



Telecom Decision CRTC 2005-6-1

Ottawa, 28 April 2006

Competitor Digital Network Services

Reference: 8661-C12-10/02, 8678-C12-11/01, 8638-C12-61/02, 8740-B2-6621/01, 8740-B2-200306771, 8740-M3-200307084, 8740-M3-200404781, 8740-T66-0057/02, 8740-T66-0063/02, 8740-T66-200313031 and 8740-S22-200406852

Erratum: Telecom Decision CRTC 2005-6

1. In *Competitor Digital Network Services*, Telecom Decision CRTC 2005-6, 3 February 2005 (Decision 2005-6), the Commission rendered its determinations in the proceeding initiated by *Competitor Digital Network Access service proceeding*, Telecom Public Notice CRTC 2002-4, 9 August 2002. In this Erratum, the Commission makes various corrections to Decision 2005-6 that, where applicable, are highlighted in bold italic.
2. In paragraph 17 of Decision 2005-6, the Commission described the Competitor Digital Network Access (CDNA) service eligibility of certain configurations, based on the Commission's confirmation in *Interim Competitor Digital Network Access service*, Telecom Decision CRTC 2002-78, 23 December 2002 that competitors may use components of the CDNA service in conjunction with any other incumbent local exchange carrier (ILEC) services or service components at tariffed rates, or with services self-supplied or provided by others. In paragraph 17 of Decision 2005-6, the Commission stated, in part

If the competitor was not co-located at the second ILEC wire centre, the competitor would obtain another access facility, not available as part of the CDNA service, to connect to its switch.
3. In paragraph 13 of *Rogers Telecom Holdings Inc. – Application with respect to Competitor Digital Network Access service*, Telecom Decision CRTC 2006-8, 15 February 2006, the Commission noted that the word "not" was mistakenly included before the text "available as part of the CDNA service to connect to its switch" and that the last sentence in paragraph 17 of Decision 2005-6 should have read as follows:

If the competitor was not co-located at the second ILEC wire centre, the competitor would obtain another access facility, available as part of the CDNA service, to connect to its switch.
4. In paragraph 276 of Decision 2005-6, the Commission discussed repair intervals and, in the final sentence of that paragraph, stated that Allstream Corp., now MTS Allstream Inc. (MTS Allstream), and other parties did not comment with respect to the mean-time-to-repair (MTTR) for the CDNA service in the proceeding initiated by *Finalization of the Quality of Service rate adjustment plan for competitors*, Telecom Public Notice CRTC 2003-9, 30 October 2003. This sentence was included in error and is factually incorrect. Accordingly, paragraph 276 of Decision 2005-6, as corrected with the deletion of this sentence, reads as follows:

In Decision 2002-34, the Commission stipulated that the interim CDNA service should be provisioned on a monthly basis with an average four-hour MTTR. By letter dated 13 December 2003, addressed to Allstream and other parties involved in the follow-up process to Decision 2003-48, the Commission stated that the issue of determining the appropriate MTTR for the CDNA service was within the scope of the process begun by *Finalization of the Quality of Service rate adjustment plan for competitors*, Telecom Public Notice CRTC 2003-9, 30 October 2003 (Public Notice 2003-9).

5. In paragraph 363 of Decision 2005-6, the Commission determined minimum average working fill factor (AWFF) values for central office (CO) optical transmission equipment, CO copper-based transmission equipment, fibre loop, fibre drop, and copper loop. The Commission stated, in part (b): "for fibre and copper loops in Bands A and B, minimum AWFFs of 70% for Bands A and B and 60% for Bands C to G." Part (b) of this sentence should have read "(b) for fibre and copper loops, minimum AWFFs of 70% for Bands A and B and 60% for Bands C to G." Accordingly, paragraph 363 of Decision 2005-6, as corrected, reads as follows:

In light of the above, the Commission determines that the following minimum AWFF values are appropriate for cost studies which include CO optical transmission equipment, CO copper-based transmission equipment, fibre loop, fibre drop, and copper loop: (a) for CO optical and copper-based transmission equipment, minimum AWFFs of 80% for Bands A and B and 70% for Bands C to G; **(b) for fibre and copper loops, minimum AWFFs of 70% for Bands A and B and 60% for Bands C to G;** and (c) minimum AWFFs of 50% for fibre drop/distribution in all bands.

