | Retraining |  |
|  | Flatd | 5052585764 | 19980201 | 3／23／98 | 3／27／98 | 100 | ID | 7635 | Active | ELP | PF | Retraining－3／25／98 |  |
|  | OTM | ／5129917894 | 19980302 | 3／27／98 | 4／2／98 | 100 | 1 | 20552 | SNY | Inactive | DW | Terminated－3／9／98 |  |
| 7 | Field＞ | 5184886142 | 19980208 | $3 / 48 / 98 \mathrm{~L}$ | 3／24／98 | 100 | $1 / D$ | 7759 | Inactive | QNY | TS | Terminated 2／24／98 |  |
|  | Field | ＋5164895218｜ | 19980212 | 3／25／98 | 3／25／98 | 100 | $1 / 0$ | 6627 | Active | QNY | MM | Verbal Warning |  |

18501


| 4/7/98 | 4/8/98 | 100 | 1/D | 6597 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3/5/98 | 3/13/98 | 100 | 1 | 9094 | Active | SNY |
| 3/5/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | 1 | 20181 | Inactive | SNY |
| 4/3/98 | 4/7/98 | 100 | ID | 9885 |  |  |
| 4/7/98 |  | 100 | ID | 9260 |  |  |
| 3/26/98 | 4/2/98 | 100 | 1 | 10200 | SNY | Inactive |
| 3/5/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | 1 | 20393 | Inactlve | SNY |
| 4/1/98 |  | 100 | 1 | 20185 | SNY | Active |
| 4/1/98 |  | 100 | I/D | 8131 | BKN | Active |
| 3/31/98 | 4/8/98 | 100 | ID | 8885 | QNY | Active |
| 3/23/98 | 3/25/98 | 100 | $1 / \mathrm{D}$ | 1994 | Inactive | LAA |
| 3/25/98 | 4/6/98 | 100 | 1/D | 9493 | Active | QNY |
| 4/8/98 |  | 100 | 1/0 | 6799 |  |  |
| 4/3/98 |  | 100 | $1 / 0$ | 3317 |  |  |
| 4/3/98 |  | 100 | I/D | 4040 |  |  |
| 4/8/98 |  | 100 | I/D | 7967 |  |  |
| 4/8/98 |  | 100 | I/D | 54178 |  |  |
| 4/1/98 |  | 100 | 1 | 9036 | QNY | Activo |
| 3/30/98 |  | 100 | I/D | 2608 | QNY | Active |
| 4/8/98 |  | 100 | $1 / \mathrm{D}$ | 506 |  |  |
| 4/3/98 | 4/1/98 | 100 | //D | 5872 |  |  |
| 3/20/98 L | 4/1/98 | 100 | 1/D | 8188 | Active | QNY |
| 0317/98 | 3/24/98 | 100 | I/D | 6029 | Acitve | QNY |
| 3/31/98 | 4/2/98 | 100 | $1 / 0$ | 6631 | QNY | Inactive |
| 3/19/98 L |  | 100 | $1 / 0$ | - 6212 | 'Active | BKN |
| 4/8/98 | 4/8/98 | 100 | 1/D | 2190 | QNY | Active |
| 4/8/98 |  | 100 | $1 / \mathrm{D}$ | 8757 |  |  |
| 4/4/98 |  | 100 | $1 / \mathrm{D}$ | 54045 | QNY | Active |
| 3/28/98 |  | 100 | $1 / 0$ | '8131. | BKN | Active |
| 4/6/98 | 4/8/98 | 100 | $1 / \mathrm{D}$ | 30741 |  |  |
| 3/27/98 |  | 100 | 1 | 20337 | SNY | Active |
| 3/25/98 | 4/1/98 | 100 | 1 | 14277 | Active | SNY |
| 4/7/98 |  | 100 | 1 | 44049 |  |  |
| 4/1/98 |  | 100 | 1 | 16721 | SNY | Active |
| 4/1/98 | 4/3/98 | 100 | 1 | 16994 | SNY | Active |
| 3/27/98 |  | 100 | 1 | 7910 | SNY | Active |
| 3/27/98 |  | 100 | 1 | 20558 | SNY | Active |
| 4/2/98 |  | 100 | 1 | 9965 |  |  |
| 3/26/98 | 47/98 | 100 | ID | 8653 | ELP | Active |
| 3/27/98 |  | 100 | ID | 8055 | ELP | Active |
| 4/6/98 |  | 100 | $1 / \mathrm{D}$ | 9759 |  |  |
| 3/27/98 |  | 100 | $1 / 0$ | 10169 | MIF | Active |
| 3/27/98 | 4/2/98 | 100 | , | 16956 | SNY | Inactive |
| 3/27/98 | 4/2198 | 100 | 1 | 16956 | SNY | Inactive |
| 3/5/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | I | 20181 | Inactive | SNY |
| 2/9/98 |  | 100 | /D | 08140 | Inactive | WDC |
| 1/30/98 |  | 100 | I/D | 05561 | Active | WDC |




| 3/13/98 | 3/18/98 | 100 | 1/D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3/11/98 | 3/16/98 | 100 | I/D |
| 1/30/98 |  | 100 | 1/D |
| 2/13/98 | 3/13/98 | 100 | 1 |
| 2/25/98 |  | 100 | 1/D |
| 3/5/98 | 3/13/98 | 100 | I/D |
| 3/18/98 | 3/23/98 | 100 | ID |
| 3/2/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | I/D |
| 3/5/98 |  | 100 | $1 / 0$ |
| 3/19/98 | 3/24/98 | 100 | ID |
| 3/13/98 | 3/24/98 | 100 | I/D |
| 3/5/98 | 3/11/98 | 100 | $1 / 0$ |
| 2/3/98 |  | 100 | ID |
| 3/5/98 |  | 100 | 1/D |
| 2/20/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | 1/D |
| 3/11/98 | 3/11/98 | 100 | ID |
| 2/11/98 |  | 100 | $1 / 0$ |
| 2/5/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | I/D |
| 3/13/98 | 3/23/98 | 100 | $1 / \mathrm{D}$ |
| 3/5/98 | 3/11/98 | 100 | I/D |
| 2/9/98 |  | 100 | I/D |
| 3/2/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | I/D |
| 2/13/98 |  | 100 | I/D |
| 1/26/98 |  | 100 | I/D |
| 2/11/98 |  | 100 | ID |
| 3/18/98 | 3/23/98 | 100 | I/D ${ }^{\prime}$ |
| 3/13/98 | 3/23/98 | 100 | 1/D |
| 3/13/98 | 3/23/98 | 100 | I/D |
| 3/18/98 | 3/23/98 | 100 | 10 |
| 2/13/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | ID |
| 2/11/98 |  | 100 | $1 / \mathrm{D}$ |
| 2/10/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | I/D |
| 2/16/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | 1 |
| 3/2/98 L- | 3/10/98 | 100 | ID |
| 3/18/98 | 3/25/98 | 100 | $1 / \mathrm{D}$ |
| 2/19/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | 1 |
| 3/18/98 | 3/25/98 | 100 | I/D |
| 3/18/98 | 3/25/98 | 100 | I/D |
| 2177/98 |  | 100 | ID |
| 2/17/98 L | 3/11/98 | 100 | ID |
| 2/17/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | $1 / 0$ |
| 2/19/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | ID |
| 3/5/98 | 3/13/98 | 100 | 1 |
| 3/18/98 | 3/25/98 | 100 | 1 |
| 2/18/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | ID |
| 2/19/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | 1 |
| 2/19/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | ID |




3 Day Suspension (3/19-3/21)-Retraining<br>B200 Suspended pending Investigatilon Terminated<br>Terminated - $3 / 2 / 98$ Terminated Verbal Waming<br>Audited - 3/12/98/Suspended thereafter<br>B200 Back End Qc investigation/suspenston pending<br>No response from the Field<br>Suspended pending Investigation-3/24/98<br>Written Waming<br>Probation - 3/9/98<br>QC Investigation/Suspension<br>No response from the Field<br>Observalon/Verbal Warning<br>Terminated<br>Suspended<br>B200 Back End Qc investigation/suspension pending<br>Terminated<br>Terrinated<br>Terminated<br>Terminated<br>No Response from Field Terminated<br>No Response from Field<br>Retraining-3/19/98<br>Written Warning<br>Written Waming<br>Witten Warning<br>B200 Back End Qc investigation/suspension pending Terminated<br>Terminated<br>QC Investigation/Suspension/Pending Fieid Backend-Retraining<br>Refresher Training<br>Termination - 3/9/98<br>Refresher Training<br>Refresher Trainlng<br>No Response from Field<br>Retraining-3/12/98<br>QC Investigation/Suspension/Pending Field/Retraining<br>QC Investigation/Suspension/Pending Fleid/Retraining<br>Refresher Tralning-3/19/98<br>Refresher Training<br>QC Investigation/Suspension/Pending Field/Retraining<br>QC Investigation/Suspenslon/Pending Fleld/Retraining<br>QC Investigation/Suspension/Pending Field/Retraining







