



Telecom Decision CRTC 2008-1

Ottawa, 17 January 2008

Use of deferral account funds to improve access to telecommunications services for persons with disabilities and to expand broadband services to rural and remote communities

Reference: 8678-C12-200615578, 8638-C12-200602708 and 8638-C12-200615586

In this Decision, the Commission approves the use of deferral account funds by incumbent local exchange carriers for certain initiatives to improve access to telecommunications services for persons with disabilities and to expand broadband services to certain rural and remote communities in British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario, and Quebec. The Commission also directs that any balance remaining in the deferral accounts be rebated to residential subscribers in non-high-cost serving areas.

Introduction

1. In Telecom Decision 2006-9, the Commission determined that incumbent local exchange carriers (ILECs) should, to the greatest extent possible, use the funds in their deferral accounts¹ to improve access to telecommunications services for persons with disabilities and to expand broadband services to rural and remote communities. The ILECs were directed to submit proposals consistent with the determinations in that Decision after consulting with advocacy organizations for persons with disabilities and provincial government agencies responsible for broadband initiatives. The Commission also concluded that any accumulated balance remaining in an ILEC's deferral account after these initiatives had been approved would be rebated to the ILEC's residential local subscribers in non-high-cost serving areas.
2. Pursuant to Telecom Decision 2006-9, accessibility proposals were submitted by Bell Aliant Regional Communications, Limited Partnership (Bell Aliant), for the Atlantic region territory of the former Aliant Telecom Inc.; Bell Canada, on behalf of itself and Bell Aliant for their Ontario and Quebec territories; MTS Allstream Inc. (MTS Allstream); Saskatchewan Telecommunications (SaskTel); and TELUS Communications Company (TCC).² Bell Aliant subsequently withdrew its accessibility proposal, indicating that the balance in its account was now negative due to drawdowns associated with Telecom Decision 2007-10. Broadband expansion proposals were also submitted by Bell Canada (on behalf of itself and Bell Aliant for their Ontario and Quebec territories), MTS Allstream, and TCC.

¹ In Telecom Decision 2002-34, the Commission imposed a pricing constraint equal to inflation less a productivity offset of 3.5 percent on residential local services in non-high-cost serving areas. However, in order to avoid an adverse impact on local competition, the Commission required all ILECs subject to Telecom Decision 2002-34 to create a deferral account where they placed amounts equal to the revenue reductions that would otherwise have resulted from an application of the price cap formula. Deferral accounts were subsequently created for Société en commandite Télébec (now Télébec, Limited Partnership) and TELUS Communications (Québec) Inc. (now part of TELUS Communications Company) in Telecom Decision 2002-43.

² While the other ILECs proposed to allocate five percent of the balance in their deferral accounts to initiatives to improve access to telecommunications services for persons with disabilities, SaskTel proposed to allocate its entire balance to accessibility initiatives.

3. In Telecom Public Notice 2006-15, the Commission initiated a proceeding to consider the ILECs' accessibility and broadband expansion proposals. The Commission received submissions and/or interrogatory responses and/or comments from numerous organizations representing people with disabilities, telecommunications service providers, alternative broadband service providers (ABSPs), and other individuals, organizations, and government representatives.
4. This proceeding closed on 14 August 2007 with the receipt of reply comments submitted by the ILECs and other parties to the proceeding. The public record of this proceeding is available on the Commission's website at www.crtc.gc.ca under "Public Proceedings."
5. The ILECs' accessibility proposals will be addressed in Part A of this Decision and their broadband expansion proposals will be addressed in Part B. Part C will address the disposal of remaining deferral account funds.

A. Accessibility proposals

6. The ILECs' submissions included a variety of proposals to improve accessibility to telecommunications services within their territories for persons with a range of disabilities, including visual, mobility, dexterity, cognitive, hearing, and speech disabilities. The ILECs' proposals are summarized below.
 - Bell Canada, SaskTel, and TCC proposed to introduce Internet Protocol (IP) Relay, a text-based tool that would allow persons who are deaf, hard of hearing, or have difficulty speaking to communicate through the telephone system with hearing persons through a relay agent.
 - Bell Canada and TCC proposed to introduce Video Relay Service (VRS), a service that would allow a person using sign language and another person using voice to communicate through a relay agent via high-speed Internet and a video camera.
 - Bell Canada also proposed to redesign the underlying application for its Voice Activated Dialing (VAD)³ service.⁴
 - TCC proposed to enhance its Directory Assistance service to allow persons with disabilities to request information on the basis of the category of a business and/or its approximate location without having to provide precise spelling or pronunciation. TCC proposed to roll out its Enhanced Directory Assistance (EDA) service free of charge to its special-needs customers.

³ VAD is an existing network-based line feature that allows a customer to place a telephone call by speaking the name of the desired party into the telephone transmitter.

⁴ The application would recognize a limited vocabulary via speech recognition, eliminating the dexterity and visual acuity requirements associated with the dialing of telephone numbers for persons with disabilities and the elderly.

- SaskTel proposed an initiative⁵ that would provide improved access to certain telecommunications services for persons with sight and mobility disabilities, and could help support independent living for persons with cognitive disabilities.
 - MTS Allstream, SaskTel, and TCC proposed to improve accessibility to their websites, including adding accessible information on products and services for customers with visual, physical, hearing, and speech disabilities as well as information about other telecommunications products and services that they offer. Bell Canada proposed to recover the costs of already implemented accessibility improvements to its website.
 - Bell Canada proposed to establish a single point of contact for persons with disabilities to receive customer service tailored to the specific needs of the customer.⁶
 - Bell Canada also proposed to conduct research into the needs of persons with disabilities during the development process of new products and services.
 - SaskTel proposed to provide free teletypewriter (TTY) units to all Transition Houses in Saskatchewan.
 - TCC proposed to introduce three internal programs to improve accessibility to its telecommunications services for persons with disabilities:
 - a TELUS Accessibility Committee;
 - the incorporation of inclusive design considerations in its service development and the development of specific inclusiveness guidelines;
 - work with wireless device manufacturers to procure accessible wireless handsets.
7. Each of the ILECs also proposed to set aside any unallocated portion of their accessibility funds for future accessibility initiatives as follows:
- Bell Canada and MTS Allstream proposed to set aside the remaining funds for specific initiatives, to be identified at a later date, to improve access to telecommunications services by persons with disabilities.
 - TCC proposed to develop the technological platform necessary to enable various services using IP and presence-based technologies. TCC would use deferral account funds only for that portion of the design, development, and implementation of services that would ensure accessibility for TCC's customers with disabilities.

⁵ Filed in confidence with the Commission.

⁶ This service would make information available about terminal equipment, accessibility-related services, user documentation, and support material in audio, large print, and Braille.

- SaskTel proposed to form a partnership with the Government of Saskatchewan's Office of Disability Issues to develop telecommunications services to better the way of life of persons with disabilities.
8. The Commission has identified the following key issues with respect to the ILECs' accessibility initiatives to be addressed in its determinations:
- I. Are the ILECs' proposals consistent with the guidelines set out in Telecom Decision 2006-9 for the disposition of funds remaining in the deferral accounts?
 - II. Would funding for future uses be an appropriate use of deferral account funds?
 - III. What follow-up processes and reporting are required?
- I. Are the ILECs' proposals consistent with the guidelines set out in Telecom Decision 2006-9 for the disposition of funds remaining in the deferral accounts?**
9. The Commission established the following guidelines in Telecom Decision 2006-9 for initiatives to improve accessibility to telecommunications services by persons with disabilities:
- i) Each ILEC with a positive accumulated balance in its deferral account was to allocate at a minimum five percent of the funds to accessibility initiatives;
 - ii) The initiatives must improve accessibility to telecommunications services for persons with disabilities;
 - iii) The ILECs were to consult and work with the appropriate advocacy organizations for persons with disabilities prior to submitting their proposals for approval; and
 - iv) Drawdowns from each ILEC's deferral account were to be applied within its own territory.
- i) Five percent allocation*
10. The Commission notes that the ILECs all proposed to allocate at least five percent of the accumulated balance in their deferral accounts to accessibility initiatives. The Commission considers that Bell Aliant's subsequent withdrawal of its proposal was consistent with the guidelines set out in Telecom Decision 2006-9 as it no longer has a positive deferral account balance. The Commission notes Bell Aliant's commitment to continue to explore ways of working toward improving accessibility to telecommunications services for persons with disabilities and encourages it to do so.

ii) Appropriateness of specific initiatives

11. While the ILECs' proposed initiatives were generally accepted by interveners as improving accessibility to telecommunications services for persons with disabilities, the Coalition of Disability Groups (the Coalition)⁷ opposed the ILECs' proposals to use deferral account funds to upgrade the accessibility of their websites, improve their customer service functions, develop IP Relay, and upgrade existing services such as VAD and EDA, on the basis that each of these proposals constituted an activity that all telecommunications service providers should be required to implement in any event, or had a significant commercial aspect. The Coalition indicated that, although these proposals had merit as accessibility initiatives, competitive neutrality required that deferral account funds not be used for these activities.
12. In reply, Bell Canada, MTS Allstream, SaskTel, and TCC submitted that their proposals met the eligibility criteria established in Telecom Decision 2006-9. Bell Canada argued that any concerns about competitive neutrality and regulatory symmetry were unwarranted in light of the nature of the deferral account funds and the ability of the Commission to impose social obligations on a symmetrical basis, where necessary.
13. The Commission considers that the initiatives proposed by the ILECs as part of the present proceeding will improve accessibility to telecommunications services for persons with disabilities consistent with Telecom Decision 2006-9. The Commission considers that approving the use of deferral account funds for the particular accessibility initiatives proposed by the ILECs in this proceeding does not give rise to concerns about competitive neutrality.

iii) Consultations

14. In developing their accessibility proposals, the ILECs consulted with national and provincial organizations representing persons with disabilities, as well as with accessibility researchers and federal and provincial government representatives. Some of the ILECs also sought suggestions from local organizations, persons with disabilities, and the general public. The Commission encourages the ILECs to continue to work with advocacy organizations to further the important public objective of accessible telecommunications services for persons with disabilities, including consulting with regional organizations as appropriate.

iv) Funds to be used in the ILEC's territory

15. Some parties suggested that the Commission could allocate funds in the deferral accounts to establish a national VRS and a national accessibility fund. In general, the ILECs submitted that national proposals were outside the scope of this proceeding.

⁷ The Coalition of Disability Groups is comprised of the following organizations that provided both joint and individual submissions and/or interrogatory responses in this proceeding: Adaptive Technology Resource Centre (University of Toronto), ARCH Disability Law Centre, Alliance for Equality of Blind Canadians, Canadian Association for Community Living, Canadian Association of Independent Living Centres, Canadian Hard of Hearing Association, Canadian Council of the Blind, Canadian National Institute for the Blind, Council of Canadians with Disabilities, Dis-IT Research Alliance, and Neil Squire Society. In addition, the Canadian Association of the Deaf participated in the development of the Coalition's position.

16. The Commission notes that, in Telecom Decision 2006-9, it directed the ILECs to file proposals to use deferral account funds exclusively within their respective incumbent territory. Therefore, the Commission considers that proposals to use deferral account funds for national initiatives are beyond the scope of this proceeding.
17. In light of the foregoing, the Commission is satisfied that the ILECs' proposals are consistent with the guidelines set out in Telecom Decision 2006-9. Therefore, the Commission **approves** the specific initiatives described in the ILECs' proposals. The Commission notes that, in certain instances, the ILECs will have to file proposed tariffs. The Commission directs the ILECs to file proposed tariffs as appropriate.

