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LACEY, WASHINGTON; DECEMBER 5, 2022
9:00 A.M.
--o00--
P R O C E E D I N G S

JUDGE KOPTA: Let's be on the record in Docket UT-181051, captioned Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission v. CenturyLink Communications, LLC.

I'm Gregory J. Kopta, one of the administrative law judges who is presiding in this proceeding along with Judge Samantha Doyle. And we will also be joined by the Commissioners in a few moments.

We are here today for evidentiary hearings in this docket, and we are addressing, at this point, some preliminary issues. We will take appearances once the Commissioners get here so that we don't have to do it twice.

And so let's, at least in my mind, the first issue that we need to address are the exhibits.

We have circulated an exhibit list to the parties and gotten feedback on that. My intention is to admit the exhibits on the exhibit list with the exception of those to which the parties have not -- all parties have not stipulated. But there are a couple of

1 clarifying things.

JUDGE KOPTA: All right. That should be acceptable. So the exhibit list should be amended to reflect that CDK-4 is actually CDK-4C, and is a confidential -- or a document that includes confidential information.

The other change to the exhibit list that I'm aware of is that Exhibits SKC-1X through 4X should actually be numbered $C$-- I mean SKC-4X through 7X. Just a minor numbering change.

Does anybody else have any corrections at this time to the exhibit list that was circulated?

Hearing none, before $I$ get to admitting exhibits, one of the issues that $I$ have is that several documents have multiple exhibit numbers in the

1 cross-examination exhibits. I understand that this is
2 for the convenience of crossing witnesses so that they
3 know which documents they will be needing to address 4 during their testimony.

1 several cross-exhibits are designated as cross-exhibits
2 that were first admitted as part of someone's testimony.
3 I would probably refer to that as the exhibit that was 4 attached to the testimony consistently throughout. But 5 do you have a different way of approaching that?

1 best way to proceed. Does that make sense to you, Mr.
2 McGinty?

MR. MCGINTY: That does make sense. Thank you for the clarification.

JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Sure.
And while we're talking about that, you did not -- or you have an objection or are not willing to stipulate to Exhibit JHJ-26CX, which is the same as DW -- JDW-82CX. Are you objecting to both of those exhibits or just the one?

MR. MCGINTY: I was objecting to both of those exhibits. I was attempting to use the convention you previously indicated, where $I$ was only referring it -- I was only referring to it by the exhibit number that was -- it was first addressed as in the exhibit list that was provided by CenturyLink. That was my intention, but $I$ intended to object to all instantiations of that document.

JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you.
And, Ms. Suetake, the same question to you. Three of the exhibits that you have objected to are also exhibits that have been marked for a witness other than Mr. Rosen. Is it your intention that you are objecting only to those documents that's used with Mr. Rosen or are you objecting to those documents in their entirety

1 however they are labeled?

MS. SUETAKE: Judge Kopta, my co-counsel, Lisa Gafken, will be addressing the objections to the exhibits.

MS. GAFKEN: Judge Kopta, my intention is to object to all exhibits -- of the exhibits. So each time it's identified for any witness. And when we get to that, I -- I have each one of the references. I was also grappling with the reducing of confusion issue. So I will probably just stick with the strategy of identifying each.

So there's a couple of exhibits that are identified three times. There's a couple of exhibits that are identified twice. I'll probably just provide both of those and all three of those references during the argument, just for absolute clarity.

JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. Well, that poses a little bit of a dilemma for me because $I$ had intended to admit all of the exhibits to which the parties stipulated. And in labeling those to which you did not stipulate, you simply used the BR exhibit numbers and not any of the others.

So I don't -- at this point, I suppose, it makes it a little bit -- I'm not sure what to do in terms of admitting the exhibits. Perhaps what $I$ will do

1 is admit the exhibits subject to any objections to
2 documents that are the same as the $B R$ documents that you
3 have objected to. Does that -- does that -- would that
4 cover the waterfront from your perspective, Ms. Gafken?

MS. GAFKEN: I think that would cover the waterfront from my perspective.

JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Well, that's what I'll do, then.

So with respect to the exhibits, all of the exhibits on the exhibit list that was circulated, which include the prefiled testimony and associated exhibits as well as the cross-examination exhibits, are admitted subject to the limitation that $I$ just discussed with Ms. Gafken.

And with the exception of the following documents, Exhibits BR-33X through 45X; BR-64X through 86X; Exhibit JHJ-26CX; Exhibit JHJ-27CX; Exhibit JDW-82CX; Exhibit JDW-81CX; Exhibit JDW-68X through 72X; Exhibit JDW-80X; and exhibit RA-9CX. I believe those are all of the exhibits to which the parties did not stipulate.

Are there any other exhibits at this point that anyone can identify to which the parties -- one party or another does not stipulate?

MS. GAFKEN: Judge Kopta, there is one more

1 exhibit. We did identify it in our initial email. It was $B R-87 X$. We -- we do have a copy of that now, and that is one that $I$ will be objecting to.

JUDGE KOPTA: All right. CR-87 or BR?
MS. GAFKEN: B as in Brian, BR.
JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. That's what I thought. Just wanted to make sure we get the initials correct.

All right. So BR-87X is also not admitted.
And I understand that we can address the objections to some of these exhibits at this time.

Mr. McGinty, all of those that are identified for Staff witnesses are those that you believe you can address at this point; is that correct? MR. MCGINTY: I think that's correct.

JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then why don't you proceed. I don't know whether you can do them all at once or whether we need to do one by one, but whatever makes the most sense from your perspective.

MR. MCGINTY: I'm happy to go down the list and provide our specific objections to the exhibits. I'll probably lump them together to those that have similar arguments that pertain to them.

So JHJ-26CX and JHJ-27CX, which are the same as JDW-81CX and JDW-82CX, this is just a simple lack of foundation issue. From the face of the document, it's

1 not clear what these are. It's not clear where the data 2 came from, who compiled them, what the headings to the 3 columns mean, anything along those lines.

But that's just a simple lack of foundation objection.

JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Well, let's stop there before you move on to the other ones and allow CenturyLink to respond.

Mr. Sherr or Mr. Steese?
MR. STEESE: Your Honor, this is Chuck
Steese. I will address the exhibit issues.
Exhibits JHJ-26 and 27CX are also already in the record as attachments to Mr. Webber's testimony, specifically JDW-28C and JDW-30C.

So Mr. Webber already has those documents attached to his testimony. And so the foundation, for lack of a better term, of those documents has already been established through their own witness.

JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Well, here we have

1 another example of why it's cumbersome to have documents

And then 69 to 72 X are newspaper articles and pleadings having to do with an out-of-state matter involving an, I think, a South Dakota 911 system outage.

I just don't see the relevance of these. The hearing, evidentiary hearing, today is on Staff's complaint related to allegations made against CenturyLink for a 911 outage that occurred in Washington State. These potential exhibits are simply irrelevant and make no fact at issue more or less likely to have occurred.

JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. Steese?
MR. STEESE: Yes, I'll discuss JDW-68X
first. This is an SCC filing by ComTech. It provides various background about ComTech. It provides

1 information about the fact that they're focused on 911
2 throughout the country. So to us, this simply provides
3 background about ComTech, and certainly meets the 4 relevance threshold since ComTech and its network are at 5 issue in this proceeding.



And as far as the SCC filing, same thing. I don't know that there's any indication in that witness's testimony that he had anything to do with that or has any knowledge of that SCC filing.

And so therefore, I'm going to sustain the objection. I don't -- through his testimony.

Next, Mr. McGinty.
MR. MCGINTY: So the next would be JDW-80X. This appears to be labeled as a demonstrative -- I'm getting some feedback. Oh, there we go.

It's labeled as a demonstrative exhibit. It appears to be a timeline that was put together by CenturyLink. It's overly argumentative. It'd be appropriate for a brief, but it's not evidence that ought to be admitted in order to prove any fact at issue.

JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. Steese?
MR. STEESE: Your Honor, the document is both a summary and a demonstrative. Evidentiary Rule 1003 permits this submission of summary exhibits so long as each of the exhibits upon which the document is created is referenced. It certainly is. This is a timeline of events. The events themselves are directly at issue, not only in Mr. Webber's testimony, but in Mr. Rosen's testimony, Mr. Turner's testimony, a whole

1 series of witnesses. And so this goes directly to
2 Mr. Webber.

And the timeline itself, we think, establishes very clearly a public connection between the faulty network design and the outage on the 911 calling in December 2018.

JUDGE KOPTA: Are all of the dates on this timeline included in testimony or other exhibits that have already been admitted to the record?

MR. STEESE: Yes, Your Honor.
JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Well, I see this is cumulative of that information. I understand how it's useful for you, but $I$ agree with Mr. McGinty that, certainly, it's more appropriate for a brief as opposed to an exhibit for cross-examination. So I will sustain that objection and not admit that exhibit.

Finally, RA-9CX, Mr. McGinty.
MR. MCGINTY: Yes, Your Honor. This is a response to a data request that CenturyLink promulgated to Staff as it was responded to in September of 2022.

The issue here that Staff supplemented this response in October, and the supplemented version is not the one that's being admitted. It prejudicial to Staff to provide the unsupplemented response here.

JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. Steese?

MR. STEESE: Your Honor, Mr. McGinty is correct. That was an error on our part. We'd like to supplant the RA-9X with the supplemented version of the request for admission. That was just a mistake in terms of the version that was submitted.

JUDGE KOPTA: And, Mr. McGinty, do you have any objection to --

MR. MCGINTY: No objection to that.
JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then I will allow that to be substituted, and I will admit that exhibit.

I believe that takes care of those to which you have objected, Mr. McGinty?

MR. MCGINTY: That's correct.
JUDGE KOPTA: All right.
Ms. Gafken for Public Counsel.
MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. There are a number of exhibits that we're objecting to, and I think it makes sense to group them and take them separately as we go.

The first two that I'll address is BR-33X and $B R-87 X$. $B R-33 X$ is a request from $W M D$ or -- I'm sorry -- a request to WMD for privileged communications and protected work product. There is nothing relevant that's contained in this exhibit. Any substance of question would require an answer that includes the

1 either privileged attorney-client communications or
2 protective work product due to a common interest

I'll also address $B R-87$ as that appears to be somewhat related. That appears to be a response to a public records request and privilege log. The information subject -- I'm sorry -- the information contained in that exhibit is also subject to the same attorney-client privilege and work product doctrine that was established with the common interest agreement. There's nothing relevant that's contained in the unredacted portions of the exhibit. And as a result, Public Counsel again asks that the cross-exhibit contained as BR-87X be excluded.

JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. Steese?
MR. STEESE: With respect to these two exhibits, Your Honor, the entire point is what Ms. Gafken just said. And that is almost immediately after the outage occurred, Public Counsel, WMD began coordinating together.

And so the fact that the Public Counsel witnesses are advocating positions taken by the WMD to

1 us is something that is important to establish that they
2 had been coordinating from, basically, day one.

1 regulatory liability. And as a result, Public Counsel
2 objects to the cross-exhibit contained in BR-39X and
3 asks that it be excluded. JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. Steese? MR. STEESE: Yes, Your Honor. BR-39X is actually an attachment to the motion -- our response to the motion for summary determination. Public Counsel's argument is that CenturyLink breached the contract by failing to provide various network and transport responsibilities here. We think that that is misdirected. This letter shows that they had an opportunity to a certain breach of contract against CenturyLink and, in fact, sent a letter demanding service level credits. And -- and we objected, saying that we were not the cause of the outage.

So this letter goes directly to the issues that are at issue and placed at issue by Public Counsel.