QC Investigation/Suspenslon/Pending Field/Retraining
QC Investigation/Suspension/Pending Fleld/Retraining,
No Response from Field -Rewining $\Delta$
No Response from Fieid -Refresertorinina $\Delta$
Refresher Training
Retraining
Terminatlon-3/9/98
Terminated- 3/9/98
Refresher Training-3/19/98

Refresher Tralning
Terminated
QC Investigation
Refresher Training
Refresher Training
No Response from Field
Retraining
Terminated - 2/19/98
Terminated - $2 / 19 / 98$
Terminated - $2 / 19 / 98$
No response from the Field
No response from the Field
Observation
No Response fiom Field
No Response from Fleid
Could not find tape
NorbsponseinomFiend Refreser preinins Ls
No Response from Fleld
No Response from Fleld
Coaching/Supervision/Refresher Tralning
No records on flle
Verbal Waming/Refresher Train
No Response from Fleld
Retraining
Terminated
Verbal Waming
Tarminated
Terminated
Verbal Warning
Terminated
Verbal Waming
Terminated
$\left.\begin{aligned} & \text { Terminated }, ~ \\ & \text { Terminated }\end{aligned} \right\rvert\,$
Terminated-3/19/98
Terminated
Terminated


| 3/5/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | 1/D | 07768 | Inactive | QNY | NR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3/5/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | IID | 07759 | Inactive | QNY | NM |
| 3/2/98 | 3/40/98 | 100 | I/D | 07760 | Active | QNY | MM |
| 3/13/98 | 3/24/98 | 100 | I/D | 07759 | Inactive | QNY | DC |
| 2/11/98 |  | 100 | I/D | 07759 | Active | QNY | RC |
| 2/11/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | $1 / 0$ | 07759 | Active | QNY | RC |
| 3/2/98 |  | 100 | 1 | 9094 | Active | SNY | MM |
| 3/13/98 | 3/24/98 | 100 | 1 | 9094 | Acitve | SNY | RM |
| 2/19/98 |  | 100 | 1/0 | 09815 | Active | PHX | LH |
| 2/19/98 |  | 100 | IID | 01878 | Active | PHX | LH |
| 3/13/98 | 3/23/98 | 100 | I/D | 09827 | Acltve | PHL | JB |
| 2/17/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | 110 | 06136 | Active | PHL | AN |
| 3/13/98 | 3/23/98 | 100 | $1 / 0$ | 09551 | Aclive | PHL | JF |
| 3/13/98 | 3/23/98 | 100 | IID | 15000 | Acitve | PHL | JF |
| 1/31/98 |  | 100 | 10 | 54096 | Active | PHL |  |
| 3/5/98 | 3/11/98 | 100 | 1/D | 08072 | Inactive | LAA | FT |
| 2/17/98 |  | 100 | 1 | 20462 | Active | SNY | VK |
| 2/19/98 |  | 100 | 1/D | 01921 | Active | CH | LH |
| 3/13/98 | 3/24/98 | 100 | 1 | 7913 | Aclive | SNY | SB |
| 2/6/98 |  | 100 | 1 | 20393 | Active | SNY |  |
| 2/19/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | 10 | 05567 | Active | HOU | LH |
| 3/18/98 | 3/23/98 | 100 | I/D : | 17433 | Acitve | HOU | OS |
| 2/12/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | 10 | 17433 | Active | HOU | LH |
| 3/5/98 | 3/11/98 | 100 | ID | 03923 | Active | HOU | DS |
| 2/19/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | 1/D | 02907 | Active | HOU | LH |
| 2/12/98 | 3/13/98 | 100 | 1 | 02969 | Active | LAA | DAG |
| 2/6/98 |  | 100 | 1 | 20318 | Active | SNY |  |
| 3/5196 | 3/11/98 | 100 | I/D | 09494 | Active | BNY | MF |
| $3 / 13 \times 88$ | 3/18/98 | 100 | $1 / \mathrm{D}$ | 05510 | Inactive | BKN | JB |
| 2/11/28 |  | 100 | 1/D | 05515 | Actlve | BKN | JR |
| 2/11/98 |  | 100 | ID | 05515 | Active | BKN | JR |
| 1/31/98 |  | 100 | 1/D | 07154 | Active | QNY |  |
| 2/16/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | $1 / 0$ | 02587 | Inactive | QNY | PH |
| 2/24/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | 1 | 01820 | Active | QNY | RS |
| 2/11/98 |  | 100 | $1 / 0$ | 01819 | Active | QNY | GR |
| 2/11/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | $1 / 0$ | 01819 | Active | QNY | GR |
| 2/11/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | I/D | 04822 | Active | QNY | GR |
| 2/11/98 |  | 100 | /V | 07972 | Active | QNY | SM |
| 2/11/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | 1/0 | 07972 | Actlve | QNY | SRM |
| 3/5/98 | 3/16/98 | 100 | 110 | 07970 | Active | QNY | BV |
| 3/5/98 | 3/41/98 | 100 | /1D | 07972 | Active | QNY | BV |
| 3/4/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | I/D | 05748 | Active | QNY | PF |
| 3/5/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | 1/D | 02291 | Inactive | QNY | DS |
| 3/5/98 | 3/13/98 | 100 | 1/0 | 04040 | Active | QNY | DS |
| 3/5/98 | 3/10/98 | 100 | 1 | 05748 | Active | QNY | DS |
| 2/17/98 |  | 100 | I/D | 01819 | Active | QNY | MF |
| 2/17/98 |  | 100 | 1/D | 06205 | Active | QNY | MF |

Terminated
Terminated Terminated Terminated Terminated Terminated
No Response from Field
Coaching/Supervislor/Refresher Training
No Response from Fleld
No Response from Fleld
Coaching/Supervisior/Refresher Training Terminated
Coaching/Supervision/Refresher Training
Coaching/Supervision/Refresher Tralining
Observation/Refresher Train/Verbal Wam Terminated
No Response from Field
No Response from Field
Coaching/Supervision/Refresher Training
Monltor/Retrain
QA Monitoring (OTM)
Written Waming ,
400 Refresher Tralning
QA Monitoring (OTM)
QA Monitoring (OTM)
Terminated - 3/9/98
Order Canceled Terminated Termintated Suspended $\qquad$
No Response from Field
Written Waming Teminated
Terminated - 2/20/98
Torminated
Terminated
Verbal Waming
Terminated
Terminated
Verbal Waming
Terminated
Terminated
Terminated
Written Waming
Terminated
Terminated
Terminated