II. Would funding for future uses be an appropriate use of deferral account funds?

18. The Commission notes the ILECs' proposals to set aside any unallocated portion of their accessibility funds for future initiatives. Parties were generally of the view that reserving funds for future accessibility initiatives was an important and prudent use of the deferral account funds.
19. The Commission considers that the development of telecommunications products and services that meet the accessibility needs of persons with disabilities can only occur once those needs are identified. The Commission notes the difficulties experienced by the ILECs and the disability organizations in trying to identify within a few months suitable telecommunications initiatives that addressed the needs of persons with disabilities. The Commission considers that it would be appropriate to afford the ILECs additional time to consult and work with disability organizations, persons with disabilities, experts in disabilities and techno-accessibility, researchers, and other relevant parties in identifying the needs of persons with disabilities and developing accessibility solutions together that best meet those needs.
20. The Commission considers that the use of inclusive design principles at the early stage of service development would improve access to telecommunications services by making them usable by as many people as possible, without the need for adaptation or specialized design.
21. The Commission finds that funding for future initiatives would be an appropriate use of deferral account funds. Therefore, the Commission **approves** the proposals of Bell Canada, MTS Allstream, SaskTel, and TCC to set aside the remaining accessibility funds for future accessibility initiatives.

III. What follow-up processes and reporting are required?

22. While Bell Canada and MTS Allstream proposed to submit their future accessibility initiatives to the Commission for approval, SaskTel and TCC submitted that they should not be required to do so. TCC, noting that its remaining accessibility funds were fully allocated to specific services it intended to introduce, stated that it was prepared to report to the Commission the details of its proposed future services as they become available. Bell Canada and SaskTel also proposed to use their unallocated accessibility funds within four years.

23. The Commission notes that while the ILECs sought Commission approval to set aside deferral account funds for future accessibility initiatives, their proposals in respect of these future initiatives contained little information about the initiatives themselves. The Commission considers that reports alone will not allow interested parties an opportunity to understand, assess, and comment on the proposals. The Commission considers that a public proceeding is the appropriate vehicle to ensure that the future accessibility proposals meet the requirements of persons with disabilities and Telecom Decision 2006-9. Accordingly, the Commission directs Bell Canada, MTS Allstream, and TCC to submit their future accessibility proposals for Commission approval.
24. With respect to SaskTel, the Commission notes that it proposed to develop its future initiatives in partnership with the Government of Saskatchewan's Office of Disability Issues, a provincial government body specifically mandated to co-ordinate programs and services for persons with disabilities. Accordingly, in light of this and the limited amount of funds remaining in SaskTel's deferral account for future initiatives, the Commission is of the view that SaskTel should not be required to request Commission approval for future accessibility initiatives in the confines of its proposed partnership.
25. With respect to the time frames for the use of remaining accessibility funds, consistent with the submissions from Bell Canada and SaskTel, the Commission considers that these funds should be fully utilized within a four-year period ending in 2011.

Annual reporting

26. Beginning in 2009, the Commission directs Bell Canada, MTS Allstream, SaskTel, and TCC to file, by 31 March of each year, a report with details regarding the initiatives implemented in the previous year, including a description of each initiative, the anticipated customers, the manner in which the initiative improves accessibility, the date when service was offered, the associated costs or drawdowns from the deferral account, and the balance in the deferral account remaining for accessibility initiatives. As part of these reports, the ILECs are also to identify and provide an update on any initiatives that have been approved for funding but have not yet been fully implemented, including expected completion dates and costs.

B. Broadband expansion proposals

27. In Telecom Decision 2007-50, the Commission approved the use of deferral account funds to expand broadband services to certain communities in Rate Bands E, F, and G in British Columbia, Manitoba, Ontario, and Quebec, where no ABSP had indicated, on the record of the Telecom Public Notice 2006-15 proceeding, that it currently provided or had firm plans to provide broadband services in the near future.
28. The Commission considers that the following issues remain to be addressed:
 - I. For the remaining communities, are the ILECs' proposals consistent with Telecom Decision 2006-9 with respect to:
 - a. Definition of communities,

- b. Location of communities,
 - c. Consultations,
 - d. Customers,
 - e. Inclusion of backbone and access facilities,
 - f. Least-cost technology, and
 - g. Recovery of uneconomic costs?
- II. Which additional communities can be approved on the basis that they are not served nor likely to be served in the near future?
- III. Are the ILECs' proposals consistent with Telecom Decision 2006-9 with respect to competitor and retail services?
- IV. What follow-up processes and reporting are required?

I. For the remaining communities, are the ILECs' proposals consistent with Telecom Decision 2006-9?

a) Definition of communities

29. While MTS Allstream and TCC have proposed to expand service on the basis of specific communities identified in their proposals, Bell Canada proposed to expand on the basis of specific distribution serving areas (DSAs) within a wire centre.⁸ Bell Canada indicated that the DSA was its planning unit for commercial broadband expansion to unserved areas. Bell Canada also proposed that it should be permitted to expand into DSAs that were or would be only partially served. Certain ABSPs questioned Bell Canada's use of DSAs and its proposal to expand in DSAs that were or would be only partially served.
30. The Commission notes that, pursuant to Telecom Decision 2006-9, the ILECs were to select communities unlikely to receive broadband service in the near future. However, the Commission did not specifically define what a community was. The Commission notes that wire centres in rural and remote areas can be large, with dispersed population, and that service in one DSA does not ensure service in another DSA within the same wire centre. The Commission also notes that ABSPs had the opportunity to examine Bell Canada's proposal on the basis of DSAs and to identify those DSAs where they currently provided or planned to provide service. In light of the above, the Commission considers that Bell Canada's proposal to expand service on the basis of DSAs is acceptable. Accordingly, Bell Canada's proposal will be evaluated on the basis of DSAs while TCC's and MTS Allstream's proposals will be evaluated on the basis of the specific communities named in their proposals.

⁸ A DSA is identifiable by a reference number and the name or identifier of the associated wire centre.

31. With respect to the use of deferral account funds in partially served DSAs, the Commission considers that this would be tantamount to permitting the use of the funds in an already served community. Consistent with Telecom Decision 2006-9, the Commission finds that it would be inappropriate to permit the use of deferral account funds to enter a partially served DSA.

b) Location of communities

32. The ILECs have proposed to expand service to some communities located in Rate Bands B, C, and D. TCC submitted that these communities in its proposals were rural communities which, on their own, would be in either Rate Band E, F, or G but for the fact that they were served out of exchanges in other rate bands. Bell Canada submitted that expanding service to these communities was uneconomic and that many of them shared backbone facilities with Rate Band E and F communities, thereby minimizing the cost per line to augment these facilities.
33. Barrett Xplore Inc. (BXI), Canadian Cable Systems Alliance Inc. (CCSA), and Télécommunications Xittel inc. (Xittel) submitted that using deferral account funds in or near higher density communities in Rate Bands C and D was inconsistent with Telecom Decision 2006-9.
34. The Commission notes that Telecom Decision 2006-9 directed the ILECs to file proposals to expand broadband service to communities located *primarily* in Rate Bands E and F in high-cost serving areas unlikely to receive service from any provider in the near future. Therefore, the Commission considers that communities in other rate bands could be part of the ILECs' proposals if they are uneconomic to serve and no ABSP is serving or planning to serve them.

c) Consultations

35. The Public Interest Law Centre on behalf of Manitoba Keewatinook Okimowin (MKO) submitted that MTS Allstream's entire proposal should be rejected for inappropriate consultation and failure to meet provincial priorities. MKO requested that MTS Allstream be required to refile its broadband proposal. On the other hand, the Aboriginal Peoples Television Network Incorporated expressed concerns with the consultation process of Bell Canada and TCC, submitting that only MTS Allstream had an effective means of consulting with First Nation communities.
36. The Commission notes that, with respect to their broadband proposals, the ILECs were only directed in Telecom Decision 2006-9 to consult with provincial government agencies responsible for broadband initiatives. Based on the evidence submitted, the Commission is satisfied that the ILECs, including MTS Allstream, consulted as required. Accordingly, the Commission **denies** MKO's request that MTS Allstream be required to refile its proposal.

d) Customers

37. The ILECs' proposals included the provision of service to residential and business customers. BXI submitted that business customers should not benefit from the deferral account funds.
38. The Commission considers that its determination in Telecom Decision 2006-9 that the funds should primarily benefit residential customers was not intended to limit their use to residential customers exclusively. The Commission noted in that Decision that both the social and

economic development of rural and remote communities would be enhanced with broadband services becoming available in these communities. The Commission considers that the number of business subscribers in the funded communities will be small compared to residential subscribers, and that once the initial investment is made to bring broadband services to a community, it would be appropriate to allow business customers to access the services. In addition, given the additional revenues that will be generated by providing service to business customers in an area, it is appropriate that these amounts be included in calculating the uneconomic portion of providing the service that will be funded through the deferral accounts.

e) Inclusion of backbone and access facilities

39. The ILECs' broadband expansion proposals included both the backbone and access facilities required to expand these services to the customer's premises. BXI submitted that, in order to maintain competitive neutrality, at least 50 percent of the costs incurred by the ILECs to expand broadband services should be for backbone facilities.
40. The Commission notes that the ILECs' proposals to expand both backbone and access facilities are consistent with Telecom Decision 2006-9, and that the availability of only backbone facilities will not ensure the provision of broadband services to the customer's premises in a community. The Commission also considers that it would not be appropriate to mandate a specific cost allocation, as the repartition of costs between backbone and access will vary significantly due to factors such as the ILEC's existing network configuration and the geographical characteristics of individual communities in its proposal.

f) Least-cost technology

41. Bell Canada proposed to use a combination of technologies, including digital subscriber line (DSL) and fixed wireless technologies, while MTS Allstream and TCC mainly relied on DSL as their expansion technology. BXI and MKO submitted that there was no concrete evidence that DSL was the least-cost alternative for the proposed communities. BXI also submitted that the manner in which satellite broadband had been excluded from the proceeding distorted and diminished its role in eliminating the digital divide and was not technologically neutral. In addition, Axia SuperNet Ltd. (Axia) submitted that TCC's proposal to build duplicate backbone facilities in communities served by Alberta SuperNet (SuperNet) backbone was inconsistent with the government funding and least-cost technology determinations in Telecom Decision 2006-9.
42. The Commission notes that each ILEC stated that it had considered all suitable technologies. MTS Allstream, for example, indicated that it had considered various technologies, including wireless and satellite, but that these alternatives had proved to be less efficient, they would have required substantial upfront investment, and the resulting prices for broadband services would have been out of reach for many residents.

