

**BEFORE THE WASHINGTON
UTILITIES & TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

v.

QWEST CORPORATION D/B/A CENTURYLINK QC

DOCKET NO. UT-190209

SUSAN M. BALDWIN ON BEHALF OF PUBLIC COUNSEL UNIT

EXHIBIT SMB-10

CenturyLink Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 33C

November 22, 2019

PC-33C RE: CenturyLink's Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 1, file named "UT-190209 CONFIDENTIAL EXHIBIT CP-2 ATTACHMENT.pdf".

CenturyLink is listed as the carrier associated with the numbers listed. Did CenturyLink receive a "Code 34"? If not, why not? If so, why didn't CenturyLink re-route the 911 calls to the Miami switch? Explain in detail.

Response: West's Englewood switch would have sent all affected originating carriers, including CenturyLink, a cause code 34 during this partial outage. West's switch and cause code response does not change based on the identity of the originating carrier. Rerouting capability depends on originating service provider (OSP) switch type, configuration and response. West has no visibility or control into OSP forward/alternate routing capabilities and configurations. However, West requires all connecting carriers to have primary and alternative path to its two redundant switches. Furthermore, West instructs all OSPs that they should have the capability to forward route in response to valid cause codes such as the returned cause code 34. Additionally, West recommends all OSPs implement load balancing and alternative routing configurations.

As noted in previous responses, there was a single call where CenturyLink was the originating service provider where the call did not re-route. The CenturyLink switch that received the cause code 34 for this failed call was not capable of re-routing on cause codes, but CenturyLink does have primary and alternate paths to West's switches. It is possible that the call did not fail over to Miami based on the explanation provided in response to PC-35(a).

Respondent: CenturyLink Legal