

Docket No. UT-181051

Bench Request No. 1 to CenturyLink Communications, LLC

December 8, 2022

Bench Request No. 1:

By December 9, 2022, produce a copy of CLC's response to Public Counsel Data Request 58.

Response:

See Attachment 1.

Respondent: CenturyLink Legal

Docket No. UT-181051

CenturyLink Communications, LLC's Responses to Public Counsel Data Request Nos. 50-65

May 5, 2022

Page 10 of 17

PC-58 Re: Response Testimony of Steven E. Turner, Exh. SET-1TC at 43.

Please provide the footnote text for footnotes 43, 44, and 45, which was omitted in the testimony filed on March 31, 2022.

RESPONSE:

The footnote text for footnotes 43-45 was inadvertently omitted, as was the text for footnote 46. Footnotes 43 and 44 should refer to Exhibit SET-7C.

Footnote 43 should read as follows:

See Exh. SET-7C, Burton, Victor, TeleCommunication Systems, State of Washington E-911 Transition Call Flows between CenturyLink/West-Intrado and Comtech TCS ESInets, November 21, 2016.

Footnote 44 should read as follows:

See Exh. SET-7C, Section 1.1.

Footnote 45 should read as follows:

See Exh. SH-5C. This discussion is related to SIP signaling messages as opposed to SS7 signaling messages. The exchange of information that occurs for SIP and SS7 is virtually the same. However, despite the fact that Comtech wrote these standards for how CTL and Comtech would interconnect using SIP signaling, ultimately Comtech indicated in writing to CTL that it wanted to utilize SS7 signaling. The bottom line is that the similarity between SIP and SS7 signaling confirms that the demarcation is when the INVITE (SIP) or IAM (SS7) message is sent from CTL to Comtech. And for the purposes of understanding the importance of defining the demarcation, the technology differences are irrelevant.

Footnote 46 should read as follows:

Rosen Direct Testimony.

Respondent(s): Steven Turner