MS. GAFKEN: If I may, Mr. Steese mistakes what the basis of our motion for summary judgment is. We are not alleging breach of contract, but we are pointing to the contract as evidence of what CenturyLink's duties were with respect to the 911. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, again, this is something I don't see any relationship to this in Mr. Rosen's testimony, and certainly there's enough evidence in the

1 record to make the argument that you want to make,

2 Mr. Steese. I don't think the document is necessary for that. So I sustain the objection to that document. Next.

MS. GAFKEN: Okay. The next one is an exhibit that has a couple of different exhibit designation. BR-42CX, which has also been designated JDW-52CX. This exhibit contains CenturyLink's vendor agreements and a contract between CenturyLink and ComTech related to ALI, the ALI transition. JUDGE KOPTA: And ALI is A-L-I all caps? MS. GAFKEN: Yeah. Okay. JUDGE KOPTA: For the court reporter. MS. GAFKEN: That's a good -- good reminder, Judge Kopta. Public Counsel objects to the relevance of this exhibit as the documents do not relate to questions of this docket. As a result, Public Counsel objects to Cross-Exhibit BR-42CX and JD-52CX and asks that these exhibits be excluded.

JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. Steese?
MR. STEESE: The contracts between ComTech and CenturyLink and -- all part of the transition network. We think this is highly relevant to the proceeding, and it should be included. JUDGE KOPTA: I, again, do not see a

1 connection between these documents and Mr. Rosen's
2 testimony. If he has any personal knowledge about

1 proceeding.

JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. Steese?
MR. STEESE: This proceeding absolutely relates to ComTech's network design. Mr. Rosen talks at great length about ComTech's network design and cites repeatedly to ComTech data request responses.

So the fact that these responses are directly from ComTech, discuss its network design, at least some of them do, that the whole point is to look at the ComTech network design and determine whether or not it was or was not the cause of the outage, why 911 calls did not complete.

And, again, Mr. Rosen discusses at great length in both his direct testimony as well as in his responsive testimony ComTech data request responses and

1 whether or not that network was or was not designed 2 properly.

1 the admission of those Cross-Exhibit BR-64X and
2 Cross-Exhibit BR-65X.

JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. Steese?
MR. STEESE: Your Honor, this is -- the response is the same. Comtech's network design and its SS7 design and capabilities are directly at issue in this proceeding.

And for the exact same reason as I articulated moments ago, these documents go directly to that network design.

JUDGE KOPTA: These are both responses to -by Public Counsel, specifically Mr. Rosen, to data requests from CenturyLink.

I agree with Mr. Steese that this is an issue before the Commission. Therefore, I overrule the objection and will admit those two documents.

Any other objections at this point that we can address?

MR. STEESE: Your Honor, if $I$ can briefly. I understand that in an email from this morning, Public Counsel said that they did not need to raise objections to the other exhibits at this point in time.

In an effort to help the proceeding move quickly, we would ask, if possible, that we address the other remaining objections as well.

MS. GAFKEN: The other remaining objections are going to be based on how the exhibits are used. So the ones that I've already addressed and that Judge Kopta ruled upon, those are ones that are more general in nature. And the other exhibits, as I said, will depend on how CenturyLink intends to use them with their witness.

JUDGE KOPTA: I think that's a fair way of proceeding. I agree, Mr. Steese, it would be beneficial if we could address all objections at this point, but that does not seem to be something that we can do. So we will just await the use of those documents in cross-examination of Mr. Rosen to determine whether they will be admitted or not.

All right. I think that takes care of exhibits. The other elephant in the room is confidentiality.

Several of the parties and the Commission itself have raised the issue of the extents to which we need to close those hearings to those who have not signed the confidentiality agreement or otherwise entitled to review confidential information.

Mr. Steese, are you going to be addressing this on behalf of CenturyLink?

MR. STEESE: Your Honor, yes, I will.

JUDGE KOPTA: All right. First question $I$ have for you, given that Mr. Sherr was the one who raised this initially is, how much of the cross-examination that you're anticipating would need to be in a closed session?

MR. STEESE: That's obviously very witness dependent, Your Honor. There are a couple of witnesses that it will be minimal.

But in terms of Dr. Akl, it will be virtually all of his examination. Mr. Webber will probably be about 70 percent, and Mr. Rosen about -JUDGE KOPTA: Sorry. I didn't hear the percentage for Mr. Rosen.

MR. STEESE: About 50 percent.
And it's the -- kind of this thing where there's two issues.

One is the details are almost always identified as confidential, and the details are what we need to discuss.

But the other is if we share a document on a screen that has a line identified as confidential, irrespective of whether or not $I$ am asking about that particular line, it is important for the witness to be able to see the exhibit and for everyone to be on the same page.

And so that only, in a couple of instances $I$ can think of, is going to pose an issue. We have tried very hard to -- places or -- where it's a start and stop with minimal public questions because you have to set some foundation sometimes in the middle that would not be confidential.

But it's going to be rather extensive, and in that vein, too, we saw that $W M D$ sent an email earlier today. We want to make sure that we understand the bounds of what is deemed confidential to make sure that we don't cross a bridge that $W M D$ does not want us to cross in terms of the types of questions that we might ask that might seem not confidential to us that they would find to be confidential.

JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. McGinty, do you anticipate delving into confidential information in your cross-examination of CenturyLink witnesses?

MR. MCGINTY: Yes, I do. Particularly with the clarification today that call flow information is confidential.

I can't imagine -- you know, and obviously, this is a difficult subject to talk about because you might ask a question that you don't think imposes or creates an opportunity for an answer with confidential information, but then, you know, it does in an

1 unanticipated way.

JUDGE KOPTA: And do you have any rough estimate of the amount of your cross that might involve confidential information?

MR. MCGINTY: I think it's virtually all or could be all, especially with the clarification that WMD made today, that their intention that anything that may involve confidential information not to be in closed session, $I$ think that's got to be everything. Everything may involve confidential information.

JUDGE KOPTA: Ms. Gafken or Ms. Suetake?
MS. GAFKEN: I will start with some comments, and then $I$ may need to pass the baton to Mr. Nelson to address how much -- what portion of the cross may or may not be confidential.

But I did want to say that certainly Public Counsel supports using a closed session for those portions that would cover confidential materials. Commission does have a process that allows us to do this when we can't conduct cross that does elicit a confidential response or touches on confidential

1 information.

So in any event, we do recognize the need to, most likely, close at least portions of this proceeding. But, of course, always lean towards wanting as much open to the public as possible.

I am going to ask Mr. Nelson to respond to what portion of the cross that we anticipate might be confidential.

MR. NELSON: Good morning, Your Honor. John Nelson on behalf of Public Counsel. I both underscore Ms. Gafken's comments about generally speaking the preference for open tribunals.

However, I do also share Mr. McGinty's comments about anticipating when or when not we may

1 delve into confidential matter. You know, for example, 2 question may not intend to delve into it, and the

1 session while the nonconfidential portion would be 2 conducted outside of that in the more open proceeding.

1 confidential setting. And then what we can do is have
2 the various parties, within some period of time

3 afterwards, go through the transcript and identify the portions that are public. And then the Commission can post the public portions on its website.

JUDGE KOPTA: Well, first of all, confidential information needs to be designated. And so I'm assuming that the parties have designated information that they believe is confidential.

If someone wants to ask a question that elicits a response for information outside of the testimony that may be confidential, then I would expect that either counsel for that witness or Ms. Cortez would object, if we are in open session, to any response to that question.

That having been said, that still leaves open the question of whether it makes sense to have to go witness by witness in terms of confidential session or whether we have a more global closed hearing.

MR. STEESE: I think witness by witness. That's going, at least from us, there's going to be some that have a significant portion that are public, as I understand it. And so it makes sense to do witness by witness.

JUDGE KOPTA: Ms. Gafken?

MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. I did want to underscore that Public Counsel certainly does rely on the confidential designations in most instances. In most cases, confidential information is the Company's. Here we have an entity that also has a pretty strong confidential interest.

But we -- it's not our information, and so we do rely on those designations. I do think that we would have to go through ours again, our presentation again and, perhaps, we'll need to refile certain things to mark things that look to be not confidential as confidential after the hearing.

Having said that, $I$ do think that a witness-by-witness approach would be appropriate and preferred instead of doing something more global.

For example, I know that the -- there are some witnesses that will likely not need to touch on confidential information. For example, I don't believe that Public Counsel witness Stephanie Chase will have to touch on confidential information. And so I think, for those witnesses, we certainly do want an open process.

But there are other witnesses that will, and I agree with what's been stated by the other parties. But if there's a large percentage of a witness's cross that is confidential, then the entire portion can -- can

1 be done in a closed -- closed session.

So those are our preferences.
JUDGE KOPTA: All right.
Judge Doyle, you had something that you wanted to add?

JUDGE DOYLE: Yeah. Just a quick logistical matter. Our coordinator, Ryan Smith, put in the chat we have a number of entities on the call that are not properly identified. So when we do go into confidential proceedings, it will be a breakout room that's been designated by those who have been pre-identified as signing the confidentiality agreement.

And so for instance, Room Audio 1, we can't admit that and guarantee confidentiality without knowing all the participants being clearly identified.

So if you could either reidentify your -your connection or in the chat identify clearly exactly who is in that room so we can guarantee confidentiality. Thank you.

MR. SHERR: Judge Doyle, I can respond to that briefly. This is Adam Sherr on behalf of CenturyLink.

The CenturyLink team, which is rather significant for the hearing, is in downtown law office space. We are -- we are occupying two conference rooms.

1 The conference room that we're speaking from, I believe, 2 is identified as CLC Room 1. So we have a connection 3 for the room, but our individual connections are on our 4 computers.

MR. SHERR: Yes. That's us. As I speak,

1 you'll see that it identifies. So we're using the audio
2 from the room in this high-tech setting. So that's
3 why -- it has its own connection.

1 them disclosed in the live and open presentation. Thank 2 you.

JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Well, it sounds like the best approach is go witness by witness. So what we will do is at the beginning of each witness's testimony, go as far as we can with non-confidential or if it's a witness that, essentially, there's very little, if any, that is not confidential, then we can identify -- then $I$ would appreciate counsel conducting the cross to inform us of that fact and we can immediately, then, go into a confidential session.

I don't know about trying to do a review of the transcript afterwards. We can talk about that at the end of the hearing to see whether that makes sense. I mean, we share Public Counsel's concern that as much of our proceedings as possible should be open to the public.

At the same time, we also are very aware that much of this information is extremely sensitive, and we do not want it to be available to those who are not entitled to see it.

So we're trying to balance those two things. And we will do what we can as we go forward. But I think that's the best that we can do at the moment.

So are there any other preliminary matters that we need to address before the Commissioners join us and we begin the cross-examination?

Hearing none, I see that Commissioner Doumit is --

MR. SHERR: Excuse me. Excuse me, Your Honor. This is Adam Sherr. I'm sorry. I muted myself for the benefit of all, but $I$ am now off mute.

Just one brief preliminary matter, and that is I believe asked on Friday if Commission knows if CLC witness Lobdell would be excused or would be expected to appear to receive questions from the judges -- from Your

1 Honor or from the Commissioners. Do you happen to know? JUDGE KOPTA: We do not yet know at this point. I mean, some of it may depend on what the other witnesses' testimonies are and the extent to which Ms. Lobdell's take on some of the information or some of the information that comes up as it references to her testimony may be useful.

So --
MR. SHERR: Thank you.
JUDGE KOPTA: -- I hate to have her sit around and wait and only not to have to do it, but the only thing $I$ hate worse than that is us needing to ask her questions and she's not available.

MR. SHERR: It's all good. Thank you for responding. Appreciate it.

JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Sure.
I see that the Commissioners have joined us. So at this point, let's take appearances for the record, beginning with Commission Staff.

MR. MCGINTY: William McGinty on behalf of Commission Staff.