43. The Commission considers that the ILECs are able to leverage synergies with their existing technologies and infrastructure. Moreover, consistent with the Commission's 10 March 2006 letter⁹ specifying the requirements for the filing of broadband proposals, the ILECs may re-engineer appropriate broadband expansion projects and report the details to the Commission if new technologies meeting the service and least-cost technology requirements are introduced during the rollout of their programs. Accordingly, the Commission is satisfied that the ILECs' proposals satisfy the requirement to use least-cost technology.
44. The Commission disagrees with BXI that the role of satellite has been distorted or diminished. The Commission agrees with Network BC, on behalf of the Government of British Columbia (Network BC), the Peace Region Internet Society (PRiS), and others, that various technologies can co-exist within a large geographical area and that there is a role for wired, wireless, and satellite technologies. As noted by NetKaster Satellite Internet, a division of Northwestel Cable Inc., some of the communities in the ILECs' proposals may have customers who will remain unserved after the ILECs' proposed rollouts, due for example to distance limitations associated with DSL technology. The Commission considers that satellite and other technologies will help fill these gaps.
45. Concerning the duplication of backbone facilities in Alberta, the Commission notes that despite the presence of SuperNet in many communities in TCC's proposal, broadband services have not been deployed. The Commission considers that while government funding may have extended transport facilities to a community, as long as broadband services are not widely available to end-users, the community will not benefit from government funding in the manner envisioned in Telecom Decision 2006-9.
46. The Commission notes TCC's submission that it does not support a broadband service model which utilizes SuperNet for broadband transport facilities. However, TCC has proposed to build access facilities to connect ABSPs with either the SuperNet transport facilities or its own transport facilities. The Commission also notes Axia's submission that TCC interconnects with SuperNet in other areas. Therefore, the Commission considers that there is no serious impediment to TCC's use of SuperNet. The Commission notes, however, that if TCC were to use SuperNet, its cost structure would reflect the ongoing rates for that use. The Commission also notes that the work required for TCC to use its own backbone would vary between upgrading existing facilities and installing entirely new ones, which may make it least costly for TCC to use its own backbone in certain communities and to rely on SuperNet in others.
47. In light of the above, the Commission directs TCC to use the least-cost solution for each community where interconnection with the SuperNet backbone is available (i.e. SuperNet or its own backbone facilities). The Commission considers that TCC should include the results of this analysis in its updated cost studies to be filed as a follow-up to this Decision.

⁹ Letter to interested parties to Telecom Public Notice 2004-1.

g) Recovery of uneconomic costs

48. The parties' submissions raised issues with respect to the assumptions surrounding the rate of penetration and tax rates used by the ILECs to determine the uneconomic costs of their proposals. As well, Bell Canada and MTS Allstream objected to the determinations in Telecom Decision 2007-50 related to treatment of end-of-study values.
49. With respect to penetration rate, BXI submitted that Bell Canada's assumed rate appeared to be understated relative to the other ILECs. Bell Canada responded by noting that its subscription rate forecast was based on existing and projected penetration rates in similar communities in terms of socio-economic, demographic, and geographical characteristics.
50. The Commission considers that it is reasonable that the assumptions in the ILECs' cost studies would differ based on the specific characteristics of the communities in their proposals. Accordingly, based on its analysis of the record, the Commission considers that the penetration rates assumed by each of the ILECs are appropriate.
51. Concerning the tax rate, MKO submitted that MTS Allstream's proposal did not reflect true costs and potential revenues as the company did not expect to pay income taxes until 2014. MTS Allstream replied that its cost studies were consistent with Phase II costing guidelines and reflected the incremental liability that accrues regardless of any tax assets that MTS Allstream may have to defray the yearly effect on actual cash taxes paid. The Commission is satisfied that MTS Allstream's costing information is consistent with Phase II costing guidelines.
52. With respect to the treatment of plant equipment, the Commission determined in Telecom Decision 2007-50 that it would be appropriate for the ILECs to treat plant equipment consistently. In particular, the Commission determined that any outside plant equipment deployed in non-economic communities should be treated as non-fungible in the ILECs' cost studies, and any non-outside plant equipment should be treated as fungible.
53. Bell Canada submitted that its broadband expansion program would be uneconomic beyond the mandated 15-year study period, making a zero end-of-study value for all plant costs appropriate. MTS Allstream submitted that the changes in the treatment of end-of-study values mandated by the Commission created a bias in favour of communities closest to existing fibre and could eliminate communities from consideration.
54. The Commission considers that, over a 15-year study period, there is a reasonable likelihood that efficiencies and synergies in broadband service delivery, difficult to forecast today, would be realized. The Commission also notes that pursuant to Telecom Decision 2007-50, the ILECs may recover refurbishing and displacement costs. Accordingly, the Commission continues to consider that the changes required in Telecom Decision 2007-50 are appropriate.
55. In light of the above, and based on a review of the ILECs' costing information, the Commission considers that, subject to the changes in the treatment of end-of-study values described in Telecom Decision 2007-50, the ILECs' cost studies are consistent with the determinations in Telecom Decision 2006-9 concerning the recovery of uneconomic costs. The Commission notes that the ILECs, as part of their reporting, will be expected to reflect actual costs, taking into consideration actual retail and competitor demand.

II. Which additional communities can be approved on the basis that they are not served nor likely to be served in the near future?

56. In approving additional communities, the Commission considers the following factors to be relevant:

- a. Did an ABSP request the exclusion of the community on the record of the proceeding within the time frames established in Telecom Public Notice 2006-15 on the basis that it was currently serving or planned to serve that community?
- b. Where exclusion was requested on the basis that an ABSP had plans to serve a community, did the ABSP provide evidence of firm plans?
- c. Do the services provided or planned to be provided by that ABSP meet the requirements imposed on the ILECs in the Commission's 10 March 2006 letter?
- d. Is the service coverage of the ABSPs using fixed wireless technology accurate?

a) Did an ABSP request the exclusion of the community within the time frames established in Telecom Public Notice 2006-15?

57. As part of this proceeding, an ABSP could request the exclusion of a community for which it was providing service or had firm plans to provide service during the ILEC's planned rollout period. The ABSP was required to file information by 19 February 2007, including a complete description of the current or planned service offering(s), the current number of customers, information as to the extent to which the service was or would be available to the entire community, and a detailed rollout plan by year that was to include coverage maps and an indication of the number of potential customers to whom the service would be made available (exclusion submission).

58. The Commission notes that in interrogatory responses or comments, certain ABSPs requested the exclusion of communities after 19 February 2007, outside the time frames established in Telecom Public Notice 2006-15 but before the close of record of this proceeding. The Commission notes that these late exclusion requests were made for both current and planned service. For example, BXI, noting that the rural broadband market was evolving in terms of areas served, technology availability, and cost, submitted that it had eliminated sites that had become active since its original filing and added new sites.

59. The Commission notes that, in the course of this proceeding, it welcomed information clarifying the areas and services for both served and planned communities in the ABSPs' exclusion submissions where it helped assess whether a community was served or likely to be served. The Commission also considers that the removal of communities from either the ILECs' or ABSPs' lists allows the targeting of funds to those communities that meet the criteria for funding. However, the Commission considers that allowing some ABSPs to add to their plans at the late stages of the proceeding, after the plans of others were made available on the public record, would be unfair to ABSPs who strictly adhered to the procedure.

60. The Commission notes that, in Telecom Decision 2007-110, it approved an application to review and vary Telecom Decision 2007-50 on the basis of evidence that Mitchell Seaforth Cable T.V. Ltd. was serving the community of Dublin, Ontario as of 19 February 2007. The Commission also notes that, in Telecom Decision 2007-111, it denied an application by BXI to review and vary the same Decision on the basis, in part, that two communities approved in the Decision had recently become part of its expansion plans, beyond the time frame established in Telecom Public Notice 2006-15 for identifying such communities.
61. The Commission appreciates that plans can change over time, but notes that in any regulatory proceeding certain dates must be established that apply to all parties. In order to ensure a fair, predictable, and transparent process, all parties are expected to adhere to these timelines subject to any extension that the Commission may grant.
62. Consistent with Telecom Decisions 2007-110 and 2007-111, for purposes of this Decision, the Commission considered the ABSPs' evidence of firm plans and service comparability as long as an exclusion request was filed within the time frames established in Telecom Public Notice 2006-15. Where a late filed exclusion request was received for an ABSP's current service to a community, and insufficient information was available to determine whether service was being provided to the community as of 19 February 2007, the Commission will initiate a follow-up process concurrent with the issuance of this Decision to obtain a full record to evaluate such exclusion requests. Part I of Appendix A identifies the ABSPs and communities subject to this process.
63. The Commission also notes that in accordance with the Commission's 10 March 2006 letter, the ILECs submitted supplemental plans which were to be drawn from in the event that communities in their rollout plans were not approved for deferral account funding. The Commission considers that ABSPs had an adequate opportunity to request the exclusion of the supplemental communities proposed by MTS Allstream and TCC, and that these can be considered at this time.
64. CCSA submitted that the communities in Bell Canada's supplemental plan should not be approved as Bell Canada had not provided detailed DSA-level information for consideration by the ABSPs as part of this proceeding. The Commission is of the view that for a community to be considered for broadband expansion, ABSPs must have had a full opportunity to request its exclusion. The Commission considers that some of Bell Canada's supplemental communities could be approved, while others would require DSA-level detail maps from Bell Canada and input from ABSPs in order to be considered for approval. Concurrent with the issuance of this Decision, the Commission will initiate a follow-up process to address the Bell Canada supplemental communities which are listed in Part II of Appendix A.
65. In light of the above, the Commission **approves** the use of deferral account funds by the ILECs in communities where no ABSP requested exclusion of the community on the record of this proceeding within the parameters set out above.

b) Did the ABSP provide evidence of firm plans?

66. As part of their exclusion submissions for planned communities, ABSPs were to provide evidence of firm plans to provide service in those communities. The Commission notes that ABSPs had multiple opportunities through their interrogatory responses and comments to clarify their exclusion submissions. Despite this, the Commission notes that not all ABSPs provided all of the evidence required.
67. Bell Canada submitted that the Commission should not exclude an area unless the ABSP had provided firm plans, approved by its Board of Directors, to serve a significant number of customers, or if no ABSPs had plans to serve that area by the same year indicated in the ILEC's planned rollout.
68. The Commission has assessed each ABSP's plan based on the completeness and the quality of the information provided in response to the information required in Telecom Public Notice 2006-15, paying particular attention to the following three criteria:
 - i) clear identification of the community and serving area where the ABSP plans to begin offering broadband services to the general public;
 - ii) identification of the ABSP's rollout plan, including the year in which the ABSP plans to begin offering broadband services to the general public in each specific community; and
 - iii) confirmation of the plans by the ABSP's Board of Directors or, in the absence of such a Board, other equivalent evidence of the ABSP's commitment to its plans.
69. Where the Commission has concluded that the ABSP has not demonstrated firm plans to serve a community, and no other ABSP has successfully claimed its exclusion, the Commission **approves** the use of deferral account funds by the relevant ILEC for the expansion of broadband into that community.
70. The Commission further notes that ABSPs' plans to expand their own broadband service using deferral account funds were not considered in excluding communities from an ILEC's proposal.

c) Do the ABSP's services meet the service requirements imposed on the ILECs in the Commission's 10 March 2006 letter?

71. Pursuant to the Commission's 10 March 2006 letter, the ILECs were to propose broadband services comparable to those they offer in urban areas in terms of rates, terms, and conditions, upload and download speeds, and reliability. As part of this proceeding, ABSPs were required to provide evidence that their service and technology were comparable, but not necessarily equivalent, to those of the ILECs. The Commission considers that the issues on comparability raised in this proceeding are speed, reliability, and rates.