|  |  | Field |  | 7183970619 | 19980117 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Field |  | 7184240684 | 19980124 |
|  |  | Field | C | 7184249759 | 19980212 |
|  |  | Field |  | 7184261972 | 19980120 |
|  |  | Field |  | 7184261972 | 19980120 |
|  |  | Field |  | 7184287910 | 19980209 |
|  |  | Field |  | 7184290070 | 19980123 |
|  |  | Fieid |  | 7184290070 | 19980222 |
|  |  | Fiald |  | 71.84295663 | 19980101 |
|  |  | Field |  | 7184297240 | 19980114 |
|  |  | Field |  | 7184443494 | 19980121 |
|  |  | Field |  | 7184462762 | 19980206 |
|  |  | Field |  | 7184576090 | 19980121 |
|  |  | Field |  | 7184656697 | 19980123 |
|  |  | Field |  | 7184781755 | 19980125 |
|  |  | Fleld |  | 7184781755 | 19980214 |
|  |  | Fleid |  | 7184781755 | 19980207 |
|  |  | Field |  | 7184785439 | - 19980209 |
|  |  | Field |  | 7184975601 | 19980206 |
|  |  | Field |  | 7186364471 | 19980124 |
|  |  | Field |  | 7186391476 | 19980204 |
|  |  | Field |  | 7186492423 | 19980115 |
|  |  | Fleld |  | 7186997887 | 19980121 |
|  |  | Field |  | 7187163398 | 19980227 |
|  |  | Field |  | 7187601098 | 19980211 |
|  |  | Field |  | 7187601098 | 19980220 |
|  |  | Fleld |  | 7187765127 | 19980110 |
|  |  | Field |  | 7187790176 | 19980116 |
|  |  | Field |  | 7187790857 | 19980210 |
|  |  | Field |  | 7187843606 | 19980117 |
|  |  | Field |  | 7187867814 | 19980126 |
|  |  | Field |  | 7188215972 | 19980120 |
|  |  | Field |  | 7188495313 | 19980127 |
|  |  | Field |  | 7188542979 | 19980131 |
|  |  | Field |  | 71988810341 | 19980201 |
|  |  | Fleld |  | 7188864087 | 19980122 |
|  |  | Field |  | 7188947653 | 19980128 |
|  | 24 | Fleld |  | 7188975980 | 19980205 |
|  |  | Fleld | - | 7188987010 | 19980114 |
| $\cdots$ |  | Field |  | 7188987010 | 18980114 |
| $\cdots$ |  | Field |  | 7188992988 | 19980127 |
| 0 | $\partial$ | Fleld |  | 7189188883 | 19980210 |
| 0 |  | Fiold |  | 7189564932 | 19980126 |
|  |  | Fiold |  | 7189680386 | 19980125 |
|  |  | Field |  | 7189976118 | 19980124 |
|  |  | Fleid |  | 7189976118 | 19980124 |
|  |  | Fleid |  | 718997.6118 | 19980124 |


| 2/9/98 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 3/5/98 | 3/13/98 |
| 3/18/98 | 3/24/98 |
| 2/9/98 |  |
| 3/13/98 | 3/24/98 |
| 3/5/98 | 3/13/98 |
| 3/18/98 | 3/24/98 |
| 3/18/98 | 3/24/98 |
| 3/5/98 | 3/13/98 |
| 2/9/98 |  |
| 3/5/98 | 3/11/98 |
| 3/5/98 | 3/10/98 |
| 2/17/98 |  |
| 3/5/98 | 3/13/98 |
| 2/19/98 | 3/10/98 |
| 2/49/98 | 3/10/98 |
| 2/19/98 | 3/10/98 |
| 3/18/98 | 3/24/98 |
| 3/18/98 | 3/24/98 |
| 2/12/98 | 3/10/98 |
| 3/5/98 | 3/10/98 |
| 1/31/98 |  |
| 2/17/98 |  |
| 3/18/98 | 3/25/98 |
| 3/5/98 | 3/13/98 |
| 3/5/98 | . $3 / 13 / 98$ |
| 1/28/98 |  |
| 3/5/98 | 3/13/98 |
| 3/5/98 | 3/13/98 |
| 2/12/98 | 3/10/98 |
| 3/13/98 | 3/24/98 |
| 3/5/98 | 3/13/98 |
| 2/47/98 |  |
| 2/17/98 |  |
| 3/18/98 | 3/24/98 |
| 2/12/98 | 3/10/98 |
| 218/98 | 3/10/98 |
| 3/12/98 L | 3/24/98 |
| 2/11/98 |  |
| 2/10/98 | 3/10/98 |
| $2 / 17 / 98$ |  |
| 3/18/98 | 3/23/98 |
| 3/5/98 | 3/13/98 |
| 3/2/98 | 3/10/98 |
| 3/4/98 | 3/10/98 |
| 3/13/98 | 3/24/98 |



Written Warning Terminated
Witten Warning Terminated Witten Warning Teminated
Written Wamin
Written Warming
Written Warning Terminated Suspended Terminated
No Response from Field Terminated Terminated
Written Waming - 2/24/98
Terminated - 2/20/98
Written Warning
Witten Waming
Terminated-2/23/98 Terminated Terminated erminated - 3/25/98 Teminated Verbal Warning
Probation-All work monitored
Verbal Warning
Written Waming
Wrtten Waming - 3/10/98
Written Waming
Written Waming
Written Warning
Terminated
Written Waming
Verbal Waming
Terminated
Written Waming ,
Terminated
Terminated

Verbal Waming
Verbal Wuming
Verbal Waming
Verbal Waming

|  | ｜OTM | 7854474224 | 19980128｜ | 2／9／98 |  | 100 | 1 | 20406 | Active | SNY |  | No records on file |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fleld | 7732836044 | 18980118 | 2／17／98 |  | 100 | ID | 09233 | Active | CHI | LH | Investigation－Temination／Suspension to follow |
|  | Fiold | $\sim 1735214429$ | 18980122 | 3／2／98 |  | 100 | VD | 07337 | Active | CHI | MM | No Response from Field |
|  | Flold | 7735214429 | 19980122 | 3／4／98 |  | 100 | ID | 07337 | Active | CHI | MM | No Response from Fieid |
|  | Fleid | 7735214429 | 18980122 | 3／13／98 | 3／10／98 | 100 | I／D | 07337 | Acitve | CHI | AM | Coaching／Supervislor／Refresher Training |
|  | Fiold | 7735233299 | 18980122 | 217／98 |  | 100 | 10 | 03631 | Active | CHI | LA | Investigation－Termination／Suspension to follow |
|  | OTM | 7818998392 | 19980128 | 217Ra复 |  | 100 | 1 | 14387 | Active | SNY | DSA | No Response from Field |
|  | Floid | 8047981100 | 18980112 | 2 Cos | － | 100 | I／D | 54096 | Active | PHL | KD | Observation／Refresher TrainNerbal Wam |
|  | Field | 8047891100 | 18980112 | 129\％ | 820 310108 | 100 | $1 / \mathrm{D}$ | 54096 | Active | PHL | KD | 500 Verbal Warning |
|  | Fiold | 6157221537 | t8980201 | 211890 | 复號 | 100 | ID | 07668 | Active | CHI | LH | No Response from Fleld |
|  | OTM | 8175575921 | 18980118 | 2118／98 | ， | 100 | 1 | 16824 | Actlve | SNY | EH | No Response from Field |
|  | Fiold | 8183479525 | 19980204 | 3／5／88 | $\therefore 3 / 11 / 88$ | 100 | 10 | 07726 | Inactive | LAC | NM | Terminated－ $3 / 5 / 98$ |
|  | OTM | V183886366 | 19880208 | 3／13／98 |  | 100 | 1 | 16625 | Aclive | SNY | EH | Na Response from Field |
|  | OTM | －8845991734 | 18980120 | 2／26／98 |  | 100 | 10 | 14482 | Active | SNY | DK | No Response from Flald |
|  | Flald | 9147914332 | 19980114 | 1／31／98 |  | 100 | $1 / 0$ | 03059 | Active | LAA |  | QC Investigation／Suspension |
|  | Fleld | 9147914332 | 19980114 | 2／20／98 |  | 100 | I／D | 03059 | Active | LAA | DK | QC Investigation／Suspenslon／Pending Field |
|  | Field | － 8155331280 | 18980125 | 3／18／98 | 3／20／98 | 100 | $1 / \mathrm{D}$ | 04464 | Acitve | ELP | DS | Termintated－over 30 days ago |
|  | Field | 8155331280 | 19980112 | 3／18／98 |  | 100 | $1 / \mathrm{D}$ | 30501 | Active | ELP | DS | No Response from Fleld |
|  | Fleld | ． 9155443564 | 19980111 | 2／11／98 | 3／10／98 | 100 | ID | 04464 | Active | ELP | NR | Terminated－2／20／98 |
|  | Flold | 915544780 | 19980211 | 3／18／98 |  | 100 | I／D | 07540 | Aclive | ELP | MF | No Response from Field |
|  | Flald | 9155448439 | 19980112 | 2／17／98 |  | 100 | $1 / 0$ | 07140 | Inactive | ELP | MF | Terminated |
|  | Fiold | 9155829229 | 19980103 | 1／23／98 |  | 100 | $1 / 0$ | 04464 | Inactlve | ELP |  | Terminated |
|  | Fiold | 9155845540 | 19980205 | 3／18／98 |  | 100 | $1 / 0$ | 09516 | Acitve | ELP | BV | No Response from Field |
|  | Field | 9155650280 | 19880204 | 3／13／98 | 3／20／98 | 100 | $1 / 0$ | 05386 | Acitve | ELP | LM | Retraining－3／19／98 |
|  | Fleld | 9155654960 | 19880207 | 3／18／98 |  | 100 | 1 D | 09224 | Acitve | ELP | DS | No Response from Field |
|  | Flold | 9155657341 | 19880118 | $2 / 12 / 98$ | 3／10／98 | 100 | 10 | 07140 | Inactive | ELP | DAG | Terminated |
|  | Fiold | 8165681801 | 1898010 | $2 / 9198$ |  | 100 | I／D | 08197 | Actlve | ELP | CR | ObservationNerbal Waming |
|  | Fiold | 9155687433 | 18980128 | 2／1898 | 3／10／98 | 100 | 10 | 07168 | Actlve | ELP | LH | ObservatlonNertal Waming |
|  | Flold | 9155816998 | 18980109 | 1／30／88 |  | 100 | $1 / \mathrm{D}$ | 08612 | Active | ELP |  | Retralning |
|  | Fleld | 0155847081 | 19980204 | 2／18／98 | 3／10／98 | 100 | I／D | 08059 | Actlve | ELP | LH | Terminated－3／5／98 |
|  | Flold | $\checkmark 9155941542$ | 19980128 | 3／2／98 | 3／10／98 | 100 | $1 / D$ | 07140 | Inactive | ELP | MM | Terminated |
|  | Flold | $\because 9155942931$ | 18980204 | 3／13／98 |  | 100 | 1 D | 07640 | Active | ELP | BV | No Response from Fleld |
|  | Flold | 9157555213 | 19880128 | 3／13／98 | 3／20／98 | 100 | $1 / 0$ | 04464 | Acitve | ELP | RD | Terminated－over 30 days ago |
|  | Flald | 8157748857 | 18980110 | 212198 | 3／10198 | 100 | 1 | 08055 | Active | ELP | CP | ObservationNerbal Waming |
|  | Fiold | 9157782801 | 19880118 | 2／18／98 | 3／10／98 | 100 | $1 / 10$ | 07641 | Active | ELP | AR | ObservationNerbal Waming |
|  | Fiold | 9158214186 | 19980117 | 2／9198 |  | 100 | $1 / 0$ | 07635 | Active | ELP | OWW | Observation／Verbal Waming |
|  | Frold | 8158558377 | 19980210 | 3／5／98 | 3／11／98 | 100 | 10 | 09854 | Active | ELP | DS | Observation／Verbal Waming |
| $\infty$ | Fiold | 9582624443 | 19880102 | 1／28／98 |  | 100 | 10 | 07502 | Active | MCA | DS | Reiresher Training No response from the Field |
| 0 | Fiok OTM | 972421650 9782835009 | 18860215 <br> 18980120 | $3 / 12 / 88$ $2 / 2198$ |  | 100 <br> 100 | 1 | 01379 20181 | Active | SNY | SS | No resporseining |