JUDGE KOPTA: And Public Counsel.
MS. SUETAKE: Public Counsel. This is Nina
Suetake for Public Counsel, and I'm joined by co-counsels Lisa Gafken and John Nelson.

JUDGE KOPTA: And for the Company?
MR. SHERR: Morning. Adam Sherr on behalf of CLC.

MR. STEESE: And Chuck Steese on behalf of CLC, Your Honor.

JUDGE KOPTA: And for the Washington
Military Department?
MS. CORTEZ: Dawn Cortez on behalf of the Washington State Military Department.

JUDGE KOPTA: And on behalf of ComTech?
MS. ORNSTEIN: Susan Ornstein on behalf of Telecommunications Systems, Inc.

JUDGE KOPTA: Any other appearances?
All right. Hearing none, just a brief technical observation. Please mute your phones if you are not speaking or in the middle of doing the cross or being responded to cross questions.

In addition, I don't think we need the cameras on, except for those who are directly involved in the cross-examination, just to sort of reduce the clutter a little bit. I mean, it's always nice to see people, but our focus is on the witness who is testifying.

I will be on camera. I'm assuming the Commissioners will also be on camera and will be

1 unmuted. So I think that should take care of 2 everything.

1 confidential information, then that should be in a 2 closed session.

The other option would be to use a redacted version that redacts the confidential portion to the extent that that's not germane to the questions that are being asked of that witness. Does that make sense, Mr. Sherr?

MR. SHERR: It does. It does.
JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Well, then, we will proceed along those lines.

Mr. McGinty.
MR. MCGINTY: Yes, Your Honor. First Staff witness is Jacque Hawkins-Jones, whose testimony has been prefiled with the Commission.

COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor -- if I may. Apologize.

JUDGE KOPTA: That's right. Commissioner Doumit, I neglected to allow you to speak first. So please do.

COMMISSION DOUMIT: I apologize for that, Your Honor. I have two statements for the record that I wanted to make, Your Honor. Both relate to the potential sort of, you know, involvements -- but in the matter.

The first is that $I$ worked for Verizon until

1 I came to the Commission, and I learned from their
2 record that Verizon as an originating provider was
3 impacted in some degree by -- by the outage. I
4 wanted to say $I$ don't recall that incident, and I don't
5 recall having anything to do with it sort of at the
6 time. But $I$ wanted to state that for the record and
7 want, you know, to ask whether there will be any
8 objections to my participation based on that prior 9 affiliation.

JUDGE KOPTA: All right. So are there any objections to Commissioner Doumit participating in this proceeding under -- with that understanding?

MR. MCGINTY: No objections from Staff.
JUDGE KOPTA: I hear no other objections, and therefore, there are none. So we are -- second point.

COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Second point, yes -thank you, Your Honor -- is that my son works for Delta Partners, which is a wholly owned subsidiary of FTI Consulting, one of the Company's witnesses, expert witnesses, and works with -- for FTI Consulting. I have not discussed this case in substance with my son whatsoever, but I did, again, want to make that statement for the record to discern whether there may be objections based upon my relationship with my son.

JUDGE KOPTA: Are there any objections? MR. MCGINTY: No objections from Staff. MS. GAFKEN: No objections from Public

Counsel.
JUDGE KOPTA: All right.
COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you, Your Honor.
Sorry for the interruption. Thank you.
JUDGE KOPTA: No, not at all. I'm glad you
clarified that.
(Jacque Hawkins-Jones sworn.)
(Main session.)

E X A M I N A T I O N
BY MR. MCGINTY:
Q. Ms. Hawkins-Jones, so you previously filed testimony with the Commission; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. And is all of that testimony still true and correct, to the best of your knowledge?
A. Correct.
Q. And you adopt it today?
A. Yes.
Q. Including the cross answering testimony that you filed?
A. Yes.

MR. MCGINTY: No further questions.
JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Your testimony has previously been admitted, and therefore, we will move to cross-examination. Who is going to be doing that, Mr. Sherr or Mr. Steese?

MR. SHERR: This is Adam Sherr, Your Honor. I will be.

JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Proceed, Mr. Sherr.

CROSS S E X A M I N A T I O N
BY MR. SHERR:
Q. Good morning, Ms. Hawkins-Jones. Nice to see you. I think we've spoken a couple times on the phone, but nice to meet you, well, sort of in person here.

You were not a Commission employee at the time of the December 2018 outage; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. You joined the Commission in August of 2019?
A. Correct.
Q. When were you assigned to investigate the outage at question in this case?
A. In August of 2019.
Q. Okay. Immediately upon joining the Commission?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Were you assigned to head the

1 investigation on behalf of Staff?
A. I was assigned as the lead investigator of this investigation.
Q. Okay. Who was the lead investigator prior to you?
A. Susie Paul.
Q. Okay. Is Ms. Paul still an employee of the Commission?
A. No, she is not.
Q. When you were assigned to investigate the outage in August of 2019, were you told that the investigation was focused solely on CenturyLink?
A. No, I was not.
Q. When did that -- when was that decision made?
A. In consultation with Commission Staff and our then expert. After review of all the evidence, Staff made a determination in their investigative report.
Q. And when was -- when was the decision made that the investigation would be solely focused on CenturyLink?

MR. MCGINTY: Objection. Asked and answered.

MR. SHERR: Well, with respect, I asked when, and I don't believe Ms. Hawkins-Jones responded. JUDGE KOPTA: I'll allow the question.
A. I wouldn't be able to tell you when exactly that occurred.

BY MR. SHERR:
Q. Okay. And you mentioned a prior expert. That was Mr. Wheeler, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Over the course of the two years Staff investigated the outage, Staff issued five sets of informal data requests to the Company; is that true?
A. I believe so. I would have to look to confirm.
Q. Could you take a look at Exhibit JHJ-3C, which was attached to your direct testimony. Let me know when you're there.
A. Okay. What was the number again?
Q. It's JHJ-3C. And this was the narrative portion of the Staff investigation report that you just alluded to.
A. And then what -- was this provided to the Staff?
Q. This is attached to your direct testimony.
A. So that's Staff investigation report?
Q. That's right. That's Exhibit JHJ-3C. Do you have access to that now?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Okay. If you're -- are you looking at it electronically?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Great. So it's a 28-page PDF. Could you look at page 12 of the PDF. If you go to the very bottom, it says page 10. I will note that in this case, most documents have multiple numbers on them. So that can be a little confusing, but let me know when you're there.
A. I am looking at page 10 of the report.
Q. Great.

So if you look at the bottom -- the bottom -the very, very end of that page, it says 2018 investigation information. Could you just read to yourself the first sentence?
A. Okay.
Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to how many sets of data requests the Staff sent to CenturyLink during the course of the investigation?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. It was five; is that correct?
A. Correct. It says five.
Q. Great.

In your response to Staff's final set of
informal data requests to CenturyLink, that was from August of 2020, CenturyLink produced 911 call logs, one for CenturyLink, one for ComTech. Do you recall those?
A. I do recall seeing call logs, yes.
Q. Okay. And those have been -- just for your reference, those have been identified as Cross-Exhibits JHJ-26CX and 27CX?
A. Yes.
Q. You remember receiving these.

And those call logs were broken out by hour by the total number of calls during that hour and by how many successful and failed calls to 911 there were; is that accurate?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And there was, again, there was one for CenturyLink and one for ComTech?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And if the calls -- if for each row, which was an hour of the day, the number -- for the number of failed calls, an error code was given as to the nature of the error. Do you recall that?
A. Correct.
Q. And CenturyLink in its cover email that -- that accompanied those call logs defined the various -various error codes. Do you recall that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And these logs showed thousands of failed 911 calls during the time frame to ComTech, sort of PSAPs. Do you recall that?
A. Correct.
Q. And virtually no unsuccessful calls to CenturyLink PSAPs. Do you recall that?
A. That's how it was presented, yes.
Q. Okay. And CenturyLink explained that the small number of uncompleted calls did not actually fail as a result of the network outage. Do you recall that?
A. I believe that's how it was presented, yes.
Q. Okay. After receiving that data -- and let me go back.

So this was -- you received the data several months before the complaint was filed in this case against CenturyLink, true?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. After receiving the data that we just discussed, did Staff send any follow-up questions to ComTech?
A. I don't believe so, no.
Q. None to explore whether something specific in ComTech's practices or network design caused 911 calls to fail in Washington?
A. So we didn't send any follow-up after receiving these.
Q. Okay. And over the course of the same two-year investigation, Staff sent one set of data requests,

1 informal data requests, to ComTech. That was in
2 February of 2019, and another brief follow-up -- set of
3 follow-up questions in August of 2019. Do you recall
4 those?
A. I recall sending data requests to Centurylink during those times. I don't recall exactly what was on them.
Q. Okay. Well, fair enough. Let me clarify. I'm talking about sending data requests to ComTech, not CenturyLink.
A. Correct, yes.
Q. Okay. So there was an -- and if -- for your reference -- and this isn't a memory test -- so for your reference, Exhibit JHJ- $24 X$ and JHJ- $25 C X$ are the two sets of questions.
A. Yes.
Q. Just to clarify, you recall that there were -there was one set of questions sent in February '19 -of 2019 and then a brief follow-up sent in August of 2019?
A. Correct.
Q. Let's take a look at Exhibit 24X. Let me know when you have that on your screen.
A. I have it available.
Q. This document -- excuse me. Go ahead.
A. I have it available.
Q. I'm sorry. I spoke over you. Can you say that again?
A. I have the document JHJ-24X open.
Q. Thank you.

And these are Staff's initial questions to ComTech in February of 2019?
A. Correct.
Q. And Staff doesn't ask any questions here about ComTech's network design, does it?
A. I didn't draft these questions. These were drafted by Susie Paul. So these are the questions that she asked at that time.
Q. Okay. Can you take a -- just take a look. I understand that you didn't draft them. Can you take a look through the questions. Let me know when you proceeded reading through them.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Are there any questions about ComTech's network design?
A. No.
Q. Thank you.

Let's look at Exhibit 25CX. Now, I will note this document has been identified as confidential. And so be careful to the extent that your answer -- you

1 don't want your answer to include anything that's been 2 identified as confidential.

But do you have Exhibit JHJ-25CX in front of you?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Okay. And these are the August 2019 follow-up question from Staff to ComTech as well as their September 12, 2019 responses; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. And, again, you have this electronically in front of you?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. If you could take a look at page 4 of the PDF. I want to direct your attention specifically to the question, the Data Request No. RS-3A. It appears about halfway, two-thirds down the page.
A. Yes, I'm there.
Q. Can you just read the question and answer to yourself, and let me know when you've done so.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay. So here ComTech explains that its SS7 connectivity was impacted by the outage and that it experienced intermittent lack of redundancy -- excuse me -- intermittent lack of circuit redundancy, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And Staff received these responses 15 months before filing the complaint against CenturyLink, true?
A. They received them in September of 2019.
Q. And the complaint was filed in December of 2020?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Any time within those 15 months -- at any time during those 15 months did Staff follow up to investigate how ComTech design constructed or maintained its SS7 network supporting 911 calling in Washington?
A. Staff was constantly reviewing information as far as the data responses received from ComTech, and in consultation with our experts on the -- how the network was designed. And so that -- so I don't know if I would be able to answer your question exactly.
Q. Well, let me ask a more specific question.

Did Staff follow up with ComTech to investigate how ComTech's network was designed, constructed, or maintained?
A. If there was no data request provided, then no, Staff did not follow up with ComTech.
Q. Great.

And you reviewed the prefiled testimony of CenturyLink witness Stacey Hartman, which has since been adopted by Jeanne Stockman, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And you saw that that, among other things, that attached to that testimony were emails and documents gathered by CenturyLink through discovery in this case?
A. Yes.