72. Bell Canada submitted that a download speed of at least 1.5 megabits per second (Mbps) per end-user should be the minimum standard to determine service availability. The Commission notes the submissions from CCSA that the ABSPs' services were evolving and that while an ABSP might offer a slightly slower speed, such as 1.0 Mbps, the service was always-on and much faster than the dial-up services it replaced. The Commission also notes that the ILECs provide services in urban areas at speeds sometimes below 1.5 Mbps which may still be branded as high-speed Internet services.
73. In light of the foregoing, the Commission is not convinced that an ABSP's provision of service at a speed slightly slower than the advertised speed of the ILEC is not an acceptable substitute for the ILEC's service. However, the Commission is of the view that it would be appropriate, for the purpose of this Decision, to require that an ABSP be capable of offering service to the general public at a minimum download speed of 1.0 Mbps in order for a community to be deemed served with a comparable service by that ABSP.
74. The Commission is of the view that the ILECs must make services available at a download speed of at least 1.0 Mbps in all deferral account funded communities. However, the Commission considers that it would be in the public interest for an ILEC to offer various speed levels, including lower priced services at a download speed below 1.0 Mbps.
75. With respect to reliability, Bell Canada proposed to expand in communities where the only alternative was fixed wireless broadband service, particularly when such service was offered over unlicensed spectrum. Bell Canada submitted that given the limitations associated with fixed wireless technology, such as line-of-sight requirements, this would ensure a more comprehensive coverage of the community. Bell Canada also submitted that fixed wireless services over unlicensed spectrum were more prone to interference and other issues. Network BC submitted that before excluding a community from an ILEC's list, the Commission should ensure that the ABSP was capable of offering carrier grade service.
76. The Commission notes that there are advantages and limitations associated with any broadband technology. While allowing the ILECs' use of funds where the only alternative is fixed wireless broadband might ensure a more comprehensive coverage of a specific area, the Commission is of the view that it would not be consistent with Telecom Decision 2006-9. The Commission is also not persuaded that the use of unlicensed spectrum significantly degrades service in rural and remote communities, where in many cases the potential for interference is likely to be smaller than in urban areas. The Commission further notes from the submissions of ABSPs that they use various techniques to mitigate the impact of interference and other factors on their services. Accordingly, the Commission **denies** Bell Canada's request that it should be allowed to use deferral account funds in communities where the only alternative is fixed wireless broadband service, or where such service is provided over unlicensed spectrum.
77. With respect to rates, although they vary by ABSP, by ILEC, and by technology, the Commission notes that some ABSPs identified rates significantly higher than those charged by the ILECs for comparable service levels. The Commission also notes that some ABSPs have significant equipment and installation charges. The Commission finds that some variation in rates is acceptable; however, a rate will not be considered comparable where it is significantly

higher for a similar service level, or where significant additional equipment or installation costs apply that, alone or in combination with the rate, would make the service unreasonably expensive for a large proportion of the general public in the identified communities.

78. While the Commission concludes that most ABSPs in this proceeding are or will be providing services comparable to those of the ILECs, the Commission will approve the use of deferral account funds in communities where, despite an exclusion request from an ABSP, it is satisfied that the service is not comparable on the basis of the above criteria.

d) Is the service coverage of the ABSPs using fixed wireless technology accurate?

79. The Commission notes that several ABSPs depicted their fixed wireless broadband coverage as concentric circles of various radii. Based on its Inukshuk experience, Bell Canada submitted that fixed wireless coverage could not be depicted with perfect circles. Conversely, BXI submitted that there would be a natural expansion of serving areas caused by greater demand and technology availability, and that a buffer zone beyond 20 kilometres (km) around BXI's current and proposed serving areas should be established.
80. The Commission notes that several parties identified coverage or performance issues associated with fixed wireless technology, including the potential for interference and coverage limitations due, for example, to distance and line-of-sight requirements. The Commission notes some ABSPs' submissions that their fixed wireless service coverage, based on equipment specifications, could extend beyond the areas shown in their submissions. The Commission also notes CCSA's submission that, while in some areas 100 percent of the residents could not be served, the majority could be, and therefore the serving areas of CCSA members relying on fixed wireless technology should be accepted as submitted. The Commission further notes that wireline technologies such as those proposed by the ILECs are also subject to limitations. Accordingly, the Commission finds that the coverage assumptions of ABSPs using fixed wireless technology to request the exclusion of communities in this proceeding are appropriate.
81. With respect to a buffer zone, the Commission notes TCC's and Bell Canada's submissions that a 20-km buffer zone would be excessive and that it would be unreasonable to delay services to customers outside BXI's stated service areas only to provide BXI the option, at some future time, to expand in such locations. The Commission also notes the objective of using deferral account funds to accelerate the delivery of broadband services to communities unlikely to receive such services in the near future, and the fact that ABSPs had the opportunity to make submissions to help identify such communities. The Commission further notes that there is no guarantee that the areas within such a buffer zone, which were not specifically identified in an ABSP's plans, would be served in the near future. Accordingly, the Commission finds that it would not be appropriate to establish a buffer zone or otherwise exclude areas outside of the communities where an ABSP currently provides or has firm plans to provide service.
82. Accordingly, the Commission will consider exclusion requests on the basis of the coverage depicted by fixed wireless ABSPs, but will not exclude areas not explicitly identified in the ABSPs' submissions, such as areas that would be part of a buffer zone.

Conclusion

83. In light of the above, the Commission **approves** the use of funds by Bell Canada, MTS Allstream, and TCC in the communities listed in Appendix B. The Commission notes that for Bell Canada, the approved expansion only applies to the specific DSAs listed in Appendix B.

III. Are the ILECs' proposals consistent with Telecom Decision 2006-9 with respect to competitor and retail services?

84. In Telecom Decision 2006-9, the ILECs were required to make the backbone facilities funded through the deferral accounts available to ABSPs at a minimal rate. The Commission also determined that any wholesale broadband service offered by the ILECs would be made available in all funded communities. Although the Commission is satisfied that the ILECs' proposals to make their wholesale broadband services available to ABSPs at prevailing rates are consistent with Telecom Decision 2006-9, the following issues remain to be addressed:
- a) Scope and pricing of access to backbone facilities for ABSPs;
 - b) Limits on access to backbone facilities; and
 - c) Timing and offering of ILEC retail services.

a) Scope and pricing of access to backbone facilities for ABSPs

85. The Commission notes that each ILEC proposed a different definition and pricing approach with respect to competitor services. TCC proposed two separate competitor services that provided end-to-end solutions suitable for ABSPs depending on whether they planned to offer broadband services in a single community or in multiple communities. For an ABSP serving a single community, TCC proposed the Carrier Ethernet E10 service that included Ethernet Access, Ethernet Transport, and Internet Transit via TCC's Internet gateway. For an ABSP serving multiple communities, TCC proposed the Carrier Wide Area Network (WAN) E10 service that included Ethernet Access in each served community, Ethernet Transport and aggregation, and a network-to-network interconnection (NNI) that an ABSP could obtain at standard tariffed rates. The Commission notes that the proposed services are based on those made available to eligible ABSPs intending to provide Internet access in designated unserved communities in British Columbia through the existing Connecting Communities Agreement (CCA) between the Government of British Columbia and TCC. In addition, TCC proposed its SuperNet Connect Service to allow an ABSP to access the SuperNet network in Alberta.
86. The Commission notes that TCC proposed to set its competitor service rates at levels that ensured that the broadband facilities constructed through provincial initiatives would not be undercut by the use of deferral account funds. In British Columbia, TCC's proposed rates were set at levels established through the CCA. TCC set its proposed rates at the same levels in Quebec. In Alberta, TCC proposed rates that reflected the existing SuperNet rates. TCC proposed to recover the uneconomic costs of its proposed services from the deferral account, including construction costs for Ethernet Access. TCC also submitted that only including incremental maintenance costs would be at odds with the current rate structure for similar services in Alberta and British Columbia.

87. Bell Canada proposed to introduce its Broadband Expansion service (BES) to provide an ABSP with Ethernet-based transport between the central office (CO) in a community to be served by an ABSP and the associated hub CO. Bell Canada proposed that the service be available to ABSPs in communities where additional transport facilities funded through the deferral account were required to support broadband access to a community.
88. The Commission notes that Bell Canada proposed to structure its BES rate so as to recover the expenses associated with activities such as maintenance and repair, order fulfillment, product management, customer support, and billing. The Commission also notes that Bell Canada proposed to apply a mark-up of at least 15 percent to its proposed costs for its BES competitor service.
89. MTS Allstream proposed to introduce the Ethernet Extension Feature (EEF) service that would extend Ethernet Transport Service to the CO in communities approved for broadband access that did not have an Ethernet switch in place. The Commission notes that MTS Allstream's cost study for this service reflected only the maintenance expenses based on additional equipment or facilities required to extend its existing network to the affected communities.
90. MTS Allstream urged the Commission to order Bell Canada and TCC to propose prices for their services based only on maintenance costs, consistent with Telecom Decision 2006-9. Other parties concurred with MTS Allstream's position. Network BC requested that TCC be allowed to waive a \$20,000 provisioning charge for competitor access to its backbone facilities.
91. The Commission notes that both Bell Canada and MTS Allstream proposed Ethernet-based services that would enable an ABSP to use a segment of the backbone network. To provide an acceptable broadband access service, an ABSP could require additional services such as Ethernet Access or additional transport service to backhaul its traffic to an appropriate destination. In contrast, TCC proposed services that include Ethernet Access and Transport (for both services), and Internet transit for the single community service.
92. The Commission notes that MTS Allstream stated that its EEF service would provide access to Ethernet Transport services in approved communities. The Commission considers that with this definition, ABSPs would be able to make use of MTS Allstream's Ethernet Transport service, the associated carrier-to-carrier interface (CCI), and Ethernet Access.
93. The Commission notes that Bell Canada stated that an ABSP subscribing to its BES would be able to use Bell Canada's Ethernet Access service at existing rates in its serving area and its wholesale services at its hub COs. The Commission further notes that Bell Canada did not indicate which wholesale services would be appropriate for supporting the BES.
94. The Commission notes that Ethernet Access services may not be available at some communities to be approved for broadband expansion and that the provision of Ethernet Access can require significant construction costs for the ILEC. The Commission notes that TCC included Ethernet Access to these communities and proposed to waive the construction costs and recover them from the deferral account. The Commission considers it appropriate that ILECs make Ethernet Access services available to ABSPs that have committed to provide

broadband access service in a community approved for broadband expansion. The Commission further considers that TCC should waive the charges for the construction of Ethernet access facilities for an ABSP and recover these construction costs from the deferral account.