6018671845 Not Found 6129203296 Not Found S095\＆14432 Not Found 7183681834 Not Found 4178482389 Not Found 4179482389 Not Found
9204088565 Not Found

3052259145 Not Found 9722210089 Not Found 2546857455 Not Found 4092888189 Not Found 5127932854 Not Found 2022102817 Not Found

Tickniarks:
$r=$ Traced ${ }^{100}$
of ester, complaint
set to sty der
on hardest GTE
$\sim$ Traced from complaints
sent to snyder on hand at GTE/complaint
resolution
$\Delta=$ Traced updated action
Plan from inverstij-tion $\frac{80}{2}$ form retired from 65 M -sue B-12.3. Per Andy Coatis, the log is not updated with Action plans as an updated pending report $E$ M. 8 is sent to GTE on a weakly basis which shows status -6 open complaints.
F- Action plan agreed to inverty-tion form retd"
. from G-sm-sie 上, $\therefore$
E. Not recd win 48 hrs
Ser B-12p $3 / 4$

- Compered date Lo recd by Snyder to denterizuest ob complaint to see if LOA rid whin 48 hr



|  | 03/18/1998 | Montros,Jacqueline | - (305) 754-7270 | FL | OOF | 02/12/1998 | 04110 | 01143 | 004 | Y | refresher tmg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 03/18/1998 | Olensky,Patrick | (305) 770-0313 | FL | OOF | 02/27/1998 | 03498 | 17552 | 4 | y | refresher trng |
|  | 03/19/1998 | Davis, Roslyn | - ${ }^{(718)}$ 424-5120 | NY | OOF | 02/12/1998 | 09036 | 31459 | 34296 | Y | no respnse |
|  | 03/20/1998 | Han, Albert | $\checkmark$ (718) 279-3888 | NY | OOF | 01/25/1998 | 01994 | 31587 | 35432 | Y | Terminated |
|  | 03/20/1998 | Sewell, Raymond | (505) 258-5764 | NM | IF | 02/07/1998 | 7635 | 17694 |  | Y | Retraining |
|  | 03/20/1998 | Zuke, Les | (212) 769-3963 | NY | OOF | 02/11/98 | 06883 | 16358 | 13 | Y | no respnse |
|  | 03/23/1098 | Franklin, GH | (212) 663-0735 | NY | OOF | 02/13/1998 | 0550 | 01496 | 13 | Y |  |
|  | 03/23/1998 | Jordan, Mary | (206) 870-5002 | WA | OOF | 02/22/98 | 10012 | 08096 |  | N | rminated 3/11/98 |
|  | 03/25/1998 | Mgboji, Jowly | (318) 989-8056 | LA | OOF | 02/09/1998 | 9992 | 17428 | 002 | Y | no respnse |
|  | 03/25/1998 | Moore,Richard | (281) 496-9474 | TX | OOF | 01/30/1998 | 11210 | 11210 | 2 | y | rminated 4/8/98 |
|  | 03/25/1998 | Nicholas, Muriel | (718) 261-8692 | NY | OOF | 02/01/1998 | 08885 | 08885 | 13 | $Y$ | Suspended |
|  | 03/25/1998 | Ortiz,Niza | (718) 739-3449 | NY | OOF | 02/06/1998 | 02190 | 31459 | 34576 | Y | refresher trng |
|  | 03/25/1998 | Penso, Hilda | (954) 457-3856 | FL | OOF | 02/19/1998 | 10169 | 16397 | 007 | N | no respnse |
|  | 03/25/1998 | Perez,Manuel | (718) 292-7186 | NY | IF | 01/29/1998 | 09493 | 06423 | 34824 | Y | no respnse |
|  | 03/25/1998 | Salz,Lary | (212) 535-2395 | NY | OOF | 02/27/1998 | 06866 | 16358 | 13 | $\gamma$ | Terminated |
|  | 03/25/1998 | Schneider,Kenneth | (212) 545-9547 | NY | OOF | 02/17/1998 | 06026 | 06207 | 13 | Y | no respnse |
|  | 03/25/1998 | Urich,Breiman | (718) 499-0200 | NY | OOF | 02/12/1998 | 06631 | 01296 | 13 | Y | rminated 2/24/98 |
|  | 03/25/1998 | Mount, Greg | (202) 667-0905 | VA | OOF | 03/02/1998 | 03689 | 18382 |  | Y | rminated 3/30/98 |
|  | 03/25/1998 | Simon,Mr | (516) 489-5218 | NY | OOF | 02/12/1998 | 06627 | 05748 | 34402 | Y | Verbal Wrn |
|  | 03/25/1998 | Greenfield,Alfred | (214) 350-0428 | TX | OOF | 01/18/1998 | 09255 | 07383 | 4 | $y$ | esigned $3 / 18 / 98$ |
|  | 03/26/1998 | Boettcher,Kim | (206) 878-3977 | WA | OOF | 02/25/1998 | 10012 | 08096 |  | Y | rminated $3 / 11 / 98$ |
|  | 03/26/1998 | Almanzar,1sabel | (718) 381-6689 | NY | OOF | 03/04/1998 | 04040 | 05748 | 34328 | $Y$ |  |
|  | 03/27/1998 | Bazeluis, Marie N | (718) 462-1192 | NY | OOF | 01/20/1998 | 05872 | 30733 | 13 | Y |  |
|  | 03/27/1998 | Fiallo,Armando | (305) 649-6103 | FL | OOF | 02/20/1998 | 06038 | 02431 | 1 | y | Investigation |
|  | 03/30/1998 | Herman,Michae! | (202) 544-3035 | VA | OOF | 02/28/1998 | 03727 | 03392 |  | $y$ | rminated 4/6/98 |
|  | 03/31/1998 | Primelles,Nery | (305) 225-6997 | FL | OOF | 02/13/1998 | 18378 | 13424 | 1 | $y$ |  |
|  | 03/31/1.998 | Hernandez, Carmen | (773) 927-4014 | IL | OOF | 01/31/1998 | 30742 | 5155 |  | Y |  |
|  | 03/31/1998 | Sanchez, Eulalio | (915) 598-4158 | TX | OOF | 02/14/1998 | 9759 | 17752 |  | y |  |
|  | 03/31/1998 | Jean-Claude, Noel | (212) 327-1047 | NY | OOF | 02/06/1998 | 06032 | 00299 | 13 | y |  |
|  | 03/31/1998 | Salazar, Laurie | (602) 268-4420 | AZ | OOF | 02/06/1998 | 09885 | 30961 | 35656 | $Y$ |  |
| $\stackrel{0}{0}$ | 03/31/1998 | Polak, Douglas | (212) 875-8502 | NY | OOF | 02/28/1998 | 06866 | 13658 | 13 | Y |  |
| $\stackrel{+}{\square}$ | 03/31/1998 | Klein, Jerry 8 | (718) 372-6634 | NY | OOF | 02/26/1998 | 06799 | 08883 | 13 | $Y$ |  |
|  | 03/31/1998 | Bernales,Ricardo | (718) 458-2091 | NY | OOF | 02/06/1998 | 00506 | 14345 | 10949 | Y |  |
|  | 03/31/1998 | Celestin,Claude | (212) 927-0183 | NY | OOF | 02/03/1998 | 04559 | 00299 | 13 | $Y$ |  |
|  | 03/31/1998 | Alvarado, Fellix | (718) 392-8696 | NY | OOF | 02/05/1998 | 07967 | 31459 | 34576 | $Y$ |  |