MR. SHERR: Your Honor, I think this is where we may have to go into confidential concession for one brief segment of questions.

JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Is it -- will you be finished with your cross after this?

MR. SHERR: I will not. This is new. Would you like me to -- would it be preferable I skip this and come back to it?

JUDGE KOPTA: That would be my preference, yes.

MR. SHERR: Okay.
JUDGE KOPTA: I don't want to have to go back and forth. That's the concern I have. If this comes up again, then we have to go into another session. So let's get them all at one time.

MR. SHERR: Okay. Sounds good, Your Honor. BY MR. SHERR:
Q. Let me change subjects.

Looking back at Exhibit 25X.
A. Okay.
Q. Could you scroll down to this is page 6 of the PDF and, again, these are the follow-up questions from ComTech to Staff, correct?
A. These are their responses, yes.
Q. Okay. So the follow-up questions, the questions were issued in August of '19, these responses from September of '19?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Looking specifically at the response to question identified as RS-3C, which is the only -- the only question that appears on that last page of the document?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And I'll note that there is information that is identified as confidential here. So please do not read that information out loud.

Do you see that within that confidential information, without identifying specifics to it --

MR. SHERR: And I'll be honest, Your Honor. I'm not sure if this information is still considered confidential, but it's identified as such here. So I will treat it as such. BY MR. SHERR:
Q. Seeing that -- where -- the information that is identified as confidential, there are four circuit $A$ and

1 Z locations identified. Do you see those --
A. Yes.
Q. These are the circuits -- this is your understanding that these are the circuits that ComTech was leasing from CenturyLink for its use, for ComTech's use, as SS7 links in support of its 911 network?
A. That is ComTech's response, yes.
Q. Okay. Do any of these four connections originate and terminate within the state of Washington?
A. I wouldn't be able to answer that.
Q. Okay. Well, look at that, which is identified as No. 1 here. I don't want you to read it out loud. It identifies two locations.
A. Correct.

MS. CORTEZ: Objection. If I may, I'm -- I guess I'm a little confused. One of the things that I asked not to be raised in the open sessions were locations. These seem to be locations that relate, one, to the transition, but, two, these two entities may still be in place today. So I thought these things would be addressed in the closed session.

JUDGE KOPTA: Well, they are designated as confidential. So it sounds like you need to reserve that for the confidential session, Mr. Sherr.

MR. SHERR: Understood. Thank you.

MS. CORTEZ: Thank you.
BY MR. SHERR:
Q. Ms. Hawkins-Jones, let's look again at Exhibit 3C, which is attached to your direct testimony. This is the Staff investigation report.
A. Give me one minute to pull it up.
Q. Okay.
A. Okay. I am there.
Q. Okay. And this is the investigation report that was filed on the -- with the Commission by Staff on the same day as the complaint was filed in December of 2020, true?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. Did you draft the report?
A. I did draft the report, yes.
Q. Okay. Obviously, you were familiar with its contents, then, before it was submitted by Staff?
A. Yes, I am familiar with it.
Q. Okay. And this 28-page document is merely the narrative portion of the report, but the report also contained voluminous exhibits as well, true?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And those have been filed with Commission in this proceeding?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. If you could take -- and each of those attachments were identified as Appendix A through -- I can't remember -- but A through some letter; is that true? N or O? That's how they were identified?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Can you please open, on your screen, the document that's been marked as Exhibit JHJ-28CX?
A. Okay. I'm there.
Q. Okay. And this was marked, as you can tell from the upper left-hand corner of the first page, this was identified as Appendix $G$ to the Staff investigation report?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And what this document is is the root cause analysis document compiled by ComTech just a couple weeks after the outage; is that your understanding?
A. Correct.
Q. When did Staff receive this document?
A. I would have to look to confirm the date.
Q. Do you know approximately when?
A. I believe sometime in January of 2019.
Q. Good enough. Thank you.

And you've read this document before, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Could you look at the very last page, which is page 6. Let me know when you're there.
A. I am there.
Q. Okay. The page 6 contains a table. The table is entitled "Corrective and Preventative Actions." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you read No. 4 to yourself. Again, it's not clear to me what portions of these documents are confidential. So I don't want you to read it aloud. But can you just read what's been identified as No. 4 to yourself, and let me know when you've done that.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay. At any point after receiving this root cause analysis and before filing the complaint nearly two years later, did Staff investigate whether ComTech had sufficient circuit diversity for its SS7 links?
A. I wouldn't be able to say, given that this was provided when $I$ was not an employee of the Commission.
Q. Are you aware of any data requests or inquiries sent by Staff to ComTech, at any point after this document was received by Staff, where Staff inquired and investigated as to whether ComTech had sufficient circuit diversity in December of 2018 for its SS7 links?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. Do you agree that ComTech was responsible for designing, constructing, and maintaining its own SS7 network?

MR. MCGINTY: Objection. Beyond the scope. JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. Sherr?

MR. SHERR: I'm simply asking if
Ms. Hawkins-Jones, who led the investigation, has an opinion as to whether ComTech had responsibility for its own network.

JUDGE KOPTA: I will allow the question.
A. I am not a network design expert, and so I wouldn't be able to speak on that. We worked in consultation with our technical experts. BY MR. SHERR:
Q. Does the Staff investigation report, which was Exhibit JHJ-3C, does the Staff investigation report address the sufficiency of ComTech's SS7 network design?
A. Staff's investigation report goes over the recommendations provided to the Commission. And in that case, it is regarding CenturyLink, not ComTech.
Q. Thank you.

I'm going to have you look back at your direct testimony, which is Exhibit JHJ-1CT. Let me know when you're there.
A. I am there.
Q. Okay. Great.

Can you look at page 5 of your testimony. Let me know when you get to page 5 .
A. I am there.
Q. Starting at line 4, there's a question, Please briefly describe the December outage.

So here you briefly describe the outage to the 911 system in Washington, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you're aware that no part of CenturyLink's 911 system failed as a result of the Infinera outage, aren't you?
A. Can you repeat the question?
Q. I can.

Are you aware that no part of CenturyLink's 911 system failed as a result of the Infinera outage?
A. I don't know if $I$ would be able to agree with that statement.
Q. Are you aware of any interference with calls going between originating service providers and Intrado gateway?
A. Could you rephrase?
Q. Sure. I'm simply asking your awareness. Are you aware of any interference, any issues, with calls traversing between originating service providers and the

1 Intrado gateway?
A. Yes, I am aware.
Q. Okay. What issues were there between -- well, let me ask you this: Do you testify regarding problems with calls traversing between originating service providers and the Intrado gateway?
A. The information that Staff has and what $I$ have testified to has been in consultation with our technical experts. And -- which is why we have what our determination and recommendation was in our report.

So what I -- what I have testified to is what my recollection and knowledge is in the matter.
Q. Okay. I want to make sure that the question was clear enough because it may not have been to you.

Are you aware that Intrado, I'm not speaking about ComTech and I'm not speaking about Infinera, that Intrado was the underlying 911 provider for CenturyLink in Washington at the time?
A. Yes, I am aware.
Q. Okay. So I am talking about the portion of the call that went between the originating service provider and Intrado's gateway.

Do you have evidence that there were -- there were problems with calls going between the originating service provider and the Intrado gateway?
A. I believe that $I$ would not be the -- this -- can you rephrase the question?
Q. Sure. I can.

Are you aware of any problems -- now this -- let me take you back. This is December of 2018, during the network event, during the outage.

Are you aware of any calls failing, if you're thinking about the call flow, between the originating service provider and the Intrado gateway?
A. I'm not aware of calls failing.
Q. Okay. Are you aware of any issues with calls traveling between the Intrado gateway and the Intrado selected router?
A. Again, I'm not a network design expert, and we relied on them for their consultation in this investigation.
Q. Understood. But I'm asking about your awareness.

Are you aware of any issues with calls traveling between the Intrado gateway and the Intrado selected router?

MR. MCGINTY: Objection. Lack of
foundation. I'm not sure this witness is familiar with the call flow details counsel is asking about.

MR. SHERR: Again, Your Honor,

1 Ms. Hawkins-Jones led the investigation that led to a 2 complaint for millions of dollars against CenturyLink.

3 The determination of that complaint, the key
4 determination of that compliant, which is about 911
5 failure, is whether CenturyLink was responsible for 6 calls failing.
Q. Sure.

Are you aware of any issues with the operation of the Intrado selective router at the time of the outage?

JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. Sherr, I understand where you're going with this. But I think we've pretty well established that Ms. Hawkins-Jones is not a technical expert. She's going to give you the same answer each time. So I don't know that it's terribly productive to continue down this road.

MR. SHERR: I understand, Your Honor. I can move on. BY MR. SHERR:
Q. Ms. Hawkins-Jones, you understand that this complaint addresses not an outage on CenturyLink's 911 network, but on an outage affecting one of CenturyLink's national transport networks; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. I'm going to have you change your screen one more time. If you take a look at Exhibit JHJ-4. Let me know when you're there.
A. You said JHJ-4?
Q. Yeah, 4. This was an attachment to your direct testimony as well.
A. I would need a minute to pull that up.
Q. If you're not able to, I can also share my screen.
A. That would be great. Thank you.
Q. Sure. Sorry. I could have said that earlier. Are you able to see my screen?
A. Yes.
Q. Great.

And so Exhibit 4, JHJ-4, to your testimony was the narrative of the FCC's investigation report from August of 2019; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And this is also Appendix C to the Staff investigation report on file with the Commission, true?
A. Correct.
Q. Are you aware that CenturyLink, as a result of this investigation, CenturyLink was fined a total of $\$ 500,000$ for the nationwide impact of the outage by the FCC?
A. Yes.
Q. And the FCC found only 11 failed calls on CenturyLink's 911 network. And all of those were in Arizona, none in Washington; is that correct?
A. If that's what they reported, yes.
Q. You don't have any reason to disagree with that?
A. I do not.
Q. Okay.

MR. SHERR: Your Honor, the remaining questions I'll go back to all need to be in confidential session.

JUDGE KOPTA: All right. How long do you anticipate your cross continuing?

MR. SHERR: Oh, probably about ten minutes.
JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. All right. I just want to make sure we're still under our time limits.

It is currently 10:30. So why don't we take our morning break. I would like to keep it to ten minutes, if possible. So if we would -- well, in this case, since it's 10:28, if we can resume at 20 until 11:00, and at that time we will go into confidential session to allow you to ask questions that pertain to information designated as confidential.

MR. SHERR: Thank you.
JUDGE KOPTA: Let's be off the record.
(A break was taken from
10:29 to 10:43.)
(Confidential session.)
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MR. MCGINTY: Yes, very briefly, Your Honor.
$R E D I R E C T E X A M I N A T I N$ BY MR. MCGINTY:
Q. First of all, Ms. Hawkins-Jones, you testified that you rely on consultation with experts in your investigation in this case. Could you describe that process?
A. Sure. So the -- I don't know if I glitched out for a second -- Staff did consult and hire the consultants to provide us with the technical expertise regarding the network, if we had questions, what that looked like, walk us through, explain those things to us to use and encapsulate that information into our investigative report.
Q. And what's the reason for that?
A. That is because on Staff -- or -- yeah. On Staff, the Commission Staff, did not have that in-depth technical knowledge readily available.
Q. Thank you.

Now secondly, you testified that the outage that occurred in this case occurred on a CenturyLink national transport network and not on its 911 system. Do you recall that testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. Did CenturyLink use that national transport network to fulfill any 911 related responsibilities that it had?
A. Can you restate the question?
Q. Sure.

So did CenturyLink use the national transport network to fulfill any 911-related responsibilities that it had?
A. Yes.
Q. And what were those responsibilities?
A. To provide 911 service to the state of Washington.

