

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

Comments – Public Safety and Homeland)	
Security Bureau Seeks Comment on)	
Whether the Commission’s Rules Concerning)	ET Docket No. 04-35
Disruptions to Communications Should Apply)	WC Docket No. 05-271
to Broadband Internet Service Providers and)	GN Docket Nos. 09-47, 09-51,
Interconnected Voice Over Internet Protocol)	09-137
Service Providers)	

COMMENTS OF QWEST COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL INC.

Craig J. Brown
Lawrence E. Sarjeant
Suite 950
607 14th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005
202-429-3112
Craig.brown@qwest.com
Lawrence.sarjeant@qwest.com

Attorneys for

QWEST COMMUNICATIONS
INTERNATIONAL INC.

August 2, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY	1
II. DISCUSSION.....	3
A. There Is No Need To Impose Part 4 Or Another Service Disruption Reporting System On Interconnected VoIP Service.....	3
B. There Is No Need To Impose Part 4 Or Another Service Disruption Reporting System On Broadband Internet Service.....	6
C. Conditions Precedent Must Be Addressed Before The Commission’s Jurisdiction To Act Can Be Determined.....	8
D. The Commission Should Initiate A Collaborative Process With Those Directly Affected Before Adopting A Service Disruption Reporting System.....	10
E. Part 4 Service Disruption Criteria, Metrics And Timelines Would Need To Be Modified In Any Service Disruption Reporting System For VoIP Or Broadband Internet Services.....	11
F. The Confidentiality Of Submitted Information Must Be Preserved.....	12
III. CONCLUSION.....	15

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

Comments – Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau Seeks Comment on Whether the Commission’s Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications Should Apply to Broadband Internet Service Providers and Interconnected Voice Over Internet Protocol Service Providers)))
))	ET Docket No. 04-35
))	WC Docket No. 05-271
))	GN Docket Nos. 09-47, 09-51, 09-137

COMMENTS OF QWEST COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL INC.

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

Qwest Communications International Inc. (Qwest),¹ through counsel and in response to the Federal Communications Commission’s (Commission) *Public Notice* released on July 2, 2010,² files these comments in the above-captioned proceedings.

In the *Public Notice*, the Commission asks whether its current rules regarding the reporting of disruptions to communications services (Part 4 Rules)³ should apply to disruptions of interconnected Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) service or broadband Internet service.⁴

Qwest does not believe that there is a need for the Commission to impose service disruption reporting rules on interconnected VoIP service or broadband Internet service.

¹ Qwest operates a fiber-optic network that spans more than 173,000 route miles globally and has more than 1,800 transport access points of presence (PoPs), including 30 TeraPoPs. Qwest’s network also provides last-mile connections in the 14 states of its local service region. It had 2.9 million broadband subscribers in the first quarter of 2010.

² *Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau Seeks Comment on Whether the Commission’s Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications Should Apply to Broadband Internet Service Providers and Interconnected Voice Over Internet Protocol Service Providers*, Public Notice, ET Docket No. 04-35, WC Docket No. 05-271, GN Docket Nos. 09-47, 09-51, 09-137, DA 10-1245, rel. July 2, 2010.

³ See 47 C.F.R. §§ 4.1-4.13.

⁴ *Public Notice* at 2. Interconnected VoIP Service.

A judgment on the Commission's jurisdiction to impose service disruption reporting rules on interconnected VoIP service is complicated by the fact that the Commission has yet to determine in its *IP-Enabled Services Proceeding*⁵ whether interconnected VoIP service is a telecommunications service or an information service. An assessment of the Commission's jurisdiction to impose service disruption reporting rules on broadband Internet service requires the Commission to define precisely what it means by the term "broadband Internet service." The Commission also uses the terms "broadband access provider" and "broadband Internet access provider" in the *Public Notice* but does not explain the differences between a provider of broadband Internet service and a broadband access provider/broadband Internet access provider.