| 03/31/1998 | Byrd, Alberta | (215) 225-1448 | PA | OOF | 02/20/1998 | 11006 | 03039 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 03/31/1998 | Diaz, Gloria E. | (516) 741-8776 | NY | OOF | 02/13/1998 | 06597 | 05748 | 34400 |
| 03/31/1998 | Carney, Stacey | (915) 577-9454 | TX | OOF | 01/14/1998 | 8055 | 30500 |  |
| 03/31/1998 | Raptis, Susan | (212) 772-2501 | NY | OOF | 02/09/1998 | 03677 | 00399 | 013 |
| 04/01/1998 | Langley, Lynn | '(253) 931-0793 | WA | OOF | 02/20/1998 | 09133 | 03214 |  |
| 04/02/1998 | Perez, William | '(718) 627-6352 | NY | OOF | 01/15/1998 | 06212 | 16358 | 013 |
| 04/03/1998 | DeMaso, Nancy | (718) 424-7080 | NY | OOF | 01/26/1998 | 02608 | 30696 |  |
| 04/07/1998 | Wang, Betty | (626) 7995868 | CA | OOF | 03/26/1998 | 02608 | 31587 | 36320 |
| 04/08/1998 | Lagunas, Maria | (713) 455-5643 | TX | OOF | 03/21/1998 | 5568 | 30485 | 35800 |
| 04/07/1998 | Almeida, Theresa | (915) 566-8166 | TX | OOF | 03/12/1998 | 9935 | 15274 |  |

## Complaints Receipt Testwork Results

Number of complaints on hand at GTECC sent to Snyder on 3/10/98* ..... 28
Less: Complaints not due to unauthorized switches ..... -8
Less: Complaints traced to log at Snyder ..... -8
Equals: Number of complaints not received by Snyder on $3 / 10 / 98$ ..... B. 12 3/4 ..... $12 E 4$
Percentage of complaints no received by Snyder on 3/10/98 ..... 43\%* Michael Lyons' group at complaint resolution at GTECC does not keep a logcomplaints sent to Snyder. Only a copy of the complaint is kept on hand. For testworkpurposes, a days worth of complaints on hand at GTE (28 on 3/10/98) was traced toSnyder's log.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Document - (ompluctis (non resralitud) } \\
& \text { recipe tistwork summary } \\
& \text { Source - Audioir:prepernd }
\end{aligned}
$$
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## Lead Memo

GTE Communications Corp. - Snyder Communications Review Bethesda, MD

Audit No. 98:00:025
OBJECTIVE: Audit Step(s): B-10 \#3
To research and determine cause of small business orders taken before signing of contract

## SOURCE:

| V/PR Ref: | t: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-13.1 | Email communicating discovery of residential plans sold on business lines and possible slams | Karen Smith, AVP Regulatory GTE登 |
| B-132 | Email further describing 30 test calls made on orders sold in B-13.1 above | Donna Hegdahi, GTE LD |
| B-13.3. | Script being used in correcting residential plans set up on business lines | Donna Hegdahl, GTE LD |

## SCOPE:

IAD interviewed various individuals to exprain the cause and action plan of the orders described in the Email at B-13.1. IAD spoke with Michael Lyons, GTECC LD/Complaints Manager, Ed Miller, GTECC International Marketing Director, Diane Metcalf, GTE LD, Donna Hegdahl, GTE LD and George Wolfand, Snyder VP Operations.

Through inquiries, IAD tried to determine the "Root Cause" of the sale of Small Business orders prior to the signing of the new Small Business Contract and to determine the cause of the orders being rejected and any resulting customer complaints.

## TEST RESULTS:

There were two different problems which are mentioned in the Email at B-13.1. The first problem was discovered by the LEC. Approximately 600 orders were processed with residential plans on business lines. Once the LEC communicated the problem to LD, Donna Hegdahl from LD began calling these customers to set them up on the correct plans and found that the lines processed were not proper sales. The results of the first 33 calls are summarized on page 2 of $\mathrm{B}=13.1$ and are explained in detail on-B13.2. After these calls, LD decided to re-do the script to better serve the customers that were incorrectly switched.

Currently, LD is attempting to contact all 600 custonrers to set them up on the correct plans. The script that is being used is on B-13.3. LD was advised by legal to use its best efforts to attempt to contact these customers.

Based on conversations with GTE and Snyder personnel the exact cause of this problem. is unknown and is likely a combination of both customer and rep. fraud. A trend analysis on these orders was completed by Snyder which did not find any

GTE Communications Corp. - Snyder Communications Review
Susan North Bethesda, MD

Audit No. 98:00:025
04/28/98 10:27
significant trends by rep. IDs or locations to pinpoint the problem. All of these orders were field sales.

Since this problem occurred, Snyder has set up various edit checks to kick out any improper orders. The first edit compares the name and address to BTN which would kick out wrong numbers or fax numbers. The second edit calls the number (one ring) to see if a "generic 3 tone" occurs which would kick out any disconnected numbers. The third edit compares the social security number to Equifax name and address which would kick out orders being copied out of the telephone directory. However, a social security number is not required to be on the LOAs. The fourth edit sends the order to quality outbound calling in which Quality Control attempts to contact customer within 72 hours to verify order. If the customer cannot be reached within this time frame, a negative confirmation letter is mailed to the customer. The order is placed in hold status for two weeks to wait for a customer response if wrong. These edits will alleviate customer fraud and may hinder rep. fraud. However, IAD does recommend TPV for field sales (see section D for details) to further prevent rep. fraud.

The second problem mentioned in the Email on B-13.1_(page 3) was that Snyder sold small business plans in advance of the small business contract being signed. Per conversations with Diane Metcalf at LD, this was due to verbal orders given by GTE to Snyder before the contract was signed. However, since the contract was not signed, these orders could not be processed through AFNI and were re-directed for processing through NORAC. This problem has since been resolved and small business orders are now being processed.