MR. MCGINTY: Okay. No further questions. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you, Ms. Hawkins-Jones. We appreciate your testimony. You are excused.

Mr. McGinty, would you like to call your next witness?

MR. MCGINTY: Yes. I think next witness in the order is James Webber.

JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Mr. Webber, if you could turn your camera on so we can see you.

THE WITNESS: Hopefully you can see me and hear me now.

JUDGE KOPTA: I can both see you and hear

THE WITNESS: Excellent.
(James Webber sworn.)
JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. McGinty, do you have any questions for Mr. Webber?

MR. MCGINTY: No. His testimony is prefiled. As long as that's adopted and admitted into the proceeding, no questions.

JUDGE KOPTA: It has been admitted with certain caveats, but none that are germane to exhibits that he filed.

So who on behalf of CenturyLink will be questioning Mr. Webber?

MR. STEESE: Your Honor, it will be Chuck Steese that's questioning Mr. Webber.

JUDGE KOPTA: Do you have a significant amount of questions that do not involve confidential information?

MR. STEESE: Very little, but some. I tried to organize it where the first 20 minutes or so is non-confidential, Your Honor, and then we would go into confidential setting after that.

JUDGE KOPTA: Well, let's do it that way. I want to make sure that we have as much on the public record as possible. So, Mr. Steese, you may proceed.

1 And when you get to the point where you are aware that
2 confidential information is likely to be discussed, please let us know so that we can then go into confidential session.

> MR. STEESE: Of course, Your Honor. (Main session.)

CROSS S E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. STEESE:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Webber.
A. Good afternoon here in Chicago.
Q. Thank you.

And we have met before in a different proceeding, correct?
A. We have.
Q. Let's start with a little bit about your background.

You're not an engineer, correct, Mr. Webber?
A. That's correct.
Q. And I reviewed your CV, which is MDW-2, and it's several pages long, correct?
A. I don't have the exact page count, but it is several pages long. That's true.
Q. And in that CV you identify the various proceedings that you have acted as an expert in your

1 career, correct?
A. That is my intent, yes.
Q. And I searched that, and the word 911 is nowhere in your CV. So have you ever been involved in a 911 dispute before?
A. Frankly, I don't recall if I've been involved in a 911 dispute, but I've certainly been involved in 911 from a technical and a cost perspective assisting establishing 911 connectivity for at least one competitive local exchange carrier.

So I do have experience with the costs, the equipment, the routing, the standards, and practical application.
Q. But you have not designed a 911 network, correct?
A. I don't know that $I$ would say it -- that definitively. As you'll note in my CV, I was a member manager of the competitive local exchange carrier. And in that scenario, it was my responsibility to identify the signaling vendor, purchase the equipment, and establish the 911 functionality.

So in that regard, yes, I have been involved in that, but that has not been the preponderance of my career.
Q. So let's talk about that. You're talking about

1911 connecting as originating service provider, not as a
2911 provider, correct?
A. That's fair.
Q. And so when I'm talking about designing a 911 network, I'm talking about designing a 911 network for 911 providers. You've never done that, correct?
A. Well, when you talk about designing a network, there's a lot involved in designing a network. And I've been involved in analyzing network design and costs for all sorts of purposes. And I have been involved in the implementation of 911 from the perspective, as you mentioned, of a local exchange carrier, which involves switching connectivity, signalling connectivity, decisions regarding SIGTRAN, SS7, direct interconnection via IP, et cetera.

So a lot of the issues comingle and overlap.
And I think it's, to be fair to your question, inaccurate to just blanket, make a statement that I've not been involved in issues related thereto.
Q. That wasn't my question, though, Mr. Webber. My question was you were never involved in design of a 911 network for a 911 provider. And you identified several things that you have done, but given that you didn't identify that you had worked for a 911 provider helping to design their network, I take it you have not done

1 that, correct?
A. I have not designed the totality of a 911 network in the past. No, I have not.
Q. So let's turn and focus on diversity for a bit, and let's make sure we're defining the issue here.

You were aware that CenturyLink says in a 911 network you should have circuits that are geographically diverse, network diverse, and provider diverse. That's what CenturyLink says, correct?
A. Can you show me that?
Q. You've read the testimony of Mr. Turner, correct?
A. I have. It's been a while.
Q. Do you not recall him saying that in his testimony?
A. Not the three phrases that you identified together. So I would like to see that.
Q. Are you aware that Mr. Rosen from Public Counsel's witness, who has designed 911 networks, says that circuits should be geographically, network, and provider diverse. Do you remember him saying that?
A. Again, I don't recall the exact words. If you'd like to show it to me, I'd be happy to read it.
Q. Okay. And your testimony is the only obligation is to be geographically diverse with your circuits if

1 you're a 911 provider, correct?
A. I don't think that's fair to say. If you take a look at the back end of my first piece of testimony, I identified the quad scenario, if you will. My understanding that ComTech or TSYS was employing for signalling with CenturyLink's chosen provider, which was then TNS, that provides for physical diversity, it provides for geographic diversity, and it also provides for route diversity.
Q. Okay. Perfect.

So what CenturyLink and Mr. Rosen are saying is a lack of network or provider diversity was a flaw in ComTech's design, and you disagree with that, correct?
A. I don't see any standard that was applicable, whether under the Commission's rules or the administrative codes in Washington, at the time of the outage that required the additional of, as you'll say it, provider diversity in addition to the terms that I previously identified.
Q. Okay. Perfect.

So let's focus -- I'm going to do share screen, and we will move things along faster. So I'm going to bring up JDW-16, which is attached to your testimony. Do you recognize this document? I have some words highlighted to draw your attention to, but do you just

1 recognize this as an FCC release from October 15 of
2 2019, relating to the outage on the Green Network?
A. I see that.
Q. And do you see a paragraph highlighted, the first bullet. The FCC says, as of at least October 15 of 2019, ensure sufficient circuit diversity including provider diversity; do you see that?
A. Yes. So a year later the FCC is making recommendations that describe adding provider diversity. I do see that.
Q. And the reason is, quote, "To ensure that a single outage won't simultaneously affect different circuits," correct?
A. Can you show me that?
Q. It's highlighted right below.
A. I do see that, yes. Again, this is a year after the outage, and this is adding, as I recall, additional recommendations to the industry after this outage, not prior to.
Q. We'll get to that in a minute. But the whole point here is to make sure that there is no single point of failure that can cause 911 calls to not complete. That's the reason for provider diversity, correct?
A. It says -- well, the words speak for themselves,

1 but it says a single outage, not a single point of 2 failure.
Q. And here the way that ComTech designed its network, the Green CenturyLink Network provided the potential for a single point of failure, correct?
A. No, I don't believe that's true. I think the words "network" and "single point" in the statement that you just identified are being conflated.

A single point is typically considered to be a physical single point, whereas that Green Network that failed, failed at multiple nodes simultaneously, and the whole network went down, which traverses thousands of miles, not a particular single point.

So it was more than just a cut at a particular point in cable or a failure of a particular card that wasn't redundant or another failure of a piece of equipment that wasn't redundant, but rather the packet storm that propagated through that IGCC's brought down the entirety of the entire Green Network. So I can't agree that it's a single point.
Q. Are you aware that Mr. Rosen has identified software failures in the past as being, quote, "Single points of failure." You don't recall him testifying to that?
A. I don't recall his testimony verbatim, no.
Q. Now, you said that --
A. And let me -- let me be clear. I don't intend to be argumentative in this regard. We've got thousands of pages at issue in this case. I don't remember Mr. Rosen's testimony verbatim, and that's my point. It says what it says.
Q. So your point with respect to Exhibit JDW-16 was this was a year after the outage. There was no standard that you can think of that created network or provider diversity for 911 providers before the incident. That's your testimony, correct?
A. Can you show me that phrase?
Q. I just think that's what you testified to, correct?
A. I don't recall saying that in my written testimony the way you've described it.
Q. I thought you just said that a moment ago; did you not?
A. We can go back and read the entirety of what $I$ said a moment ago. My general point here is this is something that the $F C C$ is seeking to do a year after the outage because the industry has matured and learned more and is now seeking guidance and establishing more information for the industry to consider as to reliability.

You'll notice that this CSRIC standards are identified immediately above the highlighted language. They did not include the language that's below, and the FCC here is looking into that issue and establishing additional industry guidance.

JUDGE KOPTA: I just want to interrupt for the court reporter's benefits. CSRIC is all caps C-S-R-I-C, correct?

MR. STEESE: That is correct.
THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. And
I'll try to be more specific when $I$ speak. I forget the acronyms are so plentiful in our industry.

JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, they are, indeed. And I
belive you also said something about SIGTRANS.
THE WITNESS: I did.
MR. STEESE: $S-I-G-T-R-A-N$, all caps.
JUDGE KOPTA: All right.
THE WITNESS: And it's shorthand for signalling transport.

JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. Again, we're just
trying to make sure that everybody can know what is going to be down on the page.

BY MR. STEESE:
Q. Well, Let's look at Exhibit JDW-67X -- CX, excuse me. But the page I'm going to be talking about

1 will not have any confidential setting.

And do you see on page 31 of that PDF is something entitled "Emergency Services IP Network Design Information Document From NENA." Do you see that?
A. Right now you've got the -- the title page up. I would like to open up that document. So give me a moment.

Do you recall the original exhibit number to my direct?
Q. This wasn't in your direct testimony, sir.
A. Was it in my rebuttal testimony?
Q. Nope. This is a cross-examination exhibit.
A. Okay.
Q. And do you see that -- do you know what NENA is?
A. It's the emergency numbering administration. Falls under the FCC's guidance.
Q. And NENA is --
A. I'm still looking for that document. So I would like a moment.

JUDGE KOPTA: And, again, for the court reporter's benefit, NENA is all caps, N-E-N-A. BY MR. STEESE:
Q. If you want me to move the page down or a few pages, I will. My first question is going to be relatively general, and then...

MS. GAFKEN: Judge Kopta, if I may, it sounds to me like the witness doesn't know which exhibit it is that Mr . Steese is referring to. So providing that exhibit number, it's JDW-67CX.

MR. MCGINTY: This is on page 31 of the PDF. So it won't -- if you're just opening up PDFs, it won't be apparent from the first page.

THE WITNESS: Okay. And I apologize for the technical -- here. BY MR. STEESE:
Q. I'll ask you my first question. Do you see that this NENA document was approved by the NENA executive board April 5, 2018, eight months before the outage?

MR. MCGINTY: I'm going to object. Witness has indicated he'd like to be able to open the whole exhibit that earlier was approved. I'd like to give him the opportunity to do that. Can we take a short recess to make that happen? Maybe that's what we need to do?

JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Let's be off the record while we address this technical issue.
(Pause in the proceedings.)
JUDGE KOPTA: Let's be back on the record. And, Mr. Steese, you may proceed. I believe Mr. Webber has at least a portion of the document to which you are referring. THE WITNESS: I do.