If the Commission nonetheless decides to proceed with establishing a service disruption reporting system for either interconnected VoIP service or broadband Internet service, it should first collaborate with interconnected VoIP service and broadband Internet service providers to design a voluntary 12 – 24 month trial reporting system. The results of the trial would provide the Commission with a body of data upon which to decide whether the public interest would be served by a permanent service disruption reporting system for interconnected VoIP service or broadband Internet service, and if so, how it should be designed. Qwest believes that it would be counter-productive to simply extend the Commission's Part 4 Rules to interconnected VoIP service or broadband Internet service.

The concerns expressed by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) about the disclosure of information contained in service disruption submissions in comments filed in the

⁵ See *In the Matter of IP-Enabled Services*, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 19 FCC Rcd 4863 (2004).

Commission's *New Part 4 Proceeding*⁶ are as relevant today as they were in 2004.⁷ The threat environment for critical communications infrastructures continues to be high, the ability of bad actors to exploit exposed network vulnerabilities is greater, and the need to safeguard sensitive information is more compelling. Accordingly, any service disruption information submitted to the Commission by interconnected VoIP service providers or broadband Internet service providers should be treated as presumptively confidential as information submitted under Part 4 is today.

II. DISCUSSION

A. **There Is No Need To Impose Part 4 Or Another Service Disruption Reporting System On Interconnected VoIP Service.**

The communications services provided by wireline, wireless and satellite service providers that are covered by the Commission's Part 4 Rules are not purchased by customers separate from the network or physical facilities used by their service providers as the transmission platform for those services.⁸ For example, a circuit-switched voice service provider is accountable to its customer for the operation of the network facilities used to carry the service. The network facilities are an integrated element of the offered voice service. The purchaser of a circuit-switched voice service receives upon the establishment of a call a dedicated circuit over

⁶ In the Matter of New Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications, Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 19 FCC Rcd 16830 (2004) (*New Part 4 Order*).

⁷ *See id.* at 16847-48 ¶ 30.

⁸ The Part 4 Rules apply to entities that provide two-way voice and/or data communications, and/or paging services, by radio, wire, cable, satellite, and/or lightguide for a fee to one or more non-affiliates. Part 4 does not apply to networks that provide data communications for a fee (public data networks) to non-affiliates or to private networks. *See id.* at 16833 ¶ 1, n. 2.

which that call is routed from the purchaser's service location to the service location of the called party.⁹

The Commission's service disruption rules focus on the reliability and security of the facilities that support the services covered by Part 4. An "outage" is defined in Section 4.5 of the Commission's rules as "a significant degradation in the ability of an end user to establish and maintain a channel of communications as a result of failure or degradation in the performance of a communications provider's network."¹⁰ A review of the threshold criteria associated with the Commission's outage reporting requirements evidences a focus on the facilities used to support a covered communications service.¹¹

Interconnected VoIP service is distinguishable from the services covered under Part 4. It "is an [I]nternet application utilizing 'packet-switching' to transmit a voice communication over a broadband [I]nternet connection."¹² "Unlike traditional circuit-switched telephony, which establishes a dedicated circuit between the parties to a voice transmission, VoIP relies on packet-switching, which divides the voice transmission into packets and sends them over the fastest available route."¹³ As the Commission has defined interconnected VoIP service, it "[r]equires [among other things] a broadband connection from the user's location[.]"¹⁴ Although a broadband service is needed to provide the physical facility for the transmission of an

⁹ There may be more than one provider with whom the customer has a service relationship where a circuit-switched call is made to a called party outside of the service territory of the calling party's local service provider -- *i.e.*, a long distance service provider other than its local service provider.

¹⁰ 47 C.F.R. § 4.5.

¹¹ *See* 47 C.F.R. § 4.9.

¹² *Minnesota Public Utilities Commission v. FCC*, 483 F.3d 570, 574 ¶ 7 (8th Cir. 2007).