95. The Commission notes that TCC proposed rates for its competitor services that are consistent with rates for existing government-supported broadband initiatives. Given the circumstances, the Commission considers it inappropriate to adjust TCC's proposed rates in British Columbia, Quebec, and Alberta. Accordingly, the Commission finds that TCC's proposed rates are acceptable and directs TCC to file proposed tariffs for its services. The Commission further determines that TCC is to include the revenues realized from these competitor services in the determination of uneconomic costs for deferral account drawdown.
96. The Commission directs Bell Canada and MTS Allstream to submit proposed tariffs and supporting cost studies for their competitor backbone services. Bell Canada and MTS Allstream may include costs for their competitor backbone services that have not been accounted for in the determination of the uneconomic cost of broadband expansion to the communities approved for broadband expansion. The submissions are to include proposals on how an ABSP wishing to provide broadband access in an approved community can connect from its site in that community to the ILEC's CO using the ILEC's services, and further, can transport its traffic using the ILEC's proposed competitor service, or another company's service, to reach alternative destinations for termination of traffic, as provided for in TCC's proposal.

b) Limits on access to backbone facilities

97. Bell Canada proposed to limit access to its BES to two ABSPs with a capacity limit of 10 Mbps each. TCC supported a 10 Mbps limit. TCC also proposed that significant discounts on its competitor service rates would apply only to the first ABSP to enter a given community. MTS Allstream did not propose any limits.
98. Interveners raised issues with respect to the proposed limits, the terms of access, and the possibility of co-location. In addition, BXI and PRiS expressed concerns with the appropriateness of the ILECs administering their competitor services on a first-come, first-served basis. PRiS submitted that Network BC should be assigned the role of determining the ABSP to "gain" TCC's preferred rates in case of contention.
99. With respect to limits, the Commission notes that Bell Canada's proposed limit of two ABSPs at each demarcation point, in addition to itself, was based on the low expected end-user demand and the fact that there are generally only one or two ABSPs in other areas. The Commission also notes Bell Canada's submission that the actual bandwidth could be more than 10 Mbps per ABSP and would be determined as part of an assessment of the backbone requirements for each approved community. The Commission notes Rogers Communications Inc.'s (RCI) submission that while a limit of two ABSPs might suffice in many communities, it might not in all communities. RCI also submitted that spare capacity at low bandwidth was not what the Commission had intended for ABSPs in Telecom Decision 2006-9. The Commission also notes that PRiS submitted that TCC should be instructed to create more tiers of service to support up to 30 Mbps per ABSP.

100. The Commission notes that the communities in the ILECs' proposals generally have a very small subscriber base. The Commission considers that it would be cost-efficient for the ILECs to plan their network expansion in these communities on the assumption of one ABSP requiring access to their backbone facilities. On the other hand, the Commission notes the objective in Telecom Decision 2006-9 to allow for a choice of providers. Accordingly, the Commission considers that when an ILEC receives more than one *bona fide* request for backbone access from ABSPs in an approved community, the ILEC should provide the additional access(es) within a reasonable time frame and report the uneconomic costs of providing the backbone access as part of its tracking report. Furthermore, the Commission finds that each ILEC should provide its competitor services to all ABSPs requiring access to backbone facilities in an approved community at the same approved rate. The Commission further concludes that each ILEC should set the amount of bandwidth that it makes available to any ABSP in line with the provisioning guidelines that it applies to itself for similar services and end-user demand levels.
101. With respect to co-location, the Commission specifically notes the request from PRiS that TCC permit the installation of a router and a wireless radio at the hand-off location or agree that the hand-off would be over an Asymmetric Digital Subscriber Line/High bit-rate Digital Subscriber Line (ADSL/HDSL) wire service, as well as provide mobile tower access at maintenance rates. The Commission also notes that Telecom Decision 2006-9 did not mandate any specific co-location or interconnection mechanism and that the ILECs did not include co-location or interconnection in their proposals. Accordingly, the Commission considers that the ILECs should not be required to provide for co-location or interconnection.

c) Timing and offering of ILEC retail services

102. Consistent with the Commission's 10 March 2006 letter, the Commission is satisfied that Bell Canada, MTS Allstream, and TCC have proposed to make services available in deferral account funded communities that will be comparable in terms of rates, terms, and conditions, upload and download speeds, and reliability to those they provide in urban areas.
103. With respect to the timing of the rollout of access facilities, the Commission notes TCC's proposal to start by constructing only backbone facilities in a particular community in any given year and, if an ABSP indicated its intention by fall of that same year to provide broadband services to the community, TCC would wait three years before offering its own retail services. In the event that no ABSP indicated an intention to serve the community during that time frame, TCC would build access facilities and offer retail services the following year.
104. BXI submitted that, in the interest of market forces and growth, all ILECs should be compelled to abide by at least a three-year moratorium before introducing retail broadband services in an approved community.
105. The Commission notes TCC's proposal to delay in certain circumstances the introduction of its retail broadband services into an approved community and considers it acceptable. The Commission disagrees with BXI that all ILECs should be compelled to abide by a three-year moratorium, as this was not a requirement of Telecom Decision 2006-9.

106. With respect to the timing of the offering of services, Xittel requested that the Commission direct Bell Canada to submit a proposal to allow ABSPs to begin selling services to potential subscribers at the same time that Bell Canada begins to market its own services. CCSA also submitted that Bell Canada should provide information to ABSPs on the availability of its BES well in advance of the rollout of its own service.
107. The Commission notes that the ILECs will be required to file information concerning the construction and service introduction dates for each community where they intend to deploy service. The Commission determines that the ILECs should not begin to market their own services to end-users until such time as a competitor service tariff is in place and ABSPs have access to the ILEC's facilities and services.

IV. What follow-up processes and reporting are required?

108. The ILECs were encouraged in the Commission's 10 March 2006 letter to roll out their broadband expansion plan within four years. Bell Canada, noting in particular the magnitude of its plan and the associated workload, proposed a rollout over five years. In order to roll out broadband to rural and remote areas as quickly as possible, and given that not all of the proposed communities are being approved, the Commission considers that it would be appropriate for all ILECs to complete their rollout within four years, ending in 2011.
109. According to the process set out in the Commission's 10 March 2006 letter, the ILECs were also required to submit an annual updated rollout plan for each subsequent year of their rollouts based on the Commission-approved plan. The Commission notes that ABSPs had the opportunity, as part of the Telecom Public Notice 2006-15 proceeding, to request the exclusion of any community from an ILEC's proposal on the basis of the ABSP's firm plan to expand service to these communities during the ILEC's entire planned rollout period. The Commission further notes that an annual review process would be onerous on ABSPs and other parties. Accordingly, the Commission is of the view that it would be appropriate to approve the ILECs' rollout of broadband services to the communities approved in Telecom Decision 2007-50 and in this Decision, by 31 December 2011, with no ongoing requirement to file annual rollout plans.
110. In light of the foregoing, with respect to the communities approved in Appendix B to this Decision and the communities approved in Telecom Decision 2007-50 not already included in the ILECs' rollout plans filed in September and October 2007, Bell Canada, MTS Allstream, and TCC are directed to file the following information by **17 March 2008**:
 - detailed plans for rolling out broadband service to the approved communities by 31 December 2011 (including construction start date and service introduction date);
 - revised cost studies in the same format used in the ILECs' broadband expansion proposals submitted in September and October 2007, including the Detailed Summary of Phase II Costs table;
 - the estimated per community and total drawdowns from the deferral account; and

- proposed tariffs for backbone access services available to ABSPs in the approved communities. Bell Canada and MTS Allstream are each to include supporting cost studies and proposals describing how an ABSP that has committed to providing broadband access in an approved community can use other services from the company to provide end-to-end connectivity, as directed previously in this Decision.

The abridged version of these filings is to be consistent with the Commission's public disclosure determinations of 16 March 2007.

111. Consistent with the Commission's 10 March 2006 letter, Bell Canada, MTS Allstream, and TCC are directed to file, by 31 March of each year, beginning in 2009 and ending in 2012, a report that shall include
- a description of their previous year's rollout, including the service introduction date for the communities in which broadband service was made available, and the supporting rationale for any changes to the previously filed plan;
 - an update to the relevant cost studies to show actual costs and any changes from the forecasted retail and competitor service revenues; and
 - any adjustment to the deferral account drawdown for the activities carried out in the previous year, and an update to the amount remaining in the ILEC's deferral account.

C. Disposal of the remaining funds in the deferral accounts

112. The Commission notes that with respect to broadband expansion, many of the communities in the ILECs' proposals were not approved because an ABSP currently provided or had firm plans to provide broadband service in the community. As a result, the Commission anticipates that the initiatives approved as part of the Telecom Public Notice 2006-15 proceeding will not completely eliminate the balance accumulated in the ILECs' deferral accounts. Bell Canada and TCC submitted that, should funds remain, the Commission should initiate additional process to allow them to propose additional communities.
113. The Commission notes that its determinations in Telecom Decision 2007-50 and this Decision will improve access to telecommunications services for people with disabilities and bring the benefits of broadband services to hundreds of rural and remote communities. Consistent with Telecom Decision 2006-9, the Commission is of the view that any balance remaining in the deferral accounts should be rebated to consumers.
114. In light of the above, the Commission **denies** the request of Bell Canada and TCC to allow additional process for the submission of new communities. Bell Canada (on behalf of itself and Bell Aliant for their Ontario and Quebec territories), MTS Allstream, and TCC are directed to

file, by **25 March 2008**, proposals to rebate the funds remaining in their deferral accounts to their residential subscribers in non-high-cost serving areas of record as of the date of this Decision.

Secretary General

Related documents

- *Barrett Xplore Inc. – Application to review and vary certain determinations in Telecom Decision 2007-50*, Telecom Decision CRTC 2007-111, 22 November 2007
- *Mitchell Seaforth Cable T.V. Ltd. – Application to review and vary the determinations in Telecom Decision 2007-50 with respect to the community of Dublin, Ontario*, Telecom Decision CRTC 2007-110, 22 November 2007
- *Telecom Public Notice CRTC 2006-15 – Use of deferral account funds to expand broadband services to certain rural and remote communities*, Telecom Decision CRTC 2007-50, 6 July 2007, as amended by Telecom Decision CRTC 2007-50-1, 27 July 2007
- *AT&T Global Services Canada Co. – Application seeking relief with respect to the application of Basic Service Extension Feature charges to configurations involving Competitor Digital Network DS-1 to DS-0 channelization service*, Telecom Decision CRTC 2007-10, 15 February 2007
- *Review of proposals to dispose of the funds accumulated in the deferral accounts*, Telecom Public Notice CRTC 2006-15, 30 November 2006
- *Disposition of funds in the deferral accounts*, Telecom Decision CRTC 2006-9, 16 February 2006
- *Review and disposition of deferral accounts for the second price cap period*, Telecom Public Notice CRTC 2004-1, 24 March 2004
- *Implementation of price regulation for Télébec and TELUS Québec*, Telecom Decision CRTC 2002-43, 31 July 2002
- *Regulatory framework for second price cap period*, Telecom Decision CRTC 2002-34, 30 May 2002, as amended by Telecom Decision CRTC 2002-34-1, 15 July 2002

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>

I. The following are communities for which a late filed exclusion request was received on the basis of an ABSP's current service to the community, and where insufficient information was available to determine whether the ABSP was providing service to the community as of 19 February 2007. A follow-up process will be initiated to obtain the full record required to complete the evaluation of these communities.

ABSP	Community (DSA numbers)	ILEC
Rogers Communications Inc.	Beachville, ON (160-1, 160-2)	Bell Canada
Rogers Communications Inc.	Bluewater Beach, ON (161-1, 165-1, 166-1, 167-1)	Bell Aliant
Amtelecom Cable Limited Partnership c/o CCSA	Port Lambton, ON (161-1, 161-2, 280-1, 361-2)	Bell Aliant
Amtelecom Cable Limited Partnership c/o CCSA	Sombra, ON (160-1, 281-1, 360-1, 361-1)	Bell Aliant
Amtelecom Cable Limited Partnership c/o CCSA	Oil Springs, ON (260-1)	Bell Aliant
Amtelecom Cable Limited Partnership c/o CCSA	Brigden, ON (161-1, 180-1, 180-2, 380-1, 382-2, 480-1)	Bell Aliant
NRTC Communications	Pembroke, ON (111-0, 161-1, 162-1, 163-1, 190-1, 262-1, 302-0, 506-0, 509-1, 780-1, 880-1)	Bell Aliant
NRTC Communications	Petawawa, ON (266-1, 266-3, 303-0)	Bell Aliant

II. The following are communities from Bell Canada's supplemental plan which require DSA-level detail maps from Bell Canada and input from ABSPs in order to be considered for approval.