BY MR. STEESE:
Q. Mr. Webber, you can see that this is NENA document that received executive approval on April 5 of 2018, correct?
A. I agree with that.
Q. And NENA is the industry body that is exclusively responsible for overseeing 911 network design, correct?
A. It's one of the industry bodies that relates to 911 design, reliability, et cetera. There are CSRIC, for example, under the FCC has a guidance as well, but -- but it is certainly one of the premier bodies.
Q. Let's turn to page 40 of the PDF. Do you see section 2.1.2 ESInet design considerations?
A. 2.12 ESInet design, I do.
Q. And it's talking about ESInet, Emergency Service Infrastructure, the mission critical infrastructure systems that support NG911 must be established with the very highest degree of security reliability, resiliency, redundancy, survivability, and diversity. And it continues. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And it says it is important to point out that even when redundant physical circuits are quartered, for

1 the most part Legacy PSAPs do not have dual
2 facilities -- dual entrance facilities. Do you see 3 that?
A. Yes, and a PSAP is capitalized, $P$ as in Paul, Sam as in Simon, $A$ as in apple, $P$ as in Paul, little $S$. And that would be the center at which the calls are answered.
Q. It next talks about further these systems and networks will remain fully operational during regular daily operations as well as during and immediately following a major natural or manmade disaster on a local region and even -- and even nationwide basis. Do you see that? Do you see that, sir?
A. No, not yet.
Q. Did you see it highlighted? It's in the bottom -- last sentence of paragraph 1 .
A. Not in the version that I have. Oh, I see you've highlighted a different document. Yes, I see that.
Q. And --
A. Again, we're talking about the PSAP facilities at their locations where they're answering calls.
Q. The next it says, When feasible, alternate network access paths are highly desirable to consider during the ESInet design process.

Do you see that?
A. I do, and that's similar to the quad design that was used by ComTech that we had talked about earlier.

Here, we're talking about alternate entrance facilities, if you will, into a building where a PSAP is located. So you might have a cable entering on the north side of the building. And, if you're lucky, a cable that enters on the south side of the building in case something happens.

On one side of the building, at least, the circuits into that building has one -- or one of the circuits entering that building may not have been damaged.
Q. The next paragraph says, The same level of care should be taken when purchasing circuits from vendors. In many instances, multiple circuits from providers is assumed to create greater diversity and redundancy.

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. So here NENA is specifically talking about provider diversity, correct?
A. Within the context of the PSAP buildings where the calls are answered, they are, yes.
Q. And are you saying that the entrance into the PSAP facility should have greater protections than the

1 rest of the 911 network? Is that what you're saying?
A. My answer is that I've stated.
Q. And several vendors may interconnect upstream and, essentially, use the same backbone. And so it is important to understand where vendors may interconnect and how they interconnect and design an ESInet to minimize or avoid situations that lack redundancy throughout the network.

Do you see that?
JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. Steese, I'm going to interrupt you at this point. I'm having a hard time understanding how it's useful to have Mr. Webber and you read all of these portions of this document and ask Mr. Webber about them. I don't understand what you're getting at here, and we seem to be using a lot of time to take up that particular line of inquiry.

MR. STEESE: Mr. Webber is specifically testifying that there was no standard that he was aware of that suggested provider diversity was critical to consider. And here is a document from NENA, one of the leading industry bodies by his own admission, that talks about supplier diversity and talks about how you should manage supplier diversity.

And I'm going to ask him when -- because it's obvious he has not looked at this critical

1 document, and I want to be able to make sure he
2 understands what's here and then ask him some questions
3 that go directly to his testimony.

JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. Steese, that's not your job to educate Mr. Webber on this document. If he's not familiar with it, it's not an appropriate area to cross him. Establish that he has not seen this before, if you can establish that, and then we move on.

I just don't see that it's useful to have him read a document that he -- is not part of his testimony and with which he may or may not be familiar, only to get to a series of questions. I would say get to the series of questions after you establish whether or not he is familiar with this document and the information it contains.

MR. STEESE: So I'll ask Mr. Webber a very specific question. BY MR. STEESE:
Q. Were you aware of this document when you were drafting your testimony? Did you consider it?
A. Not to my recollection, no.
Q. And isn't it true --
A. And previously, you and I discussed the CSRIC recommendations from the $F C C$ that came out a year after this incident that we're talking about in 2018. A year

1 later, in 2019, the FCC came out with additional
2 guidance for resiliency for networks of the type that we're talking about. I was familiar with that, and I cited that information.

But, again, that was a year after this incident.
Q. And so eight months before the incident, NENA, the leading, one of the leading organizations, specifically recommends getting provider diversity as part of the ESInet design; isn't that true?
A. I would have to read this document in its entirety. Here, we're talking about entrance and exits to PSAPs, which is different than designing the entirety of the network. And without having studied this entire document, I'm not going to further guess.
Q. Is a connection into an ESInet only from a PSAP?
A. I -- I don't understand your question.
Q. When you talk about an ESInet, an ESInet is the entire network that forms 911, the entire 911 network, correct?
A. It is described as a 911 network. I wouldn't say it's in the entirety because there are other facets to 911 capabilities.
Q. And an ESInet has connections from selective routers into switches, and it eventually makes its way into PSAPs, correct?
A. Sure.
Q. And the ESInet is far more than just the straight connection into the PSAP, correct?
A. Again, we're getting outside of my testimony. But I would accept that premise. And, again, I would accept this document says what it says, but I haven't read it.
Q. Let's look at Mr. Rosen's testimony, which is BR-1C, bottom of page 20, continuing over to 21. You looked at Mr. Rosen's testimony as part of your preparation of your own materials, correct?
A. Which testimony is this?
Q. Mr. Rosen, Public Counsel's --
A. Which testimony?
Q. Oh, I'm sorry. His direct testimony.
A. I don't recall responding to Mr . Rosen in my reply testimony. And I don't recall whether I considered this paragraph or not.
Q. So you don't recall Mr. Rosen testifying on the bottom of page 20, line 19, In building 911 systems, I generally advise that supplier diversity be used to guard against the kind of failure that occurred here.

You never remember looking at that?
A. I -- I read it and I see that you read it accurately. I don't --
Q. I'm just asking did you consider it?
A. No.
Q. Let's look at Exhibit WMD-70. JUDGE KOPTA: Before we -- before we read, I notice some of that information was highlighted. Is that designated as confidential?

MR. STEESE: Your Honor, I was trying to keep the highlights off the screen. If it was there, I apologize. I am trying very hard to not do that. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Well, I just want to caution everyone that we are not in confidential session. So if you're sharing your screen, please do not include information that's designated as confidential.

MR. STEESE: I apologize, Your Honor. Thank you.

BY MR. STEESE:
Q. Let's look at JDW-75X. Do you see that JDW-75X is the June 24, 2016, statement of work from ComTech to the Washington State Military Department?
A. That appears to be true, yes.
Q. And this entire document, there's redactions in it. This is the redacted version. We never got the nonredacted version from ComTech. So I'm going to show you the portions here that begin on page 177 of that

MS. CORTEZ: Objection. Even though there are redactions, there appear to be highlighting that would signify confidential information that is exposed.

MR. STEESE: That's not accurate. The highlights are my highlights to draw his attention.

MS. CORTEZ: Oh, got it. Thank you.
MR. STEESE: Yes.
BY MR. STEESE:
Q. So when you look at Exhibit 75X, did you ever consider, Mr. Webber, in providing your testimony what ComTech promised to deliver to Washington State Military Department when -- with its 911 design? Did you ever look at this?
A. I don't recall talking about this document in my testimony at all, whether in my initial testimony or my reply. And I -- I don't recall having reviewed this document. I may have, but $I$ don't recall it.
Q. Oh, sorry. I thought you were finished. So in looking to see what ComTech promised to deliver the State of Washington, you didn't consider the document that identified, considered, or described what they were going to deliver to the state?
A. I think that mischaracterizes what I stated previously.

What I indicated was I did not talk about this document, whether in my direct testimony or in my reply testimony. I don't recall whether I read this document, and I don't recall statements, either in my direct or my reply testimony, where I had analyzed what ComTech promised to provide to WMD. That's simply not within the scope of what $I$ had done.
Q. So you did not -- did you recall ComTech promising that its network would eliminate all single points of failure? Were you aware of that?
A. I don't recall that. I see a document right here that says something to that effect, but I don't recall that.
Q. Do you recall ComTech promising network redundancy, similar diversity and redundancy influence all network build-out aspects to consider. Did you -were you aware of that?
A. As I sit here, as I said before, I don't recall having seen this document. I don't recall these phrases particular -- particularly, but $I$ don't dispute that they exist.
Q. And do you recall ComTech saying that it implements redundancy through, quote, "Carrier diversity," closed quote. Were you aware that they gave that assurance to the state?
A. I don't recall that in this document. I do recall seeing that in responses to discovery. In TSYS's or ComTech's answers to both the Staff and to PC I recall that being identified, but $I$ don't recall this particular document.
Q. You say PC, the Public Counsel?
A. I do.
Q. So then let's look at Exhibit 75X -- excuse me -- 74X.

Did you look at the contract between the Washington Military Department and ComTech in looking to see what ComTech was contractually obligated to provide to the State of Washington?
A. I recall looking at a lot of the contract documents to understand the network, and I forget the exact question that you asked. So maybe you could rephrase that.
Q. I just want to make sure that there's a contract between WMD and CenturyLink that you reference in your testimony.

There's also a contract between WMD and ComTech, and I'm asking whether you considered the contract between WMD and ComTech?
A. Yes, I looked at both.
Q. Okay. Thank you. I just didn't know if $I$

1 understood. Sorry. aware of that?

So let's look at page 56 of that document 74 X .
A. You're going to have to make that a lot bigger.
Q. I'm -- it's page 56. It is PDF page 62, and, of course, I'll make it bigger. Happy to do it.

And were you aware that the contract says that a service level agreement failure occurs when there is vulnerability to a single point of failure? Were you
A. I -- I don't recall that being in that contract, but it doesn't surprise me.
Q. So then if we look at page 38, the force majeure provisions of the contract. Why don't you take your time and just read that provision to yourself, and then I'm going to ask a few questions.
A. Okay. I've read that.
Q. So in this particular provision, the Washington Military Department tells ComTech that if there is an outage that could have been avoided utilizing applicable redundancy requirements, then they are not -- they are still responsible if they did not employ applicable redundancy requirements, correct?
A. I'm not an attorney, but I do see applicable redundancy requirements as a phrase in the force majeure

1 paragraph 1105.
Q. And so if ComTech had designed its network in accordance with NENA standards and employed carrier or network diversity, this particular outage on the Green Network would not have impacted their ability to complete 911 calls, would it?
A. I don't understand your question as it relates to this paragraph. You've switched from redundancy to some other term, and you're talking about the Green Network outage.
Q. Sorry?
A. Well, I don't understand your question.
Q. Fair enough.
A. You're asking me to give a legal interpretation on a question that $I$ don't understand. So I think we're going to have to back up and start with a new question.
Q. NENA said that when designing a 911 network, one is supposed to employ carrier diversity, correct?
A. The portion of that contract that -- or the portion of that NENA document you showed me was talking about connectivity into the PSAPs, and I do recall seeing the words "diversity" or the word "diversity" in there, but I'm not going to interpret that whole document right now. I haven't studied it. I told you that previously.
Q. I'll ask a separate question, then, just a very direct one. This is not looking at the contract.

Had ComTech deployed circuit diversity on its signalling links -- strike that.

Had ComTech employed carrier diversity on its signalling links and used something other than the CenturyLink Green Network to deploy two of its signalling links, the 911 calls to PSAPs served by ComTech would have completed during the December outage, true?
A. I can't say that with certainty. When you look at the FCC's report, the FCC identifies people who were impacted by the CenturyLink Green Network outage as a general matter. When I say "people," I mean companies. Two of those companies were West. Another one was TNS, and if you had different circuits, if you will, connected from ComTech to TNS, and TNS is in the middle of ComTech and CenturyLink for the remaining provisioning of the totality of the 911 services in the state, and TNS is impacted, I don't know whether different circuits connecting TNS to ComTech would or would not have resolved the problem. I simply don't have an answer to that. My answer is I don't know.
Q. But ComTech certainly did not have network diversity on its signalling links, did it?
A. I would disagree with that. When -- when you look at my direct testimony, for the tail end of that testimony, I identify the quad links. That basically means there are two sets of STPs on both sides.