¹³ *In the Matter of Petition for Declaratory Ruling that AT&T's Phone-to-Phone IP Telephony Services are Exempt from Access Charges*, Order, 19 FCC Rcd 7457, 7458-59 ¶ 3 (2004).

¹⁴ 47 C.F.R. § 9.3.

interconnected VoIP communication, it can be purchased as a separate offering from a service provider unaffiliated with the provider of the VoIP service. According to the Commission's 2010 *Local Telephone Competition Report*, 19 percent of subscribers to interconnected VoIP service at the end of 2008 purchased the service on a standalone basis as opposed to in a bundle along with a broadband service connection.¹⁵

Since interconnected VoIP service is simply an application that rides on a broadband facility and can be purchased separately from the broadband service connection that it requires, it begs the question -- what useful information can be gleaned about the reliability and security of the Nation's broadband communications networks by extending the Commission's Part 4 Rules to interconnected VoIP service or adopting a new service disruption reporting system for interconnected VoIP service? Qwest believes that the answer is very little and that the *de minimis* amount of useful information concerning the reliability and security of the Nation's broadband communications networks that may be obtained by imposing a service disruption reporting system on interconnected VoIP service would not outweigh the burdens borne by interconnected VoIP service providers.

Even if some useful information concerning broadband communications networks could be obtained from an interconnected VoIP service disruption reporting system, the number of interconnected VoIP subscribers is not significant enough to warrant the imposition of such a reporting system on interconnected VoIP service providers. The Commission recently found that at the end of 2008, interconnected VoIP service comprised only 13 percent (21.255M out of

¹⁵ See *Local Telephone Competition: Status as of December 31, 2008*, rel. June 25, 2010, at p.7, Figure 4. See also, News, FCC Releases New Local Telephone Competition Data, rel. June 25, 2010 at 2.

162.230M) of the wireline retail local telephone service connections in the United States.¹⁶ In August 2004 when the Commission adopted its *New Part 4 Order* extending service disruption reporting to wireless service, it found that the number of wireless subscribers at the end of 2003 was 158.8M.¹⁷ Although growing, the number of wireline retail local telephone service subscribers in the U.S. relying on interconnected VoIP service has yet to reach a level that justifies extending service disruption reporting requirements to it.

B. There Is No Need To Impose Part 4 Or Another Service Disruption Reporting System On Broadband Internet Service.

The nation's broadband communications networks are sound and fully capable of serving the current and future needs of Americans effectively and reliably.¹⁸ The broadband services market is highly competitive. Broadband network services providers must constantly satisfy their customers' service demands in order to succeed in the competitive marketplace, especially during those times when the ability to communicate and transmit data is most critical – during disasters, crises and when anticipated or unanticipated events drive atypical traffic volumes or otherwise threaten the seamless flow of communications. Broadband network services providers continuously strive to fulfill customers' service quality and reliability expectations by diligently following comprehensive network planning, engineering, deployment, maintenance,

¹⁶ *Local Telephone Competition Report, Status as of December 31, 2008* at 5, Figure 3. The *Local Telephone Competition Report* also indicates that 13 percent of interconnected VoIP subscribers have “nomadic” functionality. *See id.* at 7, Figure 4. The ability of an interconnected VoIP subscriber to use the service over any broadband connection would present special challenges for service disruption reporting. The VoIP service provider is unlikely to know where its customer is when using the service.

¹⁷ *New Part 4 Order*, 19 FCC Rcd at 16838 n. 18.

¹⁸ Historically, network services providers such as Qwest have implemented priority restoration practices and procedures in order to address last mile or network edge outages. The competitive nature of the broadband services market drives a heightened sensitivity and appreciation of the importance of having such practices and procedures in place for broadband networks.

replacement, repair and recovery practices and processes. They have a compelling financial incentive to commit the necessary resources to do so in order to protect and grow their service revenues.¹⁹ Accordingly, the need for a service disruption reporting system for broadband Internet service is not needed as an inducement to broadband network service providers to reduce broadband network service disruptions or improve network management or maintenance practices.