Campbellford, ON	Hastings, ON	Michigan, ON	La Patrie, QC
Casselman, ON	Hepworth, ON	Tweed, ON	Napierville, QC
Delhi, ON	Lanark, ON	Wingham, ON	Yamaska, QC
Harriston, ON	Maxville, ON		

Approved ILEC
communities/DSAs List

BELL ALIANT				
#	PROVINCE	COMMUNITY	CLLI (WIRE CENTRE)	DSA
Ontario				
1	ON	AILSA CRAIG	ALCGON01	180-3
2	ON	APSLEY	APSYON79	185-1
3	ON	BANCROFT	BNCRON21	182-2
4	ON	BANCROFT	BNCRON21	183-1
5	ON	BANCROFT	BNCRON21	301-0
6	ON	BANCROFT	BNCRON21	482-1
7	ON	BARRY'S BAY	BYBAON36	401-0
8	ON	BARRY'S BAY	BYBAON36	405-0
9	ON	BARRY'S BAY	BYBAON36	406-0
10	ON	BARRY'S BAY	BYBAON36	450-1
11	ON	BARRY'S BAY	BYBAON36	608-0
12	ON	BLUEWATER BEACH	BLBHON17	263-1
13	ON	BLYTH	BLYTON55	160-1
14	ON	BLYTH	BLYTON55	180-2
15	ON	BLYTH	BLYTON55	180-3
16	ON	BLYTH	BLYTON55	260-1
17	ON	BLYTH	BLYTON55	280-2
18	ON	BLYTH	BLYTON55	360-1
19	ON	BLYTH	BLYTON55	380-1
20	ON	BLYTH	BLYTON55	460-1
21	ON	BLYTH	BLYTON55	480-1
22	ON	BLYTH	BLYTON55	480-2
23	ON	CLINTON	CLTNON05	180-1
24	ON	CLINTON	CLTNON05	380-1
25	ON	CLINTON	CLTNON05	382-1
26	ON	CLINTON	CLTNON05	383-1
27	ON	CLINTON	CLTNON05	384-1
28	ON	CLINTON	CLTNON05	385-1
29	ON	CLINTON	CLTNON05	386-1
30	ON	CLINTON	CLTNON05	387-1
31	ON	CLINTON	CLTNON05	480-1
32	ON	CLINTON	CLTNON05	480-2
33	ON	CLINTON	CLTNON05	480-3
34	ON	CLINTON	CLTNON05	580-2
35	ON	CLINTON	CLTNON05	680-2
36	ON	COBDEN	CBDNON40	285-1
37	ON	DENBIGH	DENBON30	182-1
38	ON	DUNDALK	DNDLON16	182-1
39	ON	DUNDALK	DNDLON16	182-2
40	ON	DUNDALK	DNDLON16	183-1
41	ON	DUNDALK	DNDLON16	280-1

BELL ALIANT				
#	PROVINCE	COMMUNITY	CLLI (WIRE CENTRE)	DSA
Ontario				
42	ON	DUNDALK	DNDLON16	280-2
43	ON	DUNDALK	DNDLON16	280-3
44	ON	DUNDALK	DNDLON16	281-1
45	ON	DUNDALK	DNDLON16	282-1
46	ON	DUNDALK	DNDLON16	282-2
47	ON	DUNDALK	DNDLON16	284-1
48	ON	DUNDALK	DNDLON16	285-1
49	ON	DUNDALK	DNDLON16	286-1
50	ON	DUNDALK	DNDLON16	286-2
51	ON	DUNDALK	DNDLON16	380-1
52	ON	DUNDALK	DNDLON16	381-1
53	ON	DUNDALK	DNDLON16	382-1
54	ON	FEVERSHAM	FVHMON20	180-1
55	ON	FEVERSHAM	FVHMON20	181-1
56	ON	FEVERSHAM	FVHMON20	182-1
57	ON	FEVERSHAM	FVHMON20	260-1
58	ON	FEVERSHAM	FVHMON20	260-2
59	ON	FEVERSHAM	FVHMON20	262-1
60	ON	FEVERSHAM	FVHMON20	263-1
61	ON	FEVERSHAM	FVHMON20	290-1
62	ON	FEVERSHAM	FVHMON20	380-1
63	ON	FEVERSHAM	FVHMON20	480-1
64	ON	FEVERSHAM	FVHMON20	481-1
65	ON	FLESHERTON	FLSHON49	182-1
66	ON	FLESHERTON	FLSHON49	183-2
67	ON	FLESHERTON	FLSHON49	184-1
68	ON	GILMOUR	GLMRON31	281-2
69	ON	GODERICH	GDRCON09	180-2
70	ON	GODERICH	GDRCON09	180-3
71	ON	GODERICH	GDRCON09	182-1
72	ON	GODERICH	GDRCON09	185-1
73	ON	GODERICH	GDRCON09	185-2
74	ON	GODERICH	GDRCON09	185-3
75	ON	GODERICH	GDRCON09	280-1
76	ON	GODERICH	GDRCON09	285-1
77	ON	GODERICH	GDRCON09	285-2
78	ON	GODERICH	GDRCON09	305-1
79	ON	GODERICH	GDRCON09	380-1
80	ON	GODERICH	GDRCON09	380-2
81	ON	GODERICH	GDRCON09	380-3
82	ON	GOGAMA	GOGMON62	275-1
83	ON	GOGAMA	GOGMON62	285-1
84	ON	GOLDEN LAKE	GDLKON46	480-1
85	ON	LUCAN	LUCNON01	180-1
86	ON	LUCAN	LUCNON01	182-1

BELL ALIANT				
#	PROVINCE	COMMUNITY	CLLI (WIRE CENTRE)	DSA
Ontario				
87	ON	LUCAN	LUCNON01	185-1
88	ON	MADOC	MADCON33	381-1
89	ON	MAGNETAWAN	MGWNON02	185-1
90	ON	MAGNETAWAN	MGWNON02	190-1
91	ON	MAGNETAWAN	MGWNON02	283-1
92	ON	MARATHON	MRTHON39	183-1
93	ON	MARKDALE	MKDLON56	180-1
94	ON	MARKDALE	MKDLON56	181-1
95	ON	MARKDALE	MKDLON56	281-2
96	ON	MARKDALE	MKDLON56	283-1
97	ON	MARKDALE	MKDLON56	380-1
98	ON	MARKDALE	MKDLON56	481-1
99	ON	MARKDALE	MKDLON56	484-1
100	ON	MARKDALE	MKDLON56	486-1
101	ON	MARKDALE	MKDLON56	488-1
102	ON	MCKELLAR	MKLRON32	180-1
103	ON	MCKELLAR	MKLRON32	182-1
104	ON	MCKELLAR	MKLRON32	281-2
105	ON	MCKELLAR	MKLRON32	282-1
106	ON	MCKELLAR	MKLRON32	380-4
107	ON	MCKELLAR	MKLRON32	382-1
108	ON	MCKELLAR	MKLRON32	383-1
109	ON	NORTHBROOK	NBRKON35	180-1
110	ON	OTTER LAKE	OTLKON25	293-1
111	ON	OTTER LAKE	OTLKON25	382-2
112	ON	OTTER LAKE	OTLKON25	482-1
113	ON	OTTER LAKE	OTLKON25	484-1
114	ON	PARRY SOUND	PYSDON26	184-3
115	ON	PARRY SOUND	PYSDON26	287-1
116	ON	PARRY SOUND	PYSDON26	384-1
117	ON	PARRY SOUND	PYSDON26	385-1
118	ON	PEMBROKE	PMBRON52	403-0
119	ON	PEMBROKE	PMBRON52	504-0
120	ON	PETAWAWA	PTWWON53	302-0
121	ON	PICKLE LAKE	PKLKON34	160-1
122	ON	PICKLE LAKE	PKLKON34	191-1
123	ON	PICKLE LAKE	PKLKON34	192-1
124	ON	PICKLE LAKE	PKLKON34	260-1
125	ON	PICKLE LAKE	PKLKON34	261-1
126	ON	PICKLE LAKE	PKLKON34	261-2
127	ON	PICKLE LAKE	PKLKON34	280-1
128	ON	PICKLE LAKE	PKLKON34	380-1
129	ON	PLEVNA	PLVNON33	180-1
130	ON	PLEVNA	PLVNON33	181-1
131	ON	PLEVNA	PLVNON33	182-1

BELL ALIANT				
#	PROVINCE	COMMUNITY	CLLI (WIRE CENTRE)	DSA
Ontario				
132	ON	PLEVNA	PLVNON33	183-1
133	ON	PLEVNA	PLVNON33	281-1
134	ON	PLEVNA	PLVNON33	281-2
135	ON	PLEVNA	PLVNON33	380-1
136	ON	PLEVNA	PLVNON33	381-1
137	ON	PLEVNA	PLVNON33	381-2
138	ON	PLEVNA	PLVNON33	382-1
139	ON	PLEVNA	PLVNON33	480-1
140	ON	PLEVNA	PLVNON33	481-1
141	ON	SAUBLE BEACH	SABHON46	165-1
142	ON	SAUBLE BEACH	SABHON46	166-1
143	ON	SAUBLE BEACH	SABHON46	364-1
144	ON	SAULT STE. MARIE-AIRPORT	SSMRON86	180-2
145	ON	SAULT STE. MARIE-AIRPORT	SSMRON86	381-1
146	ON	SEBRIGHT	SBRTON32	181-1
147	ON	SEBRIGHT	SBRTON32	382-1
148	ON	SEBRIGHT	SBRTON32	383-1
149	ON	SEBRIGHT	SBRTON32	385-1
150	ON	SOUTH RIVER	SORVON35	383-1
151	ON	TAMWORTH	TMWOON37	180-1
152	ON	THORNBURY	TNBYON64	183-1
153	ON	THORNBURY	TNBYON64	282-1
154	ON	THORNBURY	TNBYON64	286-1
155	ON	THORNBURY	TNBYON64	287-1
156	ON	THORNBURY	TNBYON64	380-2
157	ON	WAWA	WAWAON01	362-1
158	ON	WAWA	WAWAON01	381-1
159	ON	WAWA	WAWAON01	680-1
160	ON	WIARTON	WRTNON66	181-1
161	ON	WIARTON	WRTNON66	182-1
162	ON	WIARTON	WRTNON66	183-1
163	ON	WIARTON	WRTNON66	183-2
164	ON	WIARTON	WRTNON66	282-1
165	ON	WIARTON	WRTNON66	283-1
166	ON	WIARTON	WRTNON66	283-2
167	ON	WIARTON	WRTNON66	284-1
168	ON	WIARTON	WRTNON66	284-2
169	ON	WIARTON	WRTNON66	285-1
170	ON	WIARTON	WRTNON66	285-2
171	ON	WIARTON	WRTNON66	286-1
172	ON	WIARTON	WRTNON66	286-2
173	ON	WIARTON	WRTNON66	287-1
174	ON	WIARTON	WRTNON66	288-1
175	ON	WIARTON	WRTNON66	289-1
176	ON	WIARTON	WRTNON66	381-1

