



Timothy M. Boucher
Associate General Counsel
1801 California Street – 10th Floor
Denver, CO 80202
Phone 303-992-5751
Facsimile 303-896-1107
Timothy.boucher@centurylink.com

EX PARTE

VIA ECFS

August 5, 2014

Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, DC 20554

RE: *In the Matter of Protecting the Open Internet*, GN Docket No. 14-28; *In the Matter of Framework for Broadband Internet Service*, GN Docket No. 10-127 – Erratum to Comments of CenturyLink of July 17, 2014

Dear Ms. Dortch:

CenturyLink filed Comments in the above-referenced proceedings on July 17, 2014. Subsequently, it has come to CenturyLink's attention that there is an inadvertent typographical error on page 57.

The following three sentences on pages 56-57 of the Comments currently read as follows:

“For example, the DC Circuit, in *Verizon*, has already found that the adoption of a no blocking rule that effectively requires that broadband providers provide a minimum level of service for free to edge providers would constitute impermissible common carrier regulation.[footnote ¹⁶⁵ omitted] The no blocking rule proposed in the *NPRM* still imposes a minimum level of service for free and purports to extend the benefit of that requirement to edge providers. As such, it constitutes permissible common carrier regulation.”

The third sentence, which contains the error, is corrected to read as follows:

“For example, the DC Circuit, in *Verizon*, has already found that the adoption of a no blocking rule that effectively requires that broadband providers provide a minimum level of service for free to edge providers would constitute impermissible common carrier regulation.[footnote ¹⁶⁵ omitted] The no blocking rule proposed in the *NPRM* still imposes a minimum level of service for free and purports to extend the benefit of that requirement to edge providers. As such, it constitutes impermissible common carrier regulation.”

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch
August 5, 2014

Page 2 of 2

As indicated, CenturyLink requests that the word “impermissible” be substituted for the word “permissible” so that the second full sentence on page 57 conveys the meaning intended. CenturyLink asks that today’s erratum filing be added to the record in both GN Docket Nos. 14-28 and 10-127.

Please contact the undersigned with any questions.

Sincerely,

/s/ Timothy M. Boucher,
Counsel for CenturyLink