Broadband network service providers and their trade associations participate with many Federal committees, councils and work groups within the Executive Office of the President, DHS, the Department of Defense, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the State Department, and the Department of Commerce that are engaged in public-private partnership activities concerning critical infrastructure protection and reliability. Qwest is an active participant in DHS public-private partnership initiatives concerning physical and cyber security.²⁰ Qwest believes that working cooperatively with government in a partnership setting is a more constructive approach to achieving the Commission's goal of obtaining information for analysis to help it ensure the best response to broadband service disruptions and prevent future disruptions. Qwest believes

¹⁹ "While carriers will never be able to eliminate outages due to weather or natural disasters, reducing outages directly attributable to factors they can control may have a favorable impact on customer retention and the provider's bottom line." PR Newswire – Factiva Dow Jones, June 17, 2010, quoting Frank Perazzini, director of telecommunications at J.D. Power and Associates in article reporting on J.D. Power and Associates 2010 U.S. Major Provider Business Telecommunications Study (SM) – Data Services, rel. June 17, 2010.

²⁰ DHS's Office of Infrastructure Protection works in close coordination with public and private sector partners and leads a coordinated effort to mitigate risks to the nation's critical infrastructure and key resources (CIKR) through the development and implementation of an effective CIKR protection program. DHS sees public-private sector partnerships as essential "in part because the private sector owns and operates approximately 85% of the nation's critical infrastructure, government agencies have access to critical threat information, and each controls security programs, research and development, and other resources that may be more effective if discussed and shared, as appropriate, in a partnership setting [emphasis added]." http://www.dhs.gov/files/partnerships/editorial_0206.shtm.

that the public's interest would be better served if the Commission would forgo imposing service disruption reporting rules on broadband Internet service and, instead, engage in existing Federal government forums concerning the protection and preservation of critical broadband infrastructures as the expert agency on telecommunications. Its expertise would prove invaluable and the dividends produced for the public would be greater than those derived from its implementation of a service disruption reporting system for broadband Internet service.

C. Conditions Precedent Must Be Addressed Before The Commission's Jurisdiction To Act Can Be Determined.

The Commission asks commenters to address the scope of its authority to impose service disruption reporting rules on interconnected VoIP service.²¹ Post *Comcast*,²² significant questions have been raised concerning the scope of the Commission's jurisdiction to regulate information services generally and broadband Internet service specifically.

The Commission determined in its *IP-Enabled Services E-911 Proceeding*²³ that it had sufficient jurisdiction to apply E-911 rules "to those VoIP services that can be used to receive telephone calls that originate on the PSTN *and* can be used to terminate calls to the PSTN -- 'interconnected VoIP services.'"²⁴ The Commission has also extended portions of its Customer Proprietary Network Information (CPNI) rules to VoIP providers under a Title I analysis.²⁵

²¹ See *Public Notice, Legal Issues* at 4.

²² *Comcast v. FCC*, 600 F.3d 642 (D.C. Cir. 2010).

²³ *In the Matters of IP-Enabled Service, E911 Requirements for IP-Enabled Service Providers*, First Report and Order and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 20 FCC Rcd 10245 (2005).

²⁴ *Id.* at ¶ 24.

²⁵ *In the Matter of Implementation of the Telecommunications Act of 1996: Telecommunications Carriers' Use of Customer Proprietary Network Information and Other Customer Information; IP-Enabled Services*, Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 22 FCC Rcd 6927 (2007) (holding that CPNI obligations were reasonably ancillary to the Commission's statutory responsibilities under sections 1, 222 and 706 and asserting Title I jurisdiction), *aff'd sub nom. Nat'l Cable & Telecom. Ass'n v. FCC*, 555 F.3d 996 (D.C. Cir. 2009).

