



Telecom Order CRTC 2012-297

PDF version

Ottawa, 17 May 2012

Sogetel inc. – Local network interconnection

File numbers: Tariff Notices 149, 149A, and 149B

Introduction

1. The Commission received an application from Sogetel inc. (Sogetel), dated 3 February 2012, and amended on 7 and 14 February 2012, in which the company proposed revisions to its General Tariff in order to introduce item 4.21 – Local network interconnection.
2. Sogetel submitted that by introducing this item, it was complying with Telecom Decision 2012-42, in which the Commission approved Sogetel's local competition implementation plan. This plan was filed with the Commission in response to a formal signed expression of interest from TELUS Communications Company (TCC) and Cogeco Cable Inc. (Cogeco), which indicated that TCC wished to interconnect with Sogetel to enable Cogeco Câble Québec s.e.n.c. to provide local services as a competitive local exchange carrier (CLEC) in Sogetel's serving territory.
3. Sogetel submitted that it had used the rates and provisions of Bell Aliant Regional Communications, Limited Partnership's Access Services Tariff item 105 – Local network interconnection and component unbundling, modified to address TCC's and Cogeco's requested services, as well as the provisions of TCC's tariff regarding information requested about 9-1-1 service.
4. The Commission approved Sogetel's application on an interim basis in Telecom Order 2012-112.
5. The Commission received comments from TCC regarding Sogetel's application. The public record of this proceeding, which closed on 25 March 2012, is available on the Commission's website at www.crtc.gc.ca under "Public Proceedings" or by using the file numbers provided above.

Should the Commission approve Sogetel's proposed tariff?

6. TCC submitted that Sogetel's proposed tariff provides that Sogetel will inform the CLEC if, during interconnection, a traffic imbalance between Sogetel and the CLEC occurs for three consecutive months on one or more specific trunk groups. TCC submitted that this three-month period does not apply in Sogetel's case because Sogetel has proposed to interconnect based on local interconnection regions (LIRs), and that Sogetel should modify its tariff accordingly.

7. TCC added that the signalling points of interconnection (POIs) that Sogetel mentioned in its proposed tariff were not appropriate. Specifically, TCC submitted that Sogetel had mentioned only two signalling POIs, each providing access to three area codes (450, 418, and 819). TCC also submitted that one of these POIs is located in Téléphone Milot inc.'s (Milot) territory, rather than in Sogetel's. TCC therefore requested that Sogetel declare signalling POIs that meet the Commission's requirements.

Commission's analysis and determinations

8. 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.
9. The Commission has reviewed Sogetel's proposed tariff and considers that it covers the services requested by TCC and Cogeco. The Commission also considers that the proposed rates meet the pricing constraints applicable to competitor services set out in Telecom Decision 2006-14. However, the Commission considers that some modifications to the proposed tariff are required, as set out below.
10. The Commission notes that, consistent with Telecom Decision 2006-35, when LIR based interconnection occurs, the local exchange carrier must inform the other local exchange carrier as soon as a traffic imbalance is detected. The Commission also notes that the three-month period mentioned in Sogetel's proposed tariff applies only to certain interconnection arrangements that are grandfathered through the exchange-based interconnection regime, consistent with Telecom Decision 2006-35, and that this regime does not apply to Sogetel. The Commission therefore considers that Sogetel's proposed tariff should be modified to remove the mention of the three-month period.
11. Regarding signalling POIs, the Commission notes that in Telecom Decision 97-8, it required that each company provide a signalling POI in each area code in which it provides services. The Commission also notes that, in Telecom Order 98-486, it found that when two local exchange carriers operate in the same set of area codes, a separate signalling POI in each area code is not required. The Commission therefore considers that it is not necessary to require Sogetel to provide a separate signalling POI for each of the three area codes in which it serves because TCC and Sogetel operate in the same set of area codes.
12. Regarding Sogetel's proposal to provide a signalling POI in Milot's territory, the Commission notes that in Telecom Decision 97-8, it did not specifically require that the signalling POIs that companies provide be located in their serving territory. Given the specific circumstances surrounding small incumbent local exchange carriers, the Commission considers that it would not be appropriate to require that they provide their signalling POIs in their serving territories. Accordingly, the Commission considers Sogetel's proposed signalling POIs to be acceptable.

13. In light of the above, the Commission **approves** Sogetel's application, effective the date of this order, subject to the company replacing item 4.21.3.1 g) on page 6 with the following:

- *Il peut se produire un déséquilibre de trafic lorsque l'échange de trafic entre une ESLC et l'entreprise se fait sur des circuits désignés à facturation sans partage. L'entreprise avisera l'ESLC du déséquilibre dès qu'elle le détecte. Les tarifs mensuels s'appliquent aux déséquilibres de trafic réels à compter de la date où l'entreprise avise l'ESLC de l'existence d'un déséquilibre, pour aussi longtemps que le déséquilibre existe. La facturation commencera un mois après la date de l'avis.*

14. The Commission directs Sogetel to file the modification described above with the Commission for information purposes, within **15 days** of the date of this order.

Secretary General

Related documents

- Telecom Order CRTC 2012-112, 22 February 2012
- *Sogetel inc. – Implementation of local competition for Cogeco Cable Inc.*, Telecom Decision CRTC 2012-42, 24 January 2012
- *Follow-up to Trunking arrangements for the interchange of traffic and the point of interconnection between local exchange carriers*, *Telecom Decision CRTC 2004-46*, Telecom Decision CRTC 2006-35, 29 May 2006
- *Revised regulatory framework for the small incumbent local exchange carriers*, Telecom Decision CRTC 2006-14, 29 March 2006
- *Transiting and points of interconnection*, Telecom Order CRTC 98-486, 19 May 1998
- *Local competition*, Telecom Decision CRTC 97-8, 1 May 1997