6. In paragraph 567 of Decision 2005-6, the Commission discussed the deferral account of Saskatchewan Telecommunications (SaskTel) and, in the fourth sentence of that paragraph, stated that "the Commission determines that SaskTel's CDNA rates are to be replaced, retroactive to 1 June 2002, by rates equal to SaskTel's retail [Digital Network Access] DNA service rates at 1 June 2002." The reference to "at 1 June 2002" was inserted in error. In this respect, the Commission notes that reductions to SaskTel's DNA service rates had been approved subsequent to 1 June 2002. Accordingly, the fourth sentence in paragraph 567 of Decision 2005-6 is corrected to read as follows:

Consequently, the Commission determines that SaskTel's CDNA rates are to be replaced, retroactive to 1 June 2002, by rates equal to SaskTel's retail DNA service rates ***applicable to the period in question.***

7. In paragraph 579 of Decision 2005-6, the Commission noted that SaskTel's interim CDNA rates were to be replaced by its "current" retail DNA service rates retroactive to 1 June 2002. The word "current" was included in error. As noted above in connection with paragraph 567, reductions to SaskTel's DNA service rates had been approved subsequent to 1 June 2002. Paragraph 579 of Decision 2005-6, as corrected, is as follows:

In this Decision, the Commission considers it appropriate to compensate ILECs for lost retail revenue due to retroactive rate adjustments for the existing CDNA service. The Commission notes, as determined above, that SaskTel's interim CDNA rates are being replaced by its retail DNA service rates retroactive to 1 June 2002, and, therefore, no compensation is required for SaskTel.

8. In paragraph 612 of Decision 2005-6, the Commission stated that SaskTel proposed to introduce a CO Link Channelizing Feature specific to optical co-location links. The Commission notes that the co-location links in question identified by SaskTel were in fact copper, not optical, links. Accordingly, paragraph 612 of Decision 2005-6, as corrected, reads as follows:

The Commission received an application, Tariff Notice 67, by SaskTel, dated 30 June 2004, to add item 610.20, Link Arrangements for Interconnecting Canadian Carriers, to its Competitor Access Tariff. In its application, SaskTel proposed to introduce CO Link Channelizing Feature specific to *copper* co-location links.

9. In Table 13 of Decision 2005-6, titled "Metropolitan IX service rates per mile per month (\$)", "Up to" was included in error in the column headings that read "Up to DS-0", "Up to DS-1" and "Up to DS-3." Accordingly, Table 13 of Decision 2005-6 is corrected by removing the references to "Up to" from these column headings, as set out below.

Table 13

Metropolitan IX service rates per mile per month (\$)

	DS-0	DS-1	DS-3
All ILECs	3.43	41.05	369.35

10. In Table 14 of Decision 2005-6, titled "Service order charge per CDN access (\$)," the service order charge per CDN access of MTS Communications Inc., now MTS Allstream, for the OC-12 transmission speed was omitted in error. In addition, due to a formula input error, the service order charge per CDN access for the DS-3 transmission speed for each ILEC was incorrectly set out in Table 14. In paragraph 549 of Decision 2005-6, the Commission determined that the mark-up to be applied to this rate element was to correspond with that applied to the recurring rate element of the DS-3 access service. As a result of a clerical error, the wrong mark-up level was applied to the service order charge for the DS-3 access component of the CDN service. Accordingly, Table 14 of Decision 2005-6 is corrected by including, for MTS Allstream, a service charge per CDN access for the OC-12 transmission speed, and by inserting the corrected service order charge per CDN access for the DS-3 transmission speed for all ILECs, as set out below.

Table 14

Service order charge per CDN access (\$)

	DS-0	DS-1	DS-3	OC-3	OC-12
Aliant (NB)	673.44	857.42	1,924.00	2,565.33	2,565.33
Aliant (NFLD)	673.44	857.42	1,924.00	2,565.33	2,565.33
Aliant (NS)	673.44	857.42	1,924.00	2,565.33	2,565.33
Aliant (PEI)	673.44	857.42	1,924.00	2,565.33	2,565.33
Bell Canada	699.12	931.23	1,619.00	2,158.67	2,158.67
MTS	620.31	985.58	1,657.12	2,209.49	2,209.49
SaskTel	666.77	929.43	1,762.51	2,363.62	2,405.34
TELUS (AB)	674.25	943.50	1,849.92	2,520.99	2,492.03
TELUS (BC)	674.25	943.50	1,849.92	2,520.99	2,492.03

Secretary General

This document is available in alternative format upon request, and may also be examined in PDF format or in HTML at the following Internet site: <http://www.crtc.gc.ca>