Qwest maintains, though, that there is not a compelling public interest basis for applying service disruption reporting rules to VoIP services.²⁶ Further, the Commission's jurisdiction to impose a service disruption reporting system on VoIP service is uncertain.

Before the existence or scope of the Commission's jurisdiction to establish a service disruption reporting system for interconnected VoIP services can be fully analyzed, the Commission must complete its *IP-Enabled Services Proceeding* and determine whether interconnected VoIP service is a telecommunications service or an information service. Qwest believes that the appropriate regulatory classification for VoIP service is as an information service.²⁷ Qwest encourages the Commission to refrain from applying any new regulations or requirements on VoIP service until it completes its *IP-Enabled Services Proceeding*, when it should conclude that the proper classification for all IP-Enabled services, including VoIP, is as information services.

Before the Commission's jurisdiction to impose a service disruption reporting system on broadband Internet service can be fully assessed, it must first define the term broadband Internet service. It is a very broad term and the *Public Notice* does not define it. In the *Public Notice*, the Commission also uses the terms broadband access provider and broadband Internet access provider without defining them. Qwest infers that a broadband Internet access provider provides the initial broadband connection from a customer's premise into a broadband service provider's metropolitan or regional network. But the *Public Notice* identifies no clear demarcation point separating the broadband "access" network from the broadband metro/regional network or from the Internet backbone network. Qwest cannot comment further on the question of the

²⁶ VoIP service comprises only 13 percent of the wireline retail local telephone service connection in the United States. See Section II.A., *supra*.

²⁷ See Comments of Qwest Communications International Inc. filed in the *IP-Enabled Services Proceeding*, WC Docket No. 04-36, filed May 28, 2004 at 14-24.

Commission's jurisdiction to impose a service disruption reporting system on broadband Internet service beyond suggesting that the farther the Commission moves away from broadband Internet access service toward Internet backbone service, the greater its challenge in establishing its jurisdiction. Those challenges are significant even as to broadband access service.

D. The Commission Should Initiate A Collaborative Process With Those Directly Affected Before Adopting A Service Disruption Reporting System.

If the Commission nonetheless elects to pursue service disruption reporting for interconnected VoIP and/or broadband Internet services,²⁸ it should first engage interconnected VoIP and/or broadband Internet service providers in a collaborative process to determine the relevant criteria for defining a VoIP or broadband Internet service disruption and the available metrics for measuring a VoIP or broadband Internet service disruption. It should then conduct a 12 to 24 month trial during which VoIP and/or broadband Internet service providers could voluntarily report service disruptions²⁹ in accordance with agreed upon criteria and metrics. At the end of the trial, the results should be assessed and a tentative conclusion reached whether voluntary or mandatory service disruption reporting for VoIP or broadband Internet services would serve the public interest when the costs and burdens of such a reporting system are weighed against any quantifiable benefits that would accrue. If the tentative conclusion is in the affirmative as to either service, a voluntary service disruption reporting system could be established or a rulemaking proceeding commenced regarding the adoption of a mandatory service disruption reporting system.³⁰

²⁸ The decision should be subject to a determination that it has jurisdiction to do so.

²⁹ Any reporting should be done over an Internet-based system.

³⁰ The less significant the reasonably anticipated net benefits from a service disruption reporting system, the more compelling the case is for the system to be voluntary.

The Disaster Information Reporting System (DIRS) provides a model that could be used for a voluntary service disruption reporting system. Companies are able to use DIRS on a voluntary basis for daily reporting on the status of their networks, as well as general situational awareness, in areas affected by disasters. Information concerning switching equipment, interoffice facilities, cell sites, broadcast stations, cable systems and public safety answering points is reported. In developing DIRS, the Commission solicited industry input, and as a result, a very workable and useful system for disaster reporting was implemented. DIRS is a success because government and industry were able to come together and work collaboratively to develop a system that is beneficial to the public and meets their respective needs. Should the Commission move forward with a service disruption reporting system for VoIP service and/or broadband Internet service, it should employ the public-private collaborative process used to develop DIRS in designing the system and allow for voluntary service provider reporting as permitted by DIRS.