FINDINGS: None
Conclusion: Based on the results of the audit tests performed, as outlined above, it appears the controls are good.
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Subject: fwd: More Snyder Slamming Allegations
Date: Thu, 2 Apr 98 11:18:19 CST
From: "Karen Smith" [karensmith@telops.gte.com](mailto:karensmith@telops.gte.com)
To: [mrsmith@gte.net](mailto:mrsmith@gte.net)
Let's try it this way.
Original Text
From: Karen Smitherga. RLTNSETXIRV, on 4/2/98 9:40 AM:
To: Mark Smitheinternal. AUDITeTXIRV.SVC
For your information.
Redacted
From: Robert Robinsoneco. LDsvcsetxirv, on 4/2/98 7:31 AM:
To: Karen Smitherga. RuTNSeTXIRV
Cc: David Gudinoegc. CSPM:BSRARTXIRV

From: Gail Kathan8CO. CLECeTXIRV, on 4/1/98 1:47 RM:
To: Cedric Tracyeco. IDSVCSETXIRV, Robert Robinsoneco. LDSVCSeTXIRV
FYI...In case you haven't seen this yet.
-
From: AMichael_Lyonsepsi.gte.coml, on 3731798II:IO AM:
To: smut [<george.wolfandesnyder.com>], smep[<Mitch.gershmanesnyder.com>],

Cc: smatp[<̄arbara.bakeresnyder.com>], Gail Kathaneco.cLECeTXIRV

As you know we were calling the customers that Snyder sold consumer plans that were business lines and of the first 30 we contact all of them were slammed. Therefore, we need to get a situation analysis; hopefully we can get that by our Thurday call on the roughly. 600 Business orders. What we are looking for is the following:

Number of Reps involved
Status of those reps as of today (Still with Snyder or previously let -go on
$X X / Y Y$ date)
Corrective plan for those reps still with Snyder.
Detailed plan of action to call customers to apologize
My assumption is that since we have been sending you the business BINs since the beginning of February, you have taken corrective action with these reps already to let them know that they sold business customers but now that we know they slammed these customers, we would like additional action.

Michael Lyons
( Forwarded by Michael Lyons/HQTX/GTEPSNOTES on



| From: | Donna Hegdahl[SMTP:donna.hegdahl@cc.gte.com] |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Wednesday, April 22, 1998 4:08 PM |
| To: | GTE 1 |
| Subject: | fwd: RE: 30 test calls |

Susan: here is the email I mentioned.
Donna
Original Text
From: "Leslie Wehrmann" deslie.wehrmann@bertram-mckee.com>, on 4/6/98
3:38 PM:
To: Donna Hegdahi@CO.LDSVCS.4@TXIRV
Donna,
Darren is not in this afternoon, and I don't have all of the call sheets. I know that there are two that we are getting more information on, so that we can properly change their ito GTE Long Distance -they are still on the floor (Darren has been re-calling both people, and as of Friday, had still not connected witheither). - 'rn still one name short, so Ill track that down tomorrow. I can get the rest of the information to you by the end of day tomorrow (I'm in training all morning). I hope this will work until I can get you the other three names.

Did you have a chance to review script that I e-mailed on Friday? Please give me feedback. Marvin and $i$ have met regarding setting up project, with new parameters and reporting. We are also working on the lists that we have in-house to determine exactly what we have (total number of names, etc.). I will have that information for you in the morning ('ll email you).


Mirage Tobacco Prevention Project - no one there by that name Marie Jacques 718/617-1532 NY Likely slam-Prestige Management - no one there by that name Mikhail Ibragimov 718/896-6198 NY Confused, language barrier - did not understand what we were talking about Paul Cohen 215/624-7418 PA Likely slam -hung up on interviewer - this is a dentist's office and would not talk with us Barry Outright 804/799-1100 VA Stam-customer had already called GTE to say he wouldn't pay bill because he did not authorize switch - switched back to previous carrier Brenda Jenkins 717/622-7444 PA Slam-customer had already talked with Tony Hastings (GTE?) and told him to switch back to previous carrier
Calvin Gideny 202 723 -1333 . DC Possible slam-doctor's office

- He's in the hospital

David Osborne 201/652-0060 NJ Siam -customer very angry about
being slammed thad already contacted AT\&T and changed service back Edward Grossman 610/363-6660 PA Slam-he was surprised to get a GTE bill in the mail. He wasnt mad, but was going to switch back to previous cartier.
Evarista Portal 305/887-5029 FL Likely slam - no one here by this name
Rose Korine Ledon $305 / 358-3710$ FL Slam - this is a jewelry store and there's no one there by that name Victor Gregory 215/639-6133 PA Slam-has already switched back
to AT\&T. Angry that he got slammed.
_Original Message
From: Donna Hegdahl
Sent: Monday, April 06, 1998 2:34 PM
To: leslie.wehrmann@bertram-mickee.com
Subject:30 test calls
Leslie: Our attomey has requested information on the 30 test calls. He
would like to know who was called and what states they are in.
Can you
quickly put together an email response with name, telephone number and
state. It does NOT need to be a formal. We will get the information on All.
the customers at the end of the project. For now, he just wants notes on
the 30. Call me if there is a question on this.
Thanks
Donna

GTE Communications Corporation - Snyder Communications, Inc. Legal Review Andrew L. Timberlake Irving, TX Audit No. 98:00:025

04/30/98 12:57

## Authorized Payments - Section E

Source(s):

| W/P <br> Reference | Purpose | Source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Marketing Agreement - Provisions for GTE and Snyder |  |
| E-2.1 | Snyder Communications, Inc./GTE Policies \& Procedures Manual - Target Customer Focus |  |
| E-2.2 | Snyder Communications, Inc./GTE Policies \& Procedures Manual Competitiveness |  |
| E-2.3 | Snyder Communications, Inc./GTE Policies \& Procedures Manual - GTE Invoicing Procedures Policies \& Procedures Version 1 |  |
| E-2.4 | GTE - High Level Payment Process Policies \& Procedures (Draft Form) | Ms. Donna Sulak (See Below for title) |
| E-2.5 | Snyder Summary Activity Analysis | Andrew Timberlake, Staff Auditor I |

- Ms. Donna Sulak, Staff Administrator - Consumer Business Analyst: Phone Number - (972) 465-4433.


## GENERAL OVERVIEW

GTE and Snyder Communications, Inc. (Snyder) entered into a Marketing Agreement dated November 12, 1997 for the purpose of Snyder providing outsourced selling and marketing functions. Snyder's target customer group is intended to be multicultural (Hispanic, Chinese, Polish, Japanese, Așian, etc.) customers for residential telephone long distance (LD) and local services in the various geographic agreed upon.

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\because \\
\because \because \quad \\
\because
\end{array}
$$

GTE Communications Corporation - Snyder Communications, Inc. Legal Review Andrew L. Timberiake

According to this agreement GTE is responsible for paying Snyder on the established Payment Date for each "Accepted Order" (LEC Confirmed) for a New Customer or an Upgrade Customer in accordance with the existing rate schedule (See Schedule 4 - Rate Schedule of the Marketing Agreement)(C/T 2.a-d.1-2). A LEC Confirmed order is one that has been received from Snyder by GTE, has beeri approved by GTE and processed successfully to activate Services. Per the telephone conversation with Ms. Sulak, no formal procedures are in place at this time for the Authorized Payment process (draft form or very informal guidelines exist at this time) due to the immaturity of the process(C/T 2.a).

To date, GTE has made three payments to Snyder for each of the months of January through March 1998. The table below provides more detailed information regarding these payments (See E-2.5 \& E-2.6):

|  | RPMS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Month | Total <br> Orders | Accepted <br> Orders | Amount <br> Paid | Acceptance <br> Rate | Unacceptable <br> Rate |
| January | 9,023 | 5,835 | 446,553 | $64.67 \%$ | $35.33 \%$ |
| February | 46,652 | 23,742 | $1,816,975$ | $50.89 \%$ | $49.11 \%$ |
| March | 78,840 | 39,776 | $3,044,057$ | $50.45 \%$ | $49.55 \%$ |
| Totals | 134,515 | 69,353 | $5,307,585$ | $51.56 \%$ | $48.44 \%$ |

Based upon the data shown in the table above, it appears that almost half of the orders submitted to GTE by Snyder are not accepted. The average rate being paid for each of the months are approximately $\$ 76.53$. Based upon this average, it appears that most of the payments have been for new customers (per the applicable rate in the Marketing Agreement - Schedule 4-Rate Schedule).

