August 28, 2009

Mr. Robert A. Morin
Secretary General
Canadian Radio-television and
Telecommunications Commission
Ottawa, ON K1A 0N2

Dear Mr. Morin:

Subject: Call for comments – Nomadic VoIP E9-1-1 service, Telecom Notice of Consultation CRTC 2009-194 (“Notice 2009-194”) – Interrogatories posed to other parties

In accordance with the proceeding schedule established for Notice 2009-194 TELUS Communications Company attaches interrogatories addressed to the following parties:

Cogeco Cable Inc. Attachment A
Rogers Communications Inc. Attachment B
Shaw Communications Inc. Attachment C

Yours truly,

{original signed by Ted Woodhead}

Ted Woodhead
Vice-President
Telecom Policy & Regulatory Affairs

EE/cs

Attachments
cc: Interested Parties to Notice 2009-194
    Paul Godin, CRTC
    Eric Edora, TELUS, (613) 597-8313
Interrogatories for: Cogeco Cable Inc. (“Cogeco”)

Cogeco(TELUS)28Aug09-1

Please refer to the alternative option proposed by Cogeco beginning at paragraph 19 of Cogeco’s August 7, 2009. Please explain the functional differences between this alternative option and the solution proposed in ESCO0283.
**Interrogatories for: Rogers Communications Inc. (“Rogers”)**

**Rogers(TELUS)28Aug09-1**

Please refer to paragraph 16 of Attachment 2 to Rogers’ August 7, 2009 Submission. Please explain the full process as to how the PSAP automatically obtains the updated civic address if a 911 call is made.

**Rogers(TELUS)28Aug09-2**

Please refer to paragraph 19 of Attachment 2 to Rogers’ August 7, 2009 Submission. Please confirm whether it is the VoIP service provider that has the database that maps IP addresses to civic addresses. Is the VoIP service provider responsible for validating that the civic address aligns with Street Address Guide format?

**Rogers(TELUS)28Aug09-3**

Please refer to paragraph 21 of Attachment 2 to Rogers’ August 7, 2009 Submission. Please explain why the home router configuration is a factor to identify whether the subscriber belongs to the same range of the DHCP IP address pool.

**Rogers(TELUS)28Aug09-4**

At paragraph 5 of Attachment 3 to its August 7, 2009 Submission, Rogers states the following.

Rogers will deploy a real-time Query server with connections to Rogers DHCP servers and back office systems as well as the ILEC’s LIS. The ILEC’s LIS will query Rogers’ RQS for the MAC:civic address associated with an IP Address. In real-time the RQS will query Rogers’ DHCP servers using the IP Address to obtain the associated MAC address. The RQS will then query Rogers back office systems to obtain the civic address associated with the MAC address. Finally the RQS passes the MAC:Civic address mapping to the ILEC LIS and then the process.

Given the number of query processes that take place in this proposal, are there any concerns regarding latency? Please explain.
Interrogatories for: Shaw Communications Inc. (“Shaw”)

Shaw(TELUS)28Aug09-1

Please refer to the description of the alternative proposal provided at paragraph 4 of Shaw’s Alternative Proposal Document filed on August 7, 2009. Please explain how Shaw’s proposal would deal with situations where the ASP’s customer interface devices do not have unique logical connection identifier.