E. Part 4 Service Disruption Criteria, Metrics And Timelines Would Need To Be Modified In Any Service Disruption Reporting System For VoIP Or Broadband Internet Services.

The Commission should not simply extend its Part 4 rules to interconnected VoIP service or broadband Internet service. The IP-based communications environment, in which a service may simply be an application provided by a service provider unaffiliated with the providers of the multiple broadband networks on which the service is transported before reaching its destination, presents a far more complicated set of variables for identifying and diagnosing service disruptions than the traditional communications environment currently subject to Part 4. Ascertaining ultimate accountability for service disruptions in the IP-based communications environment, and which entity should be required to notify the Commission and report on a service disruption, is also more complicated. The separation of responsibility for service

provisioned from the responsibility for transmission of the service that is enabled by IP networking must be recognized and accounted for in any service disruption reporting system. This level of complexity requires Commission-industry collaboration before any specific service disruption reporting system is proposed for IP-enabled services, such as interconnected VoIP, or broadband Internet service.

The Commission asks whether “significant performance degradations” should be viewed as outages that trigger reporting.³¹ Qwest has serious concerns about a service disruption reporting system for interconnected VoIP service or broadband Internet service that would treat perceived or actual performance degradation as a reportable outage. Any attempt to define the level of performance degradation that would constitute an outage would be arbitrary, and the causes of performance degradation, if identifiable, may reside outside of the service provider’s control.

The Commission asks about the reasonableness of applying the current Part 4 requirements concerning the time for, and contents of, service disruption notifications and reports to interconnected VoIP service and broadband Internet service.³² Qwest believes that both the current Part 4 service disruption thresholds and notification and reporting timeframes are not appropriate for interconnected VoIP service or broadband Internet service.

F. The Confidentiality Of Submitted Information Must Be Preserved.

The Commission asks whether service disruption information submitted by interconnected VoIP service providers and broadband Internet service providers should be treated as presumptively confidential as it is today for those subject to its Part 4 Rules.³³ Qwest

³¹ See *Public Notice* at 3, Interconnected VoIP Service; Broadband Internet Service Providers.

³² See *id.* at 5, Outage Notifications/Reporting Process.

³³ See *id.*

believes that the reasons supporting the Commission's decision to make Part 4 submissions presumptively confidential in 2004 are as relevant and persuasive today as they were then.³⁴ Should the Commission establish a service disruption reporting system for interconnected VoIP service or broadband Internet service, disclosure of the service disruption submissions of either service provider would likely cause competitive harm; enable access to sensitive communications infrastructure information by those committed to disrupting communications; and discourage forthright disclosure by service providers.³⁵ Accordingly, service disruption information submitted to the Commission by the providers of interconnected VoIP service or broadband Internet service should be treated as presumptively confidential, as it is today under Part 4.

In its comments in the *New Part 4 Proceeding*, DHS addressed the danger to critical communications infrastructure posed by the public disclosure of service disruption information reported to the Commission:

DHS firmly believes that any expansion of the outage reporting rule adopted by the Commission must be accompanied by appropriate measures to safeguard reporting data to the maximum extent consistent with applicable information access laws.

While this information is critical to identify and mitigate vulnerabilities in the system, it can equally be employed by hostile actors to identify vulnerabilities for the purpose of exploiting them.

Depending on the disruption in question, the errant disclosure to an adversary of this information concerning even a single event may present a grave risk to the infrastructure.³⁶

³⁴ See *New Part 4 Order*, 19 FCC Rcd at 16855 ¶ 45.