BELL ALIANT				
#	PROVINCE	COMMUNITY	CLLI (WIRE CENTRE)	DSA
Ontario				
177	ON	WIARTON	WRTNON66	382-1
178	ON	WIARTON	WRTNON66	382-3
179	ON	WIARTON	WRTNON66	481-1
180	ON	WIARTON	WRTNON66	484-1
181	ON	WINONA	WINOON09	306-4
Supplemental				
1	ON	ARMSTRONG	ARMSON01	160-1
2	ON	ARMSTRONG	ARMSON01	160-2
3	ON	ARMSTRONG	ARMSON01	160-3
4	ON	ARMSTRONG	ARMSON01	280-0
5	ON	ARMSTRONG	ARMSON01	280-2
6	ON	ARMSTRONG	ARMSON01	290-1
7	ON	CALABOGIE	CALBON37	101-0
8	ON	CALABOGIE	CALBON37	381-1
9	ON	CALABOGIE	CALBON37	460-1
10	ON	CALABOGIE	CALBON37	583-1
11	ON	CLOUD BAY	CDBAON30	180-1
12	ON	CLOUD BAY	CDBAON30	182-1
13	ON	CLOUD BAY	CDBAON30	183-1
14	ON	CLOUD BAY	CDBAON30	184-1
15	ON	CLOUD BAY	CDBAON30	190-1
16	ON	CLOUD BAY	CDBAON30	280-1
17	ON	CLOUD BAY	CDBAON30	280-2
18	ON	CLOUD BAY	CDBAON30	281-1
19	ON	CLOUD BAY	CDBAON30	281-2
20	ON	CLOUD BAY	CDBAON30	281-3
21	ON	CLOUD BAY	CDBAON30	282-1
22	ON	CLOUD BAY	CDBAON30	283-1
23	ON	EAGLE RIVER	EGRVON23	160-1
24	ON	EAGLE RIVER	EGRVON23	180-1
25	ON	EAGLE RIVER	EGRVON23	181-1
26	ON	EAGLE RIVER	EGRVON23	280-1
27	ON	EAGLE RIVER	EGRVON23	281-1
28	ON	EAGLE RIVER	EGRVON23	380-1
29	ON	EAGLE RIVER	EGRVON23	381-1
30	ON	ECHO BAY	ECBAON93	280-2
31	ON	ECHO BAY	ECBAON93	281-1
32	ON	ECHO BAY	ECBAON93	282-1
33	ON	ECHO BAY	ECBAON93	382-1
34	ON	KAMINISTIQUIA	KMTQON52	182-1
35	ON	KAMINISTIQUIA	KMTQON52	183-1
36	ON	KAMINISTIQUIA	KMTQON52	185-1
37	ON	KAMINISTIQUIA	KMTQON52	382-2
38	ON	KAMINISTIQUIA	KMTQON52	383-1
39	ON	KAMINISTIQUIA	KMTQON52	384-1

BELL ALIANT				
#	PROVINCE	COMMUNITY	CLLI (WIRE CENTRE)	DSA
Ontario				
Supplemental				
40	ON	KAMINISTIQUEIA	KMTQON52	385-1
41	ON	KAMINISTIQUEIA	KMTQON52	486-1
42	ON	MAYNOOTH	MYNTON34	181-2
43	ON	MAYNOOTH	MYNTON34	281-2
44	ON	MAYNOOTH	MYNTON34	282-1
45	ON	MAYNOOTH	MYNTON34	282-2
46	ON	MAYNOOTH	MYNTON34	282-3
47	ON	MAYNOOTH	MYNTON34	381-2
48	ON	MEAFORD	MEFDON58	186-1
49	ON	MEAFORD	MEFDON58	188-1
50	ON	MEAFORD	MEFDON58	282-1
51	ON	MEAFORD	MEFDON58	283-1
52	ON	MEAFORD	MEFDON58	381-1
53	ON	MORSON	MRSNON24	161-1
54	ON	MORSON	MRSNON24	162-1
55	ON	MORSON	MRSNON24	260-1
56	ON	MORSON	MRSNON24	261-1
57	ON	MORSON	MRSNON24	280-1
58	ON	MORSON	MRSNON24	281-1
59	ON	MORSON	MRSNON24	283-1
60	ON	MORSON	MRSNON24	284-1
61	ON	MORSON	MRSNON24	285-1
62	ON	SHEBANDOWAN	SBDNON51	180-1
63	ON	SHEBANDOWAN	SBDNON51	181-1
64	ON	SHEBANDOWAN	SBDNON51	183-1
65	ON	SHEBANDOWAN	SBDNON51	190-0
66	ON	SHEBANDOWAN	SBDNON51	191-1
67	ON	SHEBANDOWAN	SBDNON51	280-1
68	ON	SHEBANDOWAN	SBDNON51	281-1
69	ON	STRATTON	SRTNON22	181-1
70	ON	STRATTON	SRTNON22	183-1
71	ON	STRATTON	SRTNON22	184-1
72	ON	STRATTON	SRTNON22	185-1
73	ON	STRATTON	SRTNON22	480-1
74	ON	STRATTON	SRTNON22	481-1
75	ON	STRATTON	SRTNON22	482-1
76	ON	STRATTON	SRTNON22	483-1
77	ON	VERMILION BAY	VMBAON29	181-1
78	ON	VERMILION BAY	VMBAON29	181-2
79	ON	VERMILION BAY	VMBAON29	182-1
80	ON	VERMILION BAY	VMBAON29	182-2
81	ON	VERMILION BAY	VMBAON29	183-1
82	ON	VERMILION BAY	VMBAON29	185-1
83	ON	VERMILION BAY	VMBAON29	186-1

BELL ALIANT				
#	PROVINCE	COMMUNITY	CLLI (WIRE CENTRE)	DSA
Ontario				
Supplemental				
84	ON	VERMILION BAY	VMBAON29	190-1
85	ON	VERMILION BAY	VMBAON29	191-1
86	ON	VERMILION BAY	VMBAON29	192-1
87	ON	VERMILION BAY	VMBAON29	193-1
88	ON	VERMILION BAY	VMBAON29	280-1
89	ON	VERMILION BAY	VMBAON29	281-1
90	ON	VERMILION BAY	VMBAON29	382-1
91	ON	VERMILION BAY	VMBAON29	383-1
92	ON	VERMILION BAY	VMBAON29	384-1
93	ON	VERMILION BAY	VMBAON29	384-2
94	ON	VERMILION BAY	VMBAON29	385-1
95	ON	VERMILION BAY	VMBAON29	385-2
96	ON	VERMILION BAY	VMBAON29	386-1
97	ON	WABIGOON	WBGNON30	180-1
98	ON	WABIGOON	WBGNON30	181-1
99	ON	WABIGOON	WBGNON30	182-1
100	ON	WABIGOON	WBGNON30	280-1
101	ON	WABIGOON	WBGNON30	281-1
102	ON	WABIGOON	WBGNON30	283-1
103	ON	WABIGOON	WBGNON30	284-1
Quebec				
1	QC	BISHOPTON	BPTNPQ02	304-1
2	QC	BURY	BURYPQ04	101-1
3	QC	CLERMONT	CRCVPQ37	304-1
4	QC	CLERMONT	CRCVPQ37	307-1
5	QC	CLERMONT	CRCVPQ37	308-1
6	QC	CLERMONT	CRCVPQ37	318-1
7	QC	CLERMONT	CRCVPQ37	329-1
8	QC	EAST BROUGHTON	EBTNPQ29	160-1
9	QC	EAST BROUGHTON	EBTNPQ29	170-1
10	QC	HÉBERTVILLE-STATION	HVSTPQ20	207-1
11	QC	HÉBERTVILLE-STATION	HVSTPQ20	209-1
12	QC	HÉBERTVILLE-STATION	HVSTPQ20	218-1
13	QC	HUNTINGDON	HNTGPQ43	1220
14	QC	HUNTINGDON	HNTGPQ43	1501
15	QC	HUNTINGDON	HNTGPQ43	1601
16	QC	HUNTINGDON	HNTGPQ43	2015
17	QC	HUNTINGDON	HNTGPQ43	101-4
18	QC	HUNTINGDON	HNTGPQ43	110-1
19	QC	HUNTINGDON	HNTGPQ43	205-1
20	QC	HUNTINGDON	HNTGPQ43	225-4
21	QC	KNOWLTON	KZBZPQ10	206-1
22	QC	LA MALBAIE	LMLBPQ41	127-1

BELL ALIANT				
#	PROVINCE	COMMUNITY	CLLI (WIRE CENTRE)	DSA
Quebec				
23	QC	LEEDS	LEDSPQ32	103-1
24	QC	LEEDS	LEDSPQ32	214-1
25	QC	LEEDS	LEDSPQ32	222-1
26	QC	MANSONVILLE	MNVLPQ84	101-1
27	QC	MANSONVILLE	MNVLPQ84	105-1
28	QC	MANSONVILLE	MNVLPQ84	106-1
29	QC	MANSONVILLE	MNVLPQ84	107-1
30	QC	MANSONVILLE	MNVLPQ84	108-1
31	QC	MANSONVILLE	MNVLPQ84	202-1
32	QC	MANSONVILLE	MNVLPQ84	203-1
33	QC	ORMSTOWN	ORTNPQ44	101-5
34	QC	ORMSTOWN	ORTNPQ44	205-3
35	QC	RIVIÈRE-BLEUE	RBLUPQ47	107-1
36	QC	ROCK ISLAND	RCISPQ18	1330
37	QC	ROCK ISLAND	RCISPQ18	106-1
38	QC	ROCK ISLAND	RCISPQ18	115-1
39	QC	ROCK ISLAND	RCISPQ18	204-1
40	QC	ROCK ISLAND	RCISPQ18	205-1
41	QC	ROCK ISLAND	RCISPQ18	206-1
42	QC	ROCK ISLAND	RCISPQ18	207-1
43	QC	ST-HONORÉ (TÉMISCOUATA CO.)	SHTCPQ58	104-1 (1008)
44	QC	ST-HONORÉ (TÉMISCOUATA CO.)	SHTCPQ58	206-1 (1101)
45	QC	ST-HONORÉ (TÉMISCOUATA CO.)	SHTCPQ58	105-2
46	QC	ST-HONORÉ (TÉMISCOUATA CO.)	SHTCPQ58	105-3
47	QC	ST-HONORÉ (TÉMISCOUATA CO.)	SHTCPQ58	105-4
48	QC	ST-HONORÉ (TÉMISCOUATA CO.)	SHTCPQ58	106-2
49	QC	ST-HONORÉ (TÉMISCOUATA CO.)	SHTCPQ58	107-1
50	QC	ST-HONORÉ (TÉMISCOUATA CO.)	SHTCPQ58	205-1
51	QC	STRATFORD CENTRE	SRCTPQ01	102-1
52	QC	STRATFORD CENTRE	SRCTPQ01	103-1
53	QC	STRATFORD CENTRE	SRCTPQ01	112-1
54	QC	STRATFORD CENTRE	SRCTPQ01	202-1
55	QC	STRATFORD CENTRE	SRCTPQ01	220-1
56	QC	ST-SÉBASTIEN (FRONTENAC CO.)	STSFQ36	230-1
57	QC	SUTTON	STTNPQ81	115-1
58	QC	SUTTON	STTNPQ81	140-1
59	QC	SUTTON	STTNPQ81	150-1
60	QC	SUTTON	STTNPQ81	206-1
61	QC	SUTTON	STTNPQ81	211-1
62	QC	SUTTON	STTNPQ81	212-1
63	QC	SUTTON	STTNPQ81	220-1
64	QC	SUTTON	STTNPQ81	225-1
65	QC	SUTTON	STTNPQ81	235-1