MS. CORTEZ: Objection. I -- I can't tell where this testimony is going. I don't know if it's going to stray into the various technical aspects of the network that I've -- that I've indicated that we need to protect. And so we've already mentioned several of the providers that we'd hoped to avoid bringing out as well. So maybe this would be better in the private session.

MR. STEESE: Your Honor, I was on the verge of going into confidential setting so CenturyLink would not oppose.

JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then we will await any further response to that question until we're in confidential session.

Do you have anything else that we can discuss in open session, Mr. Steese?

MR. STEESE: Your Honor, everything else is going to be in and out of confidential.

JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Can you stop sharing your screen for just a moment, Mr. Steese.

Let's be off the record for a moment. (Pause in the proceedings.)
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*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY* ]
(A break was taken from
2:38 p.m. to 2:52 p.m.)
(Main session.)
JUDGE KOPTA: Let's be on the record after our afternoon break.

We are ready for Staff's next and last witness, Mr. McGinty. Do you want to call him?

MR. MCGINTY: Yes, next witness is Robert Akl.
(Robert Akl sworn.)
JUDGE KOPTA: Thank you.

Mr. McGinty, anything further for him? MR. MCGINTY: No.

JUDGE KOPTA: Your prefiled testimony and exhibits have been admitted, and you are available for cross. Mr. Steese, I assume, will be asking you questions.

MR. STEESE: That's correct, Your Honor.

C R O S S E X A M I N A T I O N
BY MR. STEESE:
Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Akl. How are you today?
A. Good, thank you.
Q. And we met before virtually during your deposition, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. In this matter, the Commission Staff is paying you $\$ 850$ per hour, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Let's talk about your experience. One of the things you do as a professor is you teach network design, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And one type of network that you teach your students how to design is an SS7 network, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you teach your students that when designing an SS7 network, it's essential to design the network so there is no single point of failure, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And link diversity is a critical ingredient in network reliability and requires provisioning links in such a manner that a single failure will not cause the disruption of services, correct?
A. That is fair, yes.
Q. And because of the critical nature of $S S 7$ links, physical, electrical, and architectural diversity are necessary, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you teach students, when you're teaching them how to design an SS7 network, that that network is critical to stay up because if it's down, calls don't complete, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And, again, it's always important when designing an SS7 network to ensure there's no one single point of failure, correct?
A. And not just an SS7, but, yes. It would apply to SS7 also.
Q. And for providing your opinions that are contained in your testimony, I think it's RA-1C, you

1 only reviewed the materials that are referenced in your 2 testimony, correct?

1 testimony.

JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. Steese, do you want to give a reference in Mr. Akl's testimony to the question you're asking?

MR. STEESE: On page 1, he talks about the cause. And, to me, when you're talking about the cause of an outage, it's important to understand what he knows and doesn't know about who's involved. So he's here to talk about causation and, certainly, ComTech and its network design is central to the cause in question.

JUDGE KOPTA: To the extent that he has reviewed it, and $I$ believe that may be the basis of a question of him. But $I$ don't think assuming or going beyond his testimony is appropriate at this juncture. MR. STEESE: I don't understand, Your Honor. How can one testify about cause if there's a number of facts you haven't considered? By definition, that is appropriate cross-examination of an expert, to show that the testimony should be discounted completely because they didn't consider a number of facts that led to the causal question.

JUDGE KOPTA: Well, Mr. Steese, you can make that argument in your brief. But if you're going beyond his testimony, you're going outside of the scope of a permissible cross-examination.

MR. STEESE: Just give me one moment, Your Honor.

JUDGE KOPTA: Sure.
BY MR. STEESE:
Q. So turn to your testimony at page 5. Let me know when you're there.
A. I am there.
Q. And you reference a specific exhibit, correct? You have Mr. Webber's Exhibit 4, correct?
A. Yes, there are multiple exhibits that I reference on that page. One of them is JDW-4.
Q. Correct. And if we look at JDW-4, which I'll pull up on the screen. Just one moment. JDW-4 is the FCC report about the outage, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And in looking at this particular -- oops, excuse me -- this particular exhibit, this particular exhibit talks about, in paragraph 6, covered 911 service providers are required to take reasonable measures to provide reliable 911 service in three specific respects, including, No. 1, circuit diversity, correct?
A. Yes, I see the word that you are pointing to or reading.
Q. And when you look, it says that they are required to do this. And required is mandatory,

1 correct? It's a mandatory word. Thou shall --
A. I see the words you are reading. That is correct.
Q. And when it's talking about, in the next sentence, they must certify annually, whether they audit physical diversity. The word is "must," again, a mandatory word, correct?
A. Yes. I see the word that you are reading.
Q. Now, in this particular case, if you go to your testimony at page 1, just let me bring that up quickly. You see your testimony. Your CV. Sorry. Testimony is not there. I know how to do this. Just give me one second.

Page 1 of your testimony, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. I changed to page 2 right when you said --
A. Yes. I didn't mean to do that.
Q. And if you look at your testimony, point No. 1 says that you focused on the causes of the outages on the Red Network and the Green Network as well as the relationship between the two events, correct?
A. Yes. I only looked at, not outages in general, not 911, but I only looked at CenturyLink's Red Network and Green Network, those outages. And the relationship between the Red's outage would have given us insight to

1 prevent the Green Network outage.
Q. So you were not asked to give an opinion one way or the other about what caused 911 calls to complete. You were just looking at the relationship between the outage on the Red Network in February of 2018 to the outage on the Green Network in December of 2018; is that correct?
A. Yes, that is fair. I did not look or analyze anything outside the CenturyLink's Red and Green Network outages and their relationship.
Q. Forgive me. I'm going to ask the question again. I didn't completely understand your answer.

So you were not asked to give an opinion as to why 911 calls did not complete during the outage on the Green Network; is that correct?
A. I would agree that $I$ did not look at the 911 aspect of it. I only looked at the outage on a Green Network as a result of packet storm.
Q. So I'm going to round this out to make sure I understand.

So you did not look to see if the reason why 911 calls did not complete is because there was a lack of diversity on the ComTech network. That's not something you ever evaluated, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. Let's focus, then, on this packet storm that occurred on the Red and Green Networks.

So first, you have never been retained by a client, until here, to evaluate what caused a packet storm to occur, correct?
A. Regarding causes of a packet storm as it relates to what happened here, that is correct.

But as -- but as you've asked me in my deposition, I have looked at packet storms before and how to prevent them.
Q. You were retained by a client who had -- was involved in a patent infringement case that had technology that theoretically was described to prevent packet storms. That's been your involvement with packet storms, correct?
A. My involvement in packet storms in litigation related to a patent that relates to packet storms as well as teaching my students on the technology of what causes packet storms, how to avoid packet storms. That is why I was an expert retained relating to patents related to packet storms. And that's my understanding of why I am retained in this matter, to render opinions on the packet storms on the Green Network.
Q. And you've never written an article on packet storms, correct?
A. No, I've written articles on networks in general, but not specifically on packet storms.
Q. But you've read articles written by others about packet storms, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And none of those articles that you can recall involved an evaluation of what caused that packet storm, correct?
A. Well, a lot of times, we don't know the cause of a packet storm. That is the point, is we try to prevent -- we try to design the network to prevent packet storms; if they happen, to minimize their effect. They aren't something that's normally you anticipate or, rather, they're something that you assume can happen, but you design to try to prevent or minimize their damage in a couple of different ways.
Q. Thank you.

MR. STEESE: Your Honor, at this point I'd like to go into confidential session, and I would remain there for the rest of my time.

And just so you know, it's going to be significantly less than my two hour projected.

JUDGE KOPTA: Well, I appreciate that,
Mr. Steese. Whatever time we can save will be beneficial all the way around.

10 [ *CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY*
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So, Ryan, are you still here? Ryan? Oh,

MR. SMITH: Sorry. I'm here. My computer was freezing up a little bit. Ready for me to send you

JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, please do.
MR. SMITH: All right. I'm on it.
(Pause in the proceedings.)
(Confidential session.)
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JUDGE KOPTA: Then we will move to Public Counsel.

Ms. Gafken or Ms. Suetake, do you want to call your next witness? Or, Mr. Nelson, I don't mean to leave you out.

MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel calls Stephanie Chase.

JUDGE KOPTA: All right.
(Stephanie Chase sworn.)
JUDGE KOPTA: Ms. Gafken, any questions for
Ms. Chase?
MS. GAFKEN: Sure. I have a few preliminary questions.

E X A M I N A T I O N
BY MS. GAFKEN:
Q. Ms. Chase, on whose behalf are you testifying for today?
A. Public Counsel.
Q. Were your testimony and exhibits prepared by you or under your instruction and supervision?
A. Yes, they were prepared by me.
Q. Do you have any changes to your testimony or exhibits?
A. Yes, I have one correction to make to my

1 initial -- to my direct testimony, the revised version.

On page 18, lines 10 and 11, I transposed the total numbers. And so the -- the number at the end of line 10 should be 5,376,000.

And the total number for at the end of line 11 should be $\$ 10,753,000$.
Q. So the number on those two lines were just transposed?
A. Yeah. Just the -- sorry. I'm sorry about that. Just the total numbers were transposed.
Q. And that error didn't -- would not change your testimony, correct?
A. No. It would not change the total.

MS. GAFKEN: With that, Stephanie Chase is available for cross-examination.

JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you, Ms. Gafken.

Ms. Chase, your exhibits and testimony have already been admitted as well as the cross-examination exhibits. So we're ready for cross.

I'm assuming, Mr. Sherr, that is up to you. MR. SHERR: Yes, Your Honor.
/ / / / /
/ / / / /
/ / / / / CROSS S EXAMINATION

BY MR. SHERR:
Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Chase. I'm Adam Sherr, CenturyLink. Nice to meet you.
A. Nice to meet you as well.
Q. You've been with Public Counsel since January of 2020, correct?
A. Yes, that's true.
Q. You were not with Public Counsel at the time of the outage?
A. I was not.
Q. Let's take a look -- do you have in front of you Exhibit 1 -- SKC-1TC, your direct testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you take a look at page 3 of your testimony, specifically lines 5 through 8?
A. Okay. I'm there.
Q. Okay. And there you reference an outage on CenturyLink's national network, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Same page, line 18, you make reference to a failure on CenturyLink's nationwide fiberoptic network?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you understand that the specific circuits

1 that ComTech was leasing from CenturyLink that
2 experienced the outage in December of 2018 were on
3 CenturyLink's national network, true?
A. Yes. They were on the national transport network, but impacted the 911 service that was being transitioned to ComTech.
Q. Okay. And you understand that these were interstate circuits and not intrastate circuits?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's look back at page 3 starting on line 19.
A. Okay.
Q. And carrying over to page 4, line 5. You briefly discuss the packet storm event, correct?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. Did you evaluate the probability of the particular packet malformation that preceded the packet storm event?
A. I did not.
Q. In your view, is it important for the Commission to evaluate the probability of the particular packet malformation?
A. I can't really address that, I don't think. But that's a better question for our technical expert, Mr. Rosen.
Q. Do you -- from your perspective, is it important

1 for the Commission to evaluate the foreseeability of the 2 particular packet malformation?
A. Well, that is one of the Commission's enforcement criteria, is one of the 11 enforcement criteria, is to consider the foreseeability of the event.
Q. Let's look at pages 5 to 6, 5 and 6 of your testimony, specifically line 7.
A. On page 5 or on page 6?
Q. I'm so sorry. Yeah. Starting on page 5.
A. Okay.
Q. There you discuss CenturyLink's past 911 outages, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you understand that the outage that occurred in December of 2018 did not involve any aspect of the CenturyLink 911 network in Washington?
A. I understand that the outage was on the national transport network, but $I$ also understand that that outage impacted the way that the interconnection was set up between ComTech and CenturyLink.
Q. So it's your understanding, just to make sure I'm following you, that the impact of the outage on the national network affected the signalling network, the SS7 network, that was used in support of 911 calling in

1 Washington; is that accurate?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Do you understand the distinction between the 911 network and the SS7 network?
A. Yes, I understand that there are -- that there are multiple levels to sort of layer the cake for these -- for this system.
Q. Okay. Are you aware of this outage affecting any component -- I'll ask again -- of CenturyLink's 911 network in Washington?