Several performance provisions exist within the contract and/or applicable schedules that can either increase or decrease the rate GTE is required to pay Snyder. The following will provide a brief description of some of the major provisions and the payment process currently in place:
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|  |  | RPM |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Month | Total <br> Orders | Accepted <br> Orders | Amount <br> Paid | Acceptance <br> Rate | Unacceptable <br> Rate |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| January | 9,023 | 5,835 | 446,553 | $64.67 \%$ | $35.33 \%$ |
| February | 46,652 | 23,742 | $1,816,975$ | $50.89 \%$ | $49.11 \%$ |
| March | 78,840 | 39,776 | $3,044,057$ | $50.45 \%$ | $49.55 \%$ |
| Totals | 134,515 | 69,353 | $5,307,585$ | $51.56 \%$ | $48.44 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Average Rate Paid Per Accepted Order:

| January | 76.53 |
| :--- | ---: |
| February | 76.53 |
| March | 76.53 |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Month | Rejects |
| January | 2,789 |
| February | 15,403 |
| March | 24,208 |



| Month | Business BINs |
| :--- | ---: |
| January | 74 |
| February | 549 |
| March | 744 |

## SNYDER ORDERS THAT WERE BUSINESS ACCOUNTS



| $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & x \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | - <br> 3. s. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1. Perform Mystery Shops of Snyder Fiedd Saies events. For each event visited completed a Mystery Shopper Checklist (See D11.1 for example). Also, to checklist @ D-11.1 in the instructional guidelines for completing the checklist. | $D-118$ | $\begin{aligned} & M^{T} \gamma \\ & \text { AN } 198 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 2. For each completed checklist, summarize the results and note any trends/exceptions. |  |  |
|  | 3. For a two (2) week period, sample Mystery Shops performed by Wells Fargo for Snyder and review for any trends/exceptions. Summarize the results. |  | $1$ |
|  |  |  | $\not \boxed{ }$ |

To be completed IMMEDIATELY after contact with the Snyder Sales Associate - to help you remember more details about the event and the conversation.
Location of Event: $\qquad$ II Doss $41 / 8198$ City Chi CAM
State FLlinuis
// Date Time $12: 50$
Sales Representative You Spoke With: BlakMulaw/ small Beard.
Completed by: Wayne heater
Questions


## 1.) Did the representative Identify themselves as representatives of GTE Long Distance?


2.) Was the Sales Representative wearing a name tag with the Company Name? If no, explain.


No Other Explain C_ GTE loge_shirt w/ Jacket cover
3.) Describe the representative's appearance? If no, explain.
4.) Was the booth / table organized, neat, clean, etc.? If no, explain.

Yes No i.

> Theywere outside The SCore didu't See ACTable
5.) Was the representative's first impression favorable? If no, explain.
 Friend y $\mathrm{ar}^{+}$going

## (qualipures prat: :ss

Were you asked the following questions:
1.) If you were the "Decision Maker" when it comes to long distance service?
2.) Who is your Current Long Distance Carrier?
3.) How much you spend per month on:
International Calls?
Country Called the Most?

Domestic Calls?
City Called the Most?
18880

Country Called the Most?


How Much? $\because$

$\qquad$


No
4.) If this was a business or residential telephone?
5.). If you have additional lines to change?
6.) If you have any restrictions on carrier change?


## 

1.) What plans were offered? (circle all that apply)


IIIII
IIIII International Calling Plan I International Calling Plan II
2.) What promotions were offered? (circle all that apply)

| Domestic Plans | International Plans |
| :---: | :---: |
| Easy Savings Plan - Double Discount <br> for Six Months | International Plan -360 Weekend <br> Minutes Free @ 60 min/month for <br> six months |

TotatCall-360 Weekend Minutes @ 60 min/month for 6 months

Total Call - 1000 Instate Minutes Free @ $51 / 2$ hours/month

Other Plans or Promotions Offered:
3.) What price per minute was quoted?
4.) Was a brochure or other "Take-Away"
 information available offered? D. dh' $_{n}+T_{A}$ Leume
5.) What incentives were offered - balloons, magnets, koozies, pens, pencils, etc.?

## D.dnit ret an

## Citowifig;

1.) After Objecting to sale, what was Sales Representatives Reaction?

| Continue | Stopped <br> w/ Thanks |
| :---: | :---: |
| Selling | Other |
| Describe |  |

2.) In your opinion, was the representative qualified


No to perform the job - knowledgeable about GTE products and services, courteous and professional, etc.? If no, explain.

## 

To be completed IMMEDIATELY after contact with the Snyder Sales Associate - to help you remember more details about the event and the conversation.
Location of Event: Sedaro. Sun e market State Florid da
Sales Representative You Spoke With:
Completed by:


Questions

1.) Did the representative identify themselves as representatives of GTE Long Distance?


Other Explain
2.) Was the Sales Representative wearing a name tag with the Company Name? If no, explain.


No Other Explain
3.) Describe the representative's appearance? If no, explain.

4.) Was the booth / table organized, neat, clean,

Yes No etc. $?$ If no, explain.

5.) Was the representative's first impression


No favorable? If no, explain.

## 

Were you asked the following questions:
1.) If you were the "Decision Maker" when it comes to long distance service?

Yes
2.) Who is your Current Long Distance Carrier?
3.) How much you spend per month on:

International Calls?
Country Called the Most?
Domestic Calls?
City Called the Most?

## General Overview

Currently, GTE Communication Corporation (GTECC) is selling Long Distance (LD) service national, and they are using a number of different sales channels to reach as many customers as possible. One way GTECC is selling LD service is through the use of Outside Sales Agents. Specifically, Snyder Communications, Inc. has been chosen to market GTE Long Distance products to ethnic markets. Snyder's sales to date are broken out as follows: $80 \%$ - Hispanic Sales; 5\% Mandarin, 5\% Cantonese, 3-4\% Vietnamese, 3-4\% Korean, and 2-3\% miscellaneous. Most of Snyder's sales come from different events (ie. fairs, festivals, carnivals, Grocery Stores, and Shopping Malls). At these various events, the Snyder Sales Representatives will be dressed in GTE attire, and they should be set-up at a booth or table with some kind of display. These are the type of events we will be attending.

Our focus for Mystery Shopping will be on the $80 \%$ of Hispanic Sales which is concentrated in only a few states - California, Texas, Florida and New York. In California, the following events have been confirmed for the weekend starting Friday April $17^{\text {di }}$ and continuing through Sunday April $19^{\text {di }}$. Ideally, we would like to perform our field sales verifications on Saturday April $18^{\text {th }}$. The Los Angeles event locations are as follows:

- Carnaval Primavera @ the Huntington Park Chamber of Commerce located at 6330 Pacific Blvd., Huntington Park, Califomia 90255 - Emergency Phone Number (213) $585-1155$
- El Rancho Grande Market located at 12222 Garfield Ave., South Gate, California 90280
Emergency Phone Number - (562) 790-1900
- Barnsdall Park @ Eco-Maya located at 829 S. Sycamore Ave., Los Angeles, California 90036
Emergency Phone Number - (213) 960-7879
NOTE: The Emergency Phone Numbers should be used only if you cannot find the event and need more specific directions to the locations.

When we are performing the Mystery Shopping we DO NOT want to complete a sale or fill out any forms. Your objective is take the mystery shopping to the point where you are asked if you want to sign up with GTE, but again DO NOT complete the sale. If you are asked to give out your name and telephone number, respond by stating that you are just looking for some information right now. If they continue to ask for your name and telephone number, you have the option of making up a fictions name \& number or using you own. I would suggest you make up a name and phone number with an area code within the local area.

> GTE Communications Corp. Snyder Communications Investigation Various Locations // Audit No. 98:00:025 Attorney - Client Privileged Material Do Not Copy or Disseminate

## Mystery Shopper Guidelines

## Mystery Shopper Example Scripts

These following scripts are intended as guides to help you answer some of the questions you will be receiving from the Sales Representatives. They represent several different scenarios which you could use but with a different name. However, please feel free to use your own personal calling patterns as the topic for the mystery shopping. The only guideline I would suggest is that you inflate your calling numbers to make sure that at a minimum your spend over $\$ 25$ / month with some international calls (maybe one or two calls per month to Mexico or Puerto Rico for example).

Mystery Shopper Script \#1 - Domestic Calling > \$25 per month Inter-State Calls
John Doe - (217) 789-1244 Los Alamitos, California
John is the decision maker in the house and currently has long distance service through AT\&T which to his best knowledge is not restricted. He has one telephone line, and he makes approximately $\$ 55$ per month in Long Distance Calls to his parents in Phoenix, Arizona and to a couple of friends in Mexico City, Mexico. He usually will make his calls in the evening ( $6: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ to $10: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ ) or on the weekends (anytime during the day).

Mystery Shopper Script \#2 - Intemational Calling one Primary Country with a little Domestic LD

Jane Doe - (813) 221-8601 - Miami, Florida
Jane is the decision maker when it comes to Long Distance service and currently has long distance service through MCI which is not restricted. She has two lines, but one is for her computer internet access only. She calls her family in Puerto Rico every weekend and spends approximately $\$ 60-70$ per month on long distance calls. She makes very few long distance calls domestically maybe \$5-10 per month. She has a calling card, a cellular phone, and internet access all through different companies.

