

# New Networks Institute

---

December 24<sup>th</sup>, 2015

Re: AT&T's Objection to Disclosure of Confidential Or Highly Confidential Information To Mr. Kushnick Under The Governing Protective Orders, WC Docket No. 05-25 RM-10593

Dear Ms. Dortch:

Sent via FCC Electronic Filing System

1. **IMPORTANT:** We never received notification of the new AT&T objection letter dated December 18<sup>th</sup>, 2015, from either AT&T or their law firm, Sidley Austin.
2. We found out about it from one of our lawyers, who sent us this notice, on December 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2014.

**“AT&T Objects to Disclosure of Confidential Special Access Data** “AT&T filed a [letter](#) on December 18, 2015, objecting to disclosure of its confidential special access information and data to Bruce Kushnick. AT&T said it previously [objected](#) to Kushnick’s request on October 13, 2015, and asserted Kushnick’s [reply](#) to that letter only confirms he does not qualify to obtain the highly sensitive materials that are subject to the Protective Orders.”

3. We ask that the FCC immediately grant our request for Bruce Kushnick to examine the special access data—because the clock is ticking.
4. We believe AT&T’s plan is to take advantage of my (Bruce Kushnick) personal time and of our small, independent group, which has limited resources—and run out the clock.
5. And it is obvious that AT&T (and Verizon) are concerned I will uncover issues about their special access service offerings—Why else would they single us out?
6. We will be filing a longer response to address the embarrassing barrage of miss-information from AT&T about New Networks Institute, our research, and the consortium of experts, auditors and lawyers.
7. AT&T-Sidley is claiming that I would somehow break the law and not fully live by the conditions of the letter of confidentiality I signed.

# New Networks Institute

---

8. If AT&T-Sidley has any evidence that I have ever violated a letter of confidentiality, it needs to produce such information now—or apologize for making such vulgar claims.
9. Bruce Kushnick has been a telecom analyst for 34 years, and yet AT&T-Sidley paints Bruce Kushnick as only a ‘blogger’. AT&T-Sidley also questions our expertise but doesn’t bother to mention our extensive research and filings, and our expertise used in legal and regulatory actions. For example, we have previously filed over 70 times at the FCC, including Data Quality Act complaints, as well as been active in multiple state proceedings—since 1994.
  - <http://newnetworks.com/mission-statement/bibliography/>
10. Moreover, the reports we submitted as part of these proceedings, (and others) are the first two in a series called “Fixing Telecom” and were created with a team of experts, auditors and lawyers.
  - Expert Team: <http://newnetworks.com/nniexperts/>
11. TeleTruth, our advocacy group, established in 2002, has been mostly inactive for over two years, but has a long history of public interest work. We were a member of the FCC’s Consumer Advisory Committee in 2003, for example.
12. It is clear that instead of any valid excuses to block my access to this new information, AT&T and Verizon would send a series of garbage letters of objection to run out the clock and therefore our ability to protect the Public Interest.
13. Over 2 months have passed since I filed to see the data. AT&T-Sidley’s failure to send us an email of notification about this new letter is par for the course. We waited long enough.

Bruce Kushnick, Executive Director  
[bruce@newnetwork.com](mailto:bruce@newnetwork.com)  
718-333-5161  
185 Marine Ave,  
Brooklyn NY, 11209

CC: [Specialaccess@fcc.gov](mailto:Specialaccess@fcc.gov), [cshenk@sidley.com](mailto:cshenk@sidley.com)