MS. GAFKEN: Objection. Asked and answered. JUDGE KOPTA: Overruled. I'll let her answer that.
A. So I -- I am aware that CenturyLink's national transport outage impacted the interconnection between ComTech and CenturyLink at the state level.

And I've sort of forgotten your question. I'm sorry, Mr. Sherr. Can you rephrase it? BY MR. SHERR:
Q. Sure. I will ask it again. Are you aware of any of the packet storm on the national transport network affecting any aspect of CenturyLink's 911 network?
A. Could you be more specific about what you mean by CenturyLink's 911 network?
Q. Sure. Well, let me ask you: Do you understand -- again, do you understand the difference between the 911 network and the SS7 network?
A. Yes.
Q. This outage affected the SS7 network, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. The SS7 network of ComTech, not the SS7 network utilized by CenturyLink, correct?
A. I think that's correct, yes.
Q. Okay. Let's jump to page 16 of your testimony.
A. Okay. Okay. I'm there.
Q. I'm almost there.
A. Oh, sorry.
Q. Specifically, if you look at page 16, starting on line 19, and the sentence that carries over to page 17, line 1, you say, Additionally, CenturyLink created this network without vendor diversity where a single software error could take down an entire system.

Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. What system were you referring to there?
A. To the 911 system as a whole.
Q. But -- okay. Again, there was no direct affect to CenturyLink's 911 system, only the SS7 network utilized by ComTech?
A. If by 911 -- do you mean -- by 911 system, do you mean an impact to CenturyLink's PSAPs?
Q. Well, I don't want to testify for you. So I leave it there. I think we got the answer.

Did you read miss -- did you read CenturyLink's response testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Including the testimony and exhibits of Stacy Hartman, which has since been adopted by Jeanne Stockman and Steven Turner?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Are you now aware that ComTech lacked vendor diversity for its $S S 7$ links at the time of the December 2018 outage?
A. I'm going to defer that question to Mr. Rosen.
Q. So you don't know?
A. I do not recall offhand.
Q. Okay. Are you aware that ComTech designed, constructed, and managed its own SS7 network?
A. I'm not sure that $I$ can answer that, either.
Q. Okay. Are you aware that ComTech placed all four of its $S$ S 7 links on the same CenturyLink national network?
A. Again, $I$ think that's a better question for Mr. Rosen.
Q. You're not sure?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. Are you aware that CenturyLink Communications, CLC, was unaware until the outage that ComTech had placed all of its SS7 links on the CLC Infinera Green Network?

MS. GAFKEN: I'm going to object. This is beyond the scope of Ms. Chase's testimony.

JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, Mr. Sherr, if you would point to a particular point in Ms. Chase's testimony, that would be helpful.

MR. SHERR: Sure. I can move on, Your
Honor. Ms. Chase testified regarding the outage. So I'm asking for her understanding of some of the underlying facts relevant to the outage, but $I$ can move on.

## JUDGE KOPTA: Thank you.

BY MR. SHERR:
Q. Ms. Chase, are you aware that if ComTech had placed two of its four SS7 links on another CenturyLink network or on the network of another provider that 911 calls -- ComTech -- or PSAPs would not have failed during the outage?
A. I can't answer that, but I think that would be a better question for Mr. Rosen.
Q. Let's take a look at page 18, which I think you advised us just a moment ago.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So I don't have to ask you about transposing the numbers.
A. Right.
Q. Thank you for that.
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. On page 18, you specifically, at line 10, you recommend that the Commission penalize CenturyLink Communications, as revised, $\$ 5,376,000$ for violation of RCW 80.36.220; is that correct?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. That statute deals with the duty to transmit messages, true?
A. That is true.
Q. Do you or Mr. Rosen testify about the substance of that claim at all?
A. No. There is not anything in my testimony that addresses the -- or makes a legal conclusion about that statute.
Q. Okay. Do you make any policy arguments concerning that particular violation that you allege?
A. I -- I don't make a specific reference to that statute. My -- my testimony focuses on the -- more on

1 the criteria, enforcement criteria, that the Commission
2 has set out in their policy statements.
3

Public Counsel -- you specifically recommend a penalty

1 of $\$ 10,752,000$ for violation of WAC 480.120.450. Do you 2 see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And this rule relates to E911 obligations of local exchange carriers, true?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you or Mr. Rosen testify about the substance or merits of that particular claim?
A. I don't address the specific -- the requirements of the specific WAC in my testimony.
Q. Are you aware of any evidence that CenturyLink acting as an originating service provider -- let me start over.

Are you aware of any evidence that CenturyLink Communications, the respondent in this case, acting as an originating service provider, failed to offer 911 dialling functionality to its customers?
A. Again, I'm aware of CenturyLink's obligations under the contract to provide 911 service, and that didn't happen because of the outage. So they failed to fulfill those obligations.
Q. Are you aware, in general, if a CenturyLink Communications local customer -- so in CenturyLink's capacity as an originating service provider, are you aware of any CenturyLink Communications customer who, in

1 general, could not reach emergency services by dialling 2 911, if they did not have that functionality on their 3 telephone?
A. I am not aware of a CenturyLink identified customer specifically, but many other customers in Washington who had difficulty reaching 911 services and in the case of many emergencies.
Q. Okay. Is it your understanding, then, of this rule that any failed 911 call creates liability as a violation of WAC 480.120.450?
A. It's my position and Public Counsel's position that CenturyLink had an obligation as a 911 provider, under the contract, to provide and, you know, from the caller to the PSAP, and that was not -- that obligation was not met.
Q. Okay. Public Counsel's allegations in this case, and as articulated in your testimony and Mr. Rosen's testimony, focus on CenturyLink Communications' role as interexchange carrier, not as an originating service provider; is that correct?
A. Yes, I believe that's correct.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

MR. SHERR: I have no further questions. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you, Mr. Sherr.

Any questions for Ms. Chase from the Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: None from me. Thank you, Your Honor.

CHAIR DANNER: No questions, Your Honor. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: No questions. Thank you.

JUDGE KOPTA: All right.
Redirect, Ms. Gafken?
MS. GAFKEN: I have some brief redirect.
$R E D I R E C T E X A M I N A T I N$
BY MS. GAFKEN:
Q. Ms. Chase, you were asked questions about the SS7 network and the 911 network. Do you recall that line of questioning?
A. I do.
Q. Is your understanding that the SS7 network is part of the Washington 911 network?
A. It is. Because all -- there are multiple parts that, you know, make up these networks, not just the -the signalling path, but also the voice calls.
Q. You were asked questions about your analysis in your testimony about the outage. Do you recall those questions?
A. I do.
Q. Is your testimony about the outage based on your analysis or the analysis of another witness?
A. About the outage itself, to -- with my testimony, I relied both on this Staff investigation report as well as analysis from our witness, Brian Rosen.
Q. And Mr. Rosen analyzed the circumstances of the outage; is that correct?
A. It is.
Q. You were asked questions about CenturyLink's role, and Mr. Sherr asked about CenturyLink as the originating service provider. Is the originating service provider the same as the 911 service provider?
A. I'm sorry, Lisa. Could you rephrase the question?
Q. Sure.

Is CenturyLink's role as the -- an originating service provider the same as its role as the 911 service provider?
A. No.
Q. How do they differ?
A. The role as the 911 service provider is more serious, I would say, and substantive role. They have an obligation to connect persons in need of help with

1 the PSAP to provide them that help in an emergency 2 situation.

MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. I have no further questions.

JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you, Ms. Chase, for your testimony. We appreciate it, and you are excused.

Ms. Gafken, do you have another --
MR. STEESE: Your Honor, before we proceed, this is Chuck Steese. Since we're going to go late, do you mind if we take a five-minute health break before we begin with Mr. Rosen?

JUDGE KOPTA: No. I think that would be fine. So it's now 4:19. If we could have folks come back at 4:24. Then we can give Mr. Rosen -- my

1 expectation is we will finish with Mr. Rosen this
2 evening. And so keep that in mind as we are progressing. But anyway, we will be off the record.
(A break was taken from
4:19 p.m. to 4:24 p.m.)
JUDGE KOPTA: Let's be on the record again. And Ms. Gafken is going to call your second-to-last witness.

MS. GAFKEN: We would like to call Brian Rosen.
(Brian Rosen sworn.)
JUDGE KOPTA: Thank you.
Ms. Gafken, you may proceed.
MS. GAFKEN: Thank you.
E X A M I N A T I O N

BY MS. GAFKEN:
Q. Mr. Rosen, how are you employed?
A. I'm an independent consultant.
Q. What is your occupation? What do you do?
A. I an engineer. I'm a -- I work on the 911 system and have for 20 years. Generally speaking, I've been involved in packet network since the mid '70s. I've been designing networks and working with networks all the way through. I have extensive experience in

1 network design, specifically IP networks, the SIP
2 protocol, which is used for carrying telephone calls
Q. Okay. Thank you.

MS. GAFKEN: Mr. Rosen is available for cross-examination.

JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Mr. Rosen, your testimony and exhibits have been admitted, as have been some of the cross-examination exhibits. So we will proceed with cross-examination.

Mr. Steese, your witness.
MR. STEESE: Your Honor, before I begin, Mr. Rosen made his correction, and I did not get that down. So if he could just, please, identify the page one more time. I apologize, Mr. Rosen.

THE WITNESS: It was page 21 of my rebuttal testimony.

MR. STEESE: And say that one more time, the correction, please.

THE WITNESS: In the middle of the paragraph above the diagram, there's a line that starts, Is beyond where Intrado connects to TNS. And the --

MR. STEESE: I'm sorry. Just one moment.
You said page 21 of your rebuttal?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MS. GAFKEN: So Exhibit BR-30T, page 21,
lines 10 to 11.
MR. STEESE: Say it again. I'm sorry.

THE WITNESS: The correction is beyond where Intrada connects to the TNS. The phrase and before CenturyLink connects to TNS is an error. It should be and before ComTech connects to TNS.

MR. STEESE: I apologize for that. I just wanted to make sure $I$ got it down. Thank you.

JUDGE KOPTA: Just a moment, Mr. Steese.
Commissioner Rendahl?
COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Right. So I just wanted to clarify. Mr. Rosen, you said there's a figure on that page. I don't have a figure on my page at all on page 21.

THE WITNESS: Sorry. It's not on that page. It's --

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you for that clarification. I wanted to make sure I had the right -thank you.

JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. Mr. Rosen --
MR. STEESE: That's why I was struggling too.

JUDGE KOPTA: I'm going to caution everybody to talk one at a time because we're starting to talk over each other. It's getting towards the end of the day. It's an easy thing to do, but it makes our court reporter's job much harder. So please wait until each

1 of us has finished before we talk.
Mr. Steese, please proceed.
MR. STEESE: Thank you, Your Honor.
C R O S S E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. STEESE:
Q. Mr. Rosen, it's a pleasure meeting you. I'm Chuck Steese. I represent CenturyLink Communication, LLC, in this matter.

MR. STEESE: So, Your Honor, virtually everything is going to be -- especially with the guidance given to me or us by WMD -- it's going to be in a confidential setting. I would just recommend we go straight away into the confidential setting.

JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Let's be off the record.

> (Pause in the proceedings.)
(Confidential session.)
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