



**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
STATE OF MISSOURI**

In the Matter of the Application of)
Wisper ISP Inc. for Designation as an)
Eligible Telecommunications Carrier) Case No. CA-2019-0196

DATA REQUESTS TO WISPER ISP

COMES NOW Conexon, LLC, GoSEMO, LLC, and Callabyte Technology, LLC
(hereinafter, collectively “Intervenors”), by their undersigned counsel, and pursuant to 4
CSR 240-2.090, hereby propound the following Data Requests on Wisper ISP:

1. Why did Wisper wait until December 21, 2018, to file its Application for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in Missouri – nearly four months after Wisper was announced as a CAF-II winning bidder in Missouri – when the FCC has required CAF-II winning bidders to obtain ETC designation status by February 25, 2019, absent grant of a waiver by the FCC?
2. Please provide a complete and unredacted copy of Wisper’s ETC Application, including all financial information. Intervenors, as of this date, have not received a copy of Wisper’s Exhibit D to its ETC Application.
3. Please provide copies of Wisper ISP Inc.’s CAF-II short-form and long-form applications and all related exhibits filed with the Federal Communications Commission, including all CAF-II financial documentation and network design exhibits.
4. Please explain how the Company will be able to increase its current broadband speeds to 100/20 Mbps, assuming that the Company will have at least a 70 percent subscription rate for its voice and broadband services by the time it will meet its final CAF-II service milestone, as is required by the FCC’s CAF-II rules.
5. On page 6 of Wisper’s ETC application, Wisper states it will use “fixed wireless – either 3.5 (CBRS), 2.4 GHz, 2.5 GHz (EBS), 5 GHz, TVWS, or 60 GHz – for last mile service.” Please identify the wireless licenses currently licensed or leased by Wisper to provide these last-mile voice and broadband services to potential customers in Wisper’s CAF-II winning census blocks in Missouri.
6. On page 8 of Wisper’s ETC application, Wisper states that “[t]he Company offers high speed connectivity with military grade security and adjustable speeds to both residences and business in its coverage area.” Please describe, in more detail, what constitutes “military grade security”?

7. On page 8 of Wisper's ETC application, Wisper provides current speed and pricing information for various service options. What pricing and terms of service does Wisper expect to offer to its customers in Missouri wishing to subscribe to 100 Mbps (downlink)/20 Mbps (uplink) broadband services, as well as interconnected VoIP services, in Wisper's CAF-II winning areas in Missouri?
8. On page 9 of Wisper's ETC application, Wisper states that based on a Lifeline applicant's "... qualification status, services they are interested in, and if service from Wisper is available in their area, the appropriate packages will be offered to the customer for sign up and installation will be scheduled." Is Wisper making all of its voice and/or broadband service plans it offers available to Lifeline customers or only certain Wisper service plans?
9. Please describe how Wisper will enable customers to make reasonable requests for service in its CAF-II winning areas. If Wisper is unable to fulfill a reasonable request for service from a customer residing within in its CAF-II winning areas, will Wisper report the unfulfilled request for service to the Commission?
10. When does Wisper plan to initially offer broadband and interconnected VoIP services to one or more CAF-II winning census blocks in Missouri?
11. On page 14 of Wisper's ETC application, the Company states that "[f]or its Missouri Census Blocks, Wisper committed to offer 25 Mbps download and 3 Mbps upload." Please explain whether this sentence accurately reflects Wisper's CAF-II performance obligations as a winning bidder in most areas of Missouri in the FCC's CAF-II auction. If not, please accurately explain Wisper's CAF-II performance obligations in most areas of Missouri, as well as the reason for the error.
12. On page 16 of Wisper's ETC application, with regard to the provision of E911 services, Wisper states that "Wisper's VoIP service requires an Internet Protocol (IP) connection to the Company's network or public Internet and 120 VAC power to function. In the event of a failure of the IP connection or the local AC power, the service, including the E911 feature, will not function." Please explain how Wisper complies with 47 C.F.R. § 54.101(a)(1) of the FCC's rules if Wisper is unable to provide its customers with access 911 and/or E911 services in the event of a failure of the IP connection or the local AC power.
13. With respect to its provision of interconnected VoIP services, please explain how Wisper complies with 47 C.F.R. § 54.202(a)(2) of the FCC's rules in terms of remaining functional in emergency situations (e.g., IP connection failure or local AC power failure) with regard solely to Wisper's provision of interconnected VoIP services.
14. On the first page of Wisper's Response to Application to Intervene, dated Jan. 29, 2019, Wisper states "...Petitioners have not been deputized to monitor Wisper's compliance with CAF II buildout requirements. That role squarely rests with the Federal Communications Commission." Is it Wisper's position that the Missouri Public Service