Mystery Shopper Script \#3 - Mixed International and Domestic about \$50 each per month

Paul Doe - (214) 508-1987-Dallas, Texas
Paul is the decision maker and has Long Distance service with Sprint which he thinks may be restricted. He has one primary line which he uses for his residential phone number and his small business which he runs out of his home. Paul calls his suppliers \& friends in El Paso, Texas and Juerez, Mexico on a daily basis. He calls usually in the moming to Mexico, but he calls through-out the day to El Paso. This line is also used for his fax machine.

## Mystery Shopper Guidelines

Mystery Shapper Script \#4 - Domestic only < $\$ 25$ per month IntraLata
Pam Doc - (607) 987-2468 - Sañ Diego, California
Pam lives by herself and is the decision maker. She is currently using AT\&T as her long distance provider, and she spends maybe $\$ 10-15$ per month on long distance calls. The long distance calls she does make are to Thousand Oaks, California, and she does not make any international calls.

## Mystery Shopper Checklist Explanation

NOTE: Please provide a brief explanation for all NO or OTHER answers on the Checklist.

## Image / Appearance

1.) Representative of GTE - The Snyder Sales Associate should identify themselves as agents of GTE or representatives of GTE, etc. They should not be identifying themselves as Snyder employees.
2.) Sales Representative (Rep) should be wearing a Name Tag with the GTE Name and/or Logo.
3.) The Sales Rep should be wearing Dockers style pants with a GTE Logo Shirt or a plain white or blue shirt. Also it should be appropriate for the event.
4.) The booth or table should be organized, clean and neat. "Take-Away" brochures and the give-away items (magnets, balloons, key chains, pens, pencils, etc.) should neatly laid out.
5.) Was the sales rep friendly, smiling, pleasant to talk with, etc.

Qualifying
1.) You must be the decision maker or have you name listed on the telephone account in order to make changes to your long distance carrier
2.) Identifies your current LD Carrier.
3.) How much you spend per month on LD services both international and domestic calls. You also be asked as follow-up questions what country and state or city you call the most.
4.) Snyder should only be actively selling residential phone service. However, they can offer the same plans to a small business customer if they are asked.
5.) Do you have more than one line which you will need to change the LD carrier on, and if so how many lines to change.
6.) Do you currently have any "PIC" restrictions on you telephone which would prevent you from changing LD carriers without $t$ notice.

## Mystery Shopper Guidelines

## Plan \& Promotions

1.) There are only two domestic and two international calling plans being offered by Snyder Sales Reps. They are listed on the form.
2.) Currently, there are three domestic and one international promotional offerings available to customers who sign up with GTE. If you are offered something different please include as much information as you can remember about the plan or promotion name and the free minutes which were offered.
3.) What price per minute were you quoted by the rep.
4.) Did you see and were you offered any Take-away information. Was it available on the table.
5.) What incentives were offered at the event you attended - balloons, key chain, magnet, etc.

Closing
1.) What was the Sales Reps reaction to you stating that you were not interested in signing up today. They should mention how much you can save by switch and offered another or the same product again.
2.) Was the Sales rep knowledgeable about the products they were selling or did they have to constantly look at charts, support materials or ask other sales reps for help. Was the sales rep professional and courteous at all times.

Additional remarks should be used to document anything unusual you saw or heard which would effect you decision to buy.

From: $\quad$ Borg Warner[SMTP:borgwamer@bayserve.net]
Sent: $\quad$ Friday, March 27, 1998 8:19 PM
To: Carol Bonilla
Subject: $\quad$ Re: Flea Market" 244th St. and U.S. I Homestead, FL.

## SNYDER COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

MYSTERY SHOPPER EVENT ANALYSIS
Territory Manager: Ruben Rios
Date: 3/21/98
Sales Manager: Esther Del Campo
Time: 12:15 PM
Market: Hispanic
Type of Event: Outdoors
Location: "Flea Market" 244th St. and U.S. I Homestead, FL.
Sales Representative: Rafael Munoz
(Describe if name unknown)
Scenario-
Representative wearing name tag with company name? Yes
Were you approached by representative? Yes
Point of Interaction by representative: Outside of Flea Market. Agent was approached by G.T.E. representative at 12:50 PM.
Was representative first impression favorable? Yes If not, explain:
Were you qualified? Yes
Verbal verification of: Current Long Distance Co.? No
Asked if you have decision authority? No Residential customer? No
Of amount spent: Domestic? No intemational?No Of country called? Not asked
Of address, and phone number as on bill? Yes
Were you asked: If this is main number and do you have any additional number? Yes
Restrictions on carrier change? No
Block on long distance? No
Were you asked what country or city you frequently call? No
If so, what was your response? N/A
What promotions were offered? 360 minutes free phone service.
Fee quoted: No discount availability: No length of promotion None
What price was quoted to location? None quoted
If resistance offered was an effective rebuttal given? No
If no, explain: After Agent stated AT\&T use Rafaela stated that if agent was not satisfied with G.T.E. agent could cancel agreement.

What incentives were offered? None
Were you asked to sign an agreement? Yes
Was signing authorization explained? No

Were you given a copy of service agreement (L.O.A)? Yes
If no ID (DU SS) given, was a $\$ 200.00$ credit limit explained?
Were you informed that a call could be made to verify. order? No (Calịfornia Only to Verify Order) Were you TPV'D? N/A

Was representative courteous?Yes Business-like?Yes Patient? Yes Attentive at all times? Yes

Representative's personal appearance: neat, clean, and well groomed? Yes If not, describe representative's attire:

Was there a raffie?No If so, were you given opportunity to enter?N/A Given proper form? N/A What prize was offered?N/A Were rules posted? N/A were times of drawings posted? N/A

Signs professional and clean in appearance? N/A
If not, explain: No signs were visible.
Was the booth/ table organized and neat?N/A Safe? N/A
If not, explain: No table/booth was visible

Additional Comments:
In addition to "Rafaela" there were two other G.T.E. representatives one male and one female. Although "Rafaela" was very nice, she seemed to rush through her presentation, she asked agent to fill out form and sign it. She never asked agent if it was alright to accept G.T.E. service. She stated if agent was not satisfied with G.T.E. it could be canceled. She did not teli agent the cost of the program, nor ask what country agent called etc. "Rafaela" did not seem interested in her work.

## Snyder Communications, Inc.

## GTE Policies \& Procedures Manual
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## REPRESENTATION POLICY <br> Policies \& Procedures

## GENERAL STATEMENT

Snyder understands that GTE has gone to great expense to develop its branding. Snyder will train its employees and contractors to take great care when working with a customer to represent GTE according to its policies, procedures, and standards.

## OPERATINGPROCESS

## Snyder's Responsibilities

- Sales force will be trained by local management or field trainers to properly position product and promotion to GTE's requirements.
- Train field sales personnel that Snyder is "An Authorized Representative" of GTE. Telesales will introduce themselves as "calling on behalf of GTE".
- Telesales will follow call requirements established by GTE.
- Telesales will only work leads that have been scrubbed by GTE.
- Train all sales personnei that if a customer has a complain or service issue customer will be given GTE's tollfree telephone number.
- All sales personnel must sign a code-of-conduct and Confidentiality Agreement.
- Enforce a dress code that includes usage of GTE branding:

| a) | Shirts |
| :--- | :--- |
| b) | Caps |
| c) | Rep D Badges with photograph of reps |
| d) | Send for GTE's approval all items that use GTE's logo: |
| e) | Advertisements |
| f) | Shirts |
| g) | Caps |
| h) | LOA |
| i) | Business cards |
| j) | Sale Booths |

- Will never leave a sale booth unattended and will place sales booths in areas consistent with marketing plan.
- Properily pre-qualify customers to ensure that customer meets GTE's requirements.
- Snyder is required to respond to any deviation, per Section 2bii, in a timely fashion.


## GTE's Responsibilities

- Return to Snyder within two business days approval or changes to marketing materials noted above. If approval or changes are not received within two business days of receipt, the material will be deemed accepted by GTE.
- GTE will notify Snyder's Project Manager of any policy and procedure deviation, within forty-eight hours of the occurrence. The deviation should include date, time, location, and where possible rep ID number..
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