³⁵ *Id.*

³⁶ See Comments of the Department of Homeland Security, filed June 2, 2004, ET Docket No. 04-35 at 14 (emphasis added).

Today, the threat environment for critical communications infrastructures continues to be high, the ability of bad actors to exploit exposed network vulnerabilities is greater, and the need to safeguard sensitive service disruption information concerning broadband facilities and the services carried over them is more critical.

The Commission observes that today it shares information submitted to it pursuant to its Part 4 Rules with DHS, on a confidential basis, and asks if it should continue that practice were it to expand service disruption reporting requirements to interconnected VoIP service or broadband Internet service.³⁷ Qwest supports the Commission sharing any additional service disruption information that it receives with DHS on the same basis as it shares such information today. Further, Qwest has no objection to the Commission sharing this information with other Federal agencies that have a need to know in accordance with the confidential sharing arrangement that exists with DHS, as long as the confidentiality of the shared information is preserved.

Qwest would also not oppose the Commission sharing some submitted service disruption information with those States that have the legal ability to keep it confidential, commit to doing so, and agree to reasonable restrictions.³⁸ Qwest is concerned that open records laws in some states may limit the ability of some states to protect the information from public disclosure. Specific service disruption information should only be shared with a State upon a showing that the information sought is needed by the State entity or entities that have access to it in order to conduct authorized or mandated governmental functions.

³⁷ *Public Notice* at ¶ 22.

³⁸ *See generally* the Comments and Reply Comments of the United States Telecom Association, filed Mar. 4 and Mar. 19, 2010, respectively, and the Reply Comments of the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions, filed Mar. 19, 2010, ET 04-35, RM-11588, concerning appropriate restrictions. Qwest would encourage the Commission to bring this proceeding to a close before considering the sharing of service disruption submissions or any of the information contained in them with the states or state entities.

III. CONCLUSION

There is no need for the Commission to impose a service disruption reporting system on interconnected VoIP service or broadband Internet service. That the Commission has yet to complete its *IP-Enabled Services Proceeding* to determine the regulatory classification of interconnected VoIP service and does not define the scope of broadband Internet service in the *Public Notice* hampers an analysis of the Commission's jurisdiction to require service disruption reporting by interconnected VoIP service providers or broadband Internet service providers.

It would be counter-productive for the Commission to simply extend its Part 4 Rules to interconnected VoIP providers or broadband Internet providers. To the extent that the Commission proceeds forward with service disruption reporting for interconnected VoIP service or broadband Internet service, it should first enter into a collaborative process with the affected service providers to identify the relevant criteria and available metrics upon which reporting would be based and conduct a voluntary trial before establishing a permanent or mandatory reporting system. The IP-based communications environment presents a far more complicated set of variables for identifying, diagnosing and ascertaining accountability for service disruptions than the traditional communications environment covered by Part 4.

Service disruption information continues to be very sensitive information and its confidentiality must be preserved. Any service disruption information submitted to the

Commission should continue to be treated as presumptively confidential, and it should only be shared with other governmental entities with a need to know and the capacity to protect its confidentiality.

Respectfully submitted,

QWEST COMMUNICATIONS
INTERNATIONAL INC.

By: /s/ Lawrence E. Sarjeant
Craig J. Brown
Lawrence E. Sarjeant
Suite 950
607 14th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005
202-429-3112
Craig.brown@qwest.com
Lawrence.sarjeant@qwest.com

Its Attorneys

August 2, 2010

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Richard Grozier, do hereby certify that I have caused the foregoing **COMMENTS OF QWEST COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL INC.** to be: 1) filed with the Office of the Secretary of the FCC via ECFS in ET Docket No. 04-35, WC Docket No. 05-271, and GN Docket Nos. 09-47, 09-51, 09-137; and 2) served via e-mail on the FCC's duplicating contractor, Best Copy and Printing, Inc. at www.bcpweb.com.

/s/Richard Grozier

August 2, 2010