

ORIGINAL



Voice | Data | Internet | Wireless | Entertainment

EMBARQ™

Embarq Corporation
Mailstop: FTLHO0102
1313 Blair Stone Rd.
Tallahassee, FL 32301
EMBARQ.com

March 20, 2007

CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS ATTACHED

Ms. Ann Cole, Commission Clerk
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

RE: Docket No. 060767-TP, Embarq's Claim of Confidentiality

Dear Ms. Cole:

Enclosed for filing on behalf of Embarq Florida, Inc. are the original confidential documents referred to in Embarq's Response to Staffs First Set of Interrogatories and First Request for Production of Documents.

CMP 1

COM

CTR

ECR

GCL 1

OPC

RCA

Embarq considers the data provided to be proprietary and is filing it under a claim of confidential treatment pursuant to 364.183(1), Florida Statutes and Rule 25.22.006(5), Florida Administrative Code. The confidential documents are as follows:

- Highlighted information in Interrogatory Response #4
- Highlighted information in Interrogatory Response #5
- Highlighted information in Interrogatory Response #6

SCR Please acknowledge receipt of this filing by stamping and initialing a copy of this letter
SGA and returning same to the courier. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to
SEC call me at 850/599-1560.

OTH 1 Sincerely,
records

Susan S. Masterton

Enclosures

RECEIVED & FILED

FPSC-BUREAU OF RECORDS

This claim of confidentiality was filed by or on behalf of a "telco" for Confidential DN ~~03487-07~~. The document is in locked storage pending advice on handling. To access the material, your name must be on the CASR. If undocketed, your division director must provide written permission before you can access it.

Susan S. Masterton
COUNSEL

LAW AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS- REGULATORY
DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
Fax: (850) 878-0777

02486 MAR 20 07

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

COMMISSION
CLERK

07 MAR 20 PM 4: 51

RECEIVED-TPSC

Corp. which on page 3 speaks to the use of its products in “Intrusive Parameter Manipulation” including “Called- and calling-party numbers.”

In addition, Embarq has attached in its Response to POD No. 3 an article from www.securityfocus.com which speaks about the relative ease with which one can manipulate calling party numbers “through weaknesses in Voice over IP (VOIP) programs and networks.” The FCC has also initiated probes into organizations that work to manipulate the data streams used in Caller I.D. Wired News reports that “hackers found a way to spoof their Caller I.D. by taking advantage of permissive VOIP service providers ...” See, also the article from www.wired.com attached in Embarq’s Response to POD No. 3.

4. Referring to page 6, lines 15-17, please explain how the 10% benchmark is “overly generous” to Verizon Access. Please identify sources used in response.

Response: Embarq has produced and reviewed reports containing traffic summaries for local interconnection trunks that connect Verizon Access’ network to Embarq’s network in three states in which this issue was recently raised in arbitration. The “Other Calls” category on this report contains calls lacking CPN as well as calls on which Embarq’s systems are otherwise unable to determine jurisdictions, i.e. local, intrastate or interstate classification. The report for November 2006 indicated out of xxx trunk groups studied in the three subject states, the average amount of “other calls” by minutes of use (MOU) totaled just over [REDACTED] percent of total MOU. We attach in our Response to POD No. 4 a copy of our report. This report fully illustrates that currently there is not a problem with the 10% benchmark. Further, a full month’s traffic constitutes a reasonably large sample size. The 10% threshold should allow reasonable growth and as well as allow for fluctuations inherent in the traffic.

Additionally, Verizon Access' incumbent local exchange carrier affiliate, Verizon Florida, LLC is party to at least one recent interconnection agreement in Florida in which billing provisions very similar to that proposed by Embarq are employed. The significant difference in that case is that the intrastate access billing threshold is triggered at 5% as opposed to Embarq's proposed 10%. A copy of the relevant provisions of that agreement is attached as part of Embarq's Response to POD No. 4.

- 5. Referring to page 7, lines 9-11, does Embarq have any reason to believe that Verizon Access "is planning to do something that will increase the amount No CPN (sic) traffic by a factor of thousands?" Please identify sources used in response.**

Response: Embarq is not in a position to know Verizon Access's business plans. As a point of clarification, in certain states, the amount of traffic lacking CPN would need to increase by factors of hundreds or thousands, depending on the state at issue, to reach the 10% threshold as proposed by Embarq. Holding the other columnar categories of MOU constant in the attachment to POD No. 4, traffic lacking CPN and terminated in Ohio would need to increase over [REDACTED] times to reach the 10% threshold. Under a similar construct, in Florida the traffic lacking CPN would need to increase over [REDACTED] times to reach the 10% threshold. Embarq is concerned with Verizon's objection to the threshold proposed especially in light of the current facts.

- 6. Does Embarq expect the percentage of calls without CPN to change 1) regardless of the Commission's decision on this issue or 2) as a result of the Commission's decision on this issue? Please explain your answer. Please identify sources used in response.**

Response: Embarq expects that there will be some natural degree of variability in the traffic terminated across Verizon Access' and Embarq's local interconnection trunks both with and without CPN. Current levels of the traffic without CPN is quite low – approximating [REDACTED] percent across three states. As a result of “click-to-call” technologies, other computer platform assisted or initiated calls and certain VOIP technologies, the extent to which these new technologies and new services increase at rates higher than other traffic carried across the Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN), it might be reasonable to expect some increase in calls lacking CPN regardless of Commission action.

It is not clear that it is appropriate for Verizon Access or any other carrier to terminate traffic enabled by these new technologies and lacking CPN across the parties' local interconnection trunks. Embarq emphasizes that significant differences in local reciprocal compensation and access rates produce incentives for the carrier to gain from the alteration or elimination of CPN. A Commission decision consistent with Embarq's positions would serve to uphold the validity of and encourage continued compliance with the FCC's rules even in the face of changing technological landscapes.

7. Please refer to page 9, line 18 through page 10, line 3 for the following questions:

- a. Provide an exhaustive list of the options that Verizon Access may have to deal with traffic from a carrier where the CPN has been intentionally stripped or altered. Please identify sources used in response.**

Response: As a Competitive Local Exchange Carrier, Verizon Access is in a position to contract with the carriers with which it terminates traffic. Verizon Access may simply refuse to

State of Florida



Public Service Commission

CAPITAL CIRCLE OFFICE CENTER • 2540 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-0850

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: 3.20.07
TO: Ausan Masterton
FROM: T. Henry, Division of the Commission Clerk &
Administrative Services
RE: **Acknowledgment of Receipt of Confidential Filing**

02487-07

This will acknowledge receipt of a **CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENT** filed in Docket No. 060767-TP or (if filed in an undocketed matter) concerning Reg # 4, 5 & 6, and filed on behalf of Embargo/Masterton. The document will be maintained in locked storage.

Any questions regarding this matter should be directed to Marguerite Lockard at (850) 413-6770.

I:\Confid\ackconf.doc