Commission should have no role in monitoring Wisper's compliance with its CAF-II buildout requirements? What role, if any, does Wisper believe that the Missouri Public Service Commission should play in regard to Wisper's participation in the federal USF program?

15. On page 2 of Wisper's response to Application to Intervene, Wisper indicates that there has not been sufficient business rationale to offer 100 Mbps download speed in certain markets. Why has Wisper concluded that there has not been sufficient business rationale to offer 100 Mbps download speeds in these markets?
16. Please provide approximate numbers of current Wisper residential customers who subscribe to Wisper service plans with download speeds of 100 Mbps or higher. If the number of subscribers is zero, please indicate the highest tier residential service offering and the approximate number of current Wisper customers subscribing to such service in the CAF-II areas in Missouri.
17. Please provide any speed test data of its 100 Mbps service performed consistent with FCC CAF-II testing protocols of the FCC's Connect America Fund, WC Docket No. 10-90, Order, DA 18-710 (WCB, WTB, OET rel. July 6, 2018) ("Metrics Order") If no such tests have been performed, or data or such service is available, please explain why Wisper believes it is capable of complying with the Metrics Order in the future.
18. On page 2 of Wisper's response to Application to Intervene, Wisper states that after the CAF II areas are built, Wisper will have added 150 to 200 fiber circuits across its network. How many fiber circuits does Wisper anticipate having in Missouri?
19. According to Wisper's Detailed Network Buildout Plan Wisper is primarily planning to use 3.5 GHz and 5 GHz 'last mile' access points. In many areas of Missouri unlicensed spectrum is heavily used by current wireless operators. How does Wisper intend to deal with incumbents currently providing service using the same spectrum? Has Wisper performed spectrum analysis within the awarded Census Block Groups to determine spectrum availability? How will Wisper work around future interference while maintaining the committed level of performance?
20. A number of Census Block Groups awarded to Wisper are in geographically challenging areas. In addition to terrain, dense vegetation (trees) make good RF signal coverage a challenge. Can Wisper's technology meet service level commitments by overcoming such difficult conditions? Have all service projections been completed through the use of computer models, or has onsite engineering been conducted to validate predictions?
21. Will Wisper serve the public interest by pricing services within the ranges defined in the annual Urban Rate Survey? Wisper's current advertised pricing appears to exceed those in the FCC's survey. Please explain.
22. Please identify all Officers and Directors of Wisper ISP, Inc.

23. Please provide copies of all responses provided by Wisper to any other party to this proceeding, including Commission Staff.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Megan E. Ray

Megan E. Ray, *Mo. Bar #62037*
Andreck, Evans, Lewis, Figg & Battagler, L.L.C
3816 S. Greystone Ct., Ste. B
Springfield, MO 65804
(417) 864-6401 (telephone)
(417) 864-4967 (fax)
Email: mray@lawofficemo.com

ATTORNEY FOR INTERVENORS

Certificate of Service

The undersigned certifies that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was served by electronic mail, this 7th day of February 2019 upon all counsel of record:

Douglas C. Gruenke (Mo Bar #56047)
Bruckert, Gruenke & Long, P.C.
1002 East Wesley Drive
Suite 100
O'Fallon, Illinois 62269
618.624.4221
dcg@bglattorneys.com

Kristopher E. Twomey
Law Office of Kristopher E. Twomey, P.C.
1725 I Street, N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20006
202.681.1850
kris@lokt.net

/s/ Megan E. Ray

Megan E. Ray