



## Telecom Order CRTC 2012-257

PDF version

Ottawa, 27 April 2012

### **Bruce Telecom – Access services tariff**

File numbers: Tariff Notices 140 and 140A

1. The Commission received an application by Bruce Telecom, dated 3 February 2012 and amended on 22 February 2012, in which the company proposed to introduce its Access Services Tariff.
2. Bruce Telecom submitted that the proposed tariff was filed in accordance with the Commission's directions in Telecom Decision 2012-35. In that decision, the Commission approved Bruce Telecom's implementation plans for local competition and wireless number portability (WNP), which the company had filed in response to formal expressions of interest from Bragg Communications Inc., operating as EastLink (EastLink), and Rogers Communications, on behalf of Rogers Wireless (Rogers).
3. The Commission received comments from EastLink regarding Bruce Telecom's application. The public record of this proceeding, which closed on 2 April 2012, is available on the Commission's website at [www.crtc.gc.ca](http://www.crtc.gc.ca) under "Public Proceedings" or by using the file numbers provided above.

### **Commission's analysis and determinations**

4. In its application, Bruce Telecom proposed to introduce the following services:
  - Item 100 – Local Network Interconnection; and
  - Item 200 – Local Number Portability (LNP) and Wireless Number Portability (WNP).
5. Bruce Telecom indicated that the proposed rates for these services were based on rates that the Commission had approved for Bell Aliant Regional Communications, Limited Partnership.
6. In its comments, EastLink stated that it generally agreed with Bruce Telecom's proposed tariff. However, EastLink submitted that Bruce Telecom's proposed local service request (LSR) rejection charge should be subject to the outcome of Telecom Notice of Consultation 2012-72, in which the Commission is addressing whether approval of an LSR rejection charge should be conditional upon the telecommunications carrier developing and implementing access to its operational support systems.

7. The Commission notes that competitor services are assigned to the fourth basket of the price cap framework set out in Telecom Decision 2006-14. In that decision, the Commission determined that rates for services in the fourth basket would be allowed to increase up to any rate approved by the Commission for the same service.
8. The Commission has reviewed Bruce Telecom's proposed tariff and considers that it includes the services requested by EastLink and Rogers. The Commission also considers that the proposed rates meet the pricing constraint for competitor services that was set out in Telecom Decision 2006-14.
9. The Commission notes, however, that the determinations that result from the Telecom Notice of Consultation 2012-72 proceeding may affect Bruce Telecom's proposed LSR rejection charge. The Commission therefore considers that it would be appropriate to wait until it issues its decision on that proceeding before providing its determinations on the introduction of Bruce Telecom's LSR rejection charge.
10. In light of the above, the Commission **approves in part** Bruce Telecom's application, effective the date of this order. Specifically, the Commission approves the application except for Bruce Telecom's proposed item 200.4 – Local Service Request (LSR) Rejection Charge. The Commission will provide its determinations on Bruce Telecom's proposed LSR rejection charge after it issues its decision on the Telecom Notice of Consultation 2012-72 proceeding.

Secretary General

#### **Related documents**

- *Review of conditions for approval of a local service request rejection charge*, Telecom Notice of Consultation CRTC 2012-72, 6 February 2012
- *Bruce Telecom – Implementation of local competition for Bragg Communications Inc., operating as EastLink, and wireless number portability for Rogers Communications, on behalf of Rogers Wireless*, Telecom Decision CRTC 2012-35, 24 January 2012
- *Revised regulatory framework for the small incumbent local exchange carriers*, Telecom CRTC Decision 2006-14, 29 March 2006