BELL ALIANT				
#	PROVINCE	COMMUNITY	CLLI (WIRE CENTRE)	DSA
Quebec				
66	QC	TRING JONCTION	TRJTPQ01	130-1
67	QC	WEEDON	WEDNPQ01	103-1
68	QC	WEEDON	WEDNPQ01	221-1
69	QC	WEEDON	WEDNPQ01	223-1
70	QC	WEEDON	WEDNPQ01	225-1
Supplemental				
1	QC	BAIE-ST-PAUL	BSTPPQ24	104-1
2	QC	BAIE-ST-PAUL	BSTPPQ24	204-1
3	QC	BAIE-ST-PAUL	BSTPPQ24	402-2
4	QC	COOKSHIRE	CKSRPQ07	104-1
5	QC	COOKSHIRE	CKSRPQ07	202-1
6	QC	COOKSHIRE	CKSRPQ07	203-1
7	QC	HENRYVILLE	HEVLQP94	203-1
8	QC	HENRYVILLE	HEVLQP94	204-1
9	QC	L'ANNONCIATION	LANNPQ50	111-1
10	QC	L'ANNONCIATION	LANNPQ50	114-1
11	QC	L'ANNONCIATION	LANNPQ50	115-1
12	QC	L'ANNONCIATION	LANNPQ50	117-1
13	QC	L'ANNONCIATION	LANNPQ50	125-1
14	QC	L'ANNONCIATION	LANNPQ50	135-1
15	QC	L'ANNONCIATION	LANNPQ50	136-1
16	QC	L'ANNONCIATION	LANNPQ50	137-1
17	QC	L'ANNONCIATION	LANNPQ50	212-1

BELL CANADA				
#	PROVINCE	COMMUNITY	CLLI (WIRE CENTRE)	DSA
Ontario				
1	ON	ACTON	ACTNON16	180-1
2	ON	ACTON	ACTNON16	181-1
3	ON	ACTON	ACTNON16	190-1
4	ON	ACTON	ACTNON16	283-1
5	ON	ACTON	ACTNON16	381-1
6	ON	ACTON	ACTNON16	382-1
7	ON	ACTON	ACTNON16	383-1
8	ON	BEACHVILLE	BCVLON33	180-1
9	ON	BEACHVILLE	BCVLON33	380-1
10	ON	BEACHVILLE	BCVLON33	381-1
11	ON	CAMPBELLVILLE	CPVLON15	184-1
12	ON	CREEMORE	CRMRON24	390-1
13	ON	CREEMORE	CRMRON24	391-1
14	ON	CREEMORE	CRMRON24	394-1
15	ON	CREEMORE	CRMRON24	485-1
16	ON	FORT ERIE	FTERON02	104-1
17	ON	RIDGEWAY	RDWYON06	204-1

BELL CANADA				
#	PROVINCE	COMMUNITY	CLLI (WIRE CENTRE)	DSA
Ontario				
18	ON	RIDGEWAY	RDWYON06	205-1
19	ON	RIDGEWAY	RDWYON06	213-1
20	ON	RIDGEWAY	RDWYON06	222-1
21	ON	RIDGEWAY	RDWYON06	383-1
22	ON	RIDGEWAY	RDWYON06	391-1
23	ON	STEVENSVILLE	STVLON07	161-5
24	ON	STEVENSVILLE	STVLON07	184-1
Quebec				
1	QC	ARUNDEL	ARDLPQ47	102-2
2	QC	ARUNDEL	ARDLPQ47	107-1
3	QC	ARUNDEL	ARDLPQ47	202-1
4	QC	ARUNDEL	ARDLPQ47	203-1
5	QC	ARUNDEL	ARDLPQ47	204-2
6	QC	AYER'S CLIFF	AYCLPQ01	1201
7	QC	COMPTON	CMTNPQ05	204-1
8	QC	DUNHAM	DNHMPQ90	105-1
9	QC	DUNHAM	DNHMPQ90	107-1
10	QC	DUNHAM	DNHMPQ90	108-1
11	QC	DUNHAM	DNHMPQ90	109-1
12	QC	DUNHAM	DNHMPQ90	203-1
13	QC	DUNHAM	DNHMPQ90	205-1
14	QC	DUNHAM	DNHMPQ90	208-1
15	QC	DUNHAM	DNHMPQ90	210-1
16	QC	DUNHAM	DNHMPQ90	211-1
17	QC	DUNHAM	DNHMPQ90	501-1
18	QC	DUNHAM	DNHMPQ90	504-1
19	QC	DUNHAM	DNHMPQ90	505-1
20	QC	DUNHAM	DNHMPQ90	506-1
21	QC	DUNHAM	DNHMPQ90	507-1
22	QC	DUNHAM	DNHMPQ90	508-1
MTS ALLSTREAM				
#	PROVINCE	COMMUNITY	EXCHANGE NAME	
1	MB	Roseau River	Dominion City	
2	MB	Sandy Bay	Amaranth	
3	MB	Woodridge	Woodridge	
Supplemental				
1	MB	Cooks Creek	Oakbank	
2	MB	Dallas	Fisher River	

TCC			
#	PROVINCE	COMMUNITY	EXCHANGE NAME
Alberta			
1	AB	Alder Flats	Alder Flats
2	AB	Ashmont	Ashmont
3	AB	Bear Canyon	Bear Canyon
4	AB	Berwyn	Berwyn
5	AB	Blue Ridge	Blue Ridge
6	AB	Brocket	Brocket
7	AB	Buck Lake	Alder Flats
8	AB	Burdett	Burdett
9	AB	Bymr/Byemoor	Byemoor
10	AB	Cardiff Echos	Morinville
11	AB	Coutts	Coutts
12	AB	Derwent	Derwent
13	AB	Dixonville	Dixonville
14	AB	Donalda	Donalda
15	AB	Donalda (Dnldab03)	Donalda
16	AB	Donnelly	Donnelly
17	AB	East Coulee	East Coulee
18	AB	Elkwater	Elkwater
19	AB	Etzikom	Etzikom
20	AB	Faust	Faust
21	AB	Ferintosh	Ferintosh
22	AB	Flatbush	Flatbush
23	AB	Foremost	Foremost
24	AB	Gift Lake	Gift Lake
25	AB	Girouxville	Girouxville
26	AB	Gleichen	Gleichen
27	AB	Grassy Lake	Grassy Lake
28	AB	Hilda	Hilda
29	AB	Hines Creek	Hines Creek
30	AB	Hobbema	Hobbema
31	AB	Holden	Holden
32	AB	Hussar	Hussar
33	AB	Irma	Irma
34	AB	Jarvie	Jarvie
35	AB	Joussard	Joussard
36	AB	Keephills	Keephills
37	AB	Keg River	Keg River
38	AB	Leslieville	Leslieville
39	AB	Longview	Longview
40	AB	Ma-Me-O-Beach	Ma-Me-O-Beach
41	AB	Manyberries	Manyberries
42	AB	Marlboro	Marlboro
43	AB	Mclennan	Mclennan
44	AB	Mulhurst	Mulhurst
45	AB	Mundare	Mundare

TCC			
#	PROVINCE	COMMUNITY	EXCHANGE NAME
Alberta			
46	AB	New Dayton	New Dayton
47	AB	Nordegg	Nordegg
48	AB	Peerless Lake	Peerless Lake
49	AB	Peers	Peers
50	AB	Robb	Robb
51	AB	Rolling Hills	Rolling Hills
52	AB	Rosalind	Rosalind
53	AB	Rosebud	Rosebud
54	AB	Saddle Lake I.R.	Ashmont
55	AB	Schuler	Schuler
56	AB	Seba Beach	Seba Beach
57	AB	Seven Persons	Seven Persons
58	AB	Smith	Smith
59	AB	Smoky Lake	Smoky Lake
60	AB	Stirling	Stirling
61	AB	St Michael	St Michael
62	AB	Tilley	Tilley
63	AB	Vilna	Vilna
64	AB	Walsh	Walsh
65	AB	Warner	Warner
66	AB	Waterton Park	Waterton Park
67	AB	Widewater	Widewater
68	AB	Wildwood	Wildwood
69	AB	Worsley	Worsley
70	AB	Wrentham	Wrentham
Supplemental			
1	AB	Bruce	Holden
2	AB	Calling Lake	Calling Lake
3	AB	Chipewyan Lake	Chipewyan Lake
4	AB	Clyde	Clyde
5	AB	Enchant	Enchant
6	AB	English Bay	Cold Lake
7	AB	Hays	Hays
8	AB	Heinsburg	Heinsburg
9	AB	Hslr/Heisler	Heisler
10	AB	Iron Springs	Iron Springs
11	AB	Legal	Legal
12	AB	Pickardville	Westlock
13	AB	Rochester	Rochester
14	AB	Warspite	Warspite
15	AB	Waskatenau	Waskatenau
16	AB	Whitelaw	Whitelaw

TCC			
#	PROVINCE	COMMUNITY	EXCHANGE NAME
British Columbia			
1	BC	Chawathil	Hope
2	BC	Elko	Elko
3	BC	Hesquiaht	Tofino
4	BC	Hesquiaht (Refuge Cove 6)	Tofino
5	BC	Jaffray (Galloway)	Jaffray
6	BC	Kitselas (Kulspai 6)	Terrace
7	BC	Kluskus No. 1	Bouchie Lake
8	BC	Kwicksutaineuk-Ah-Kwaw-Ah-Mish (Gwayasdums No. 1)	Port McNeill
9	BC	Little Shuswap Lake (Chum Creek)	Chase
10	BC	Marble Bay	Lake Cowichan
11	BC	Pender Harbour (Earls Cove)	Pender Harbour
12	BC	Pender Harbour (Egmont)	Pender Harbour
13	BC	Puckathoetchin No. 11	Hope
14	BC	Red Mountain (Red Mtn Ski Area)	Rossland
15	BC	Saltery Bay	Black Point
Supplemental			
1	BC	Bonaparte (Bonaparte 3)	Cache Creek
2	BC	Ditidaht (Malachan 11)	Youbou
3	BC	Ehattesah (Chenahkint 12)	Zeballos
4	BC	Klahoose Fn (Tork 7)	Cortes Island
5	BC	Lake Babine Nation (Pinkut Lake 23)	Burns Lake
6	BC	Nee-Tahi-Buhn (Uncha Lake 13A)	Grassy Plains
7	BC	Tsawatanineuk (Quaee 7)	Alert Bay
8	BC	Xeni Gwet'In First Nations Government (Chilco Lake No. 1A)	Tatla Lake
Quebec			
1	QC	Cap des Rosiers	Cap des Rosiers
2	QC	Cloridorme	Cloridorme
3	QC	Gesgapegiag 2	Maria
4	QC	St-Joseph-des-Érables	St-Joseph
Supplemental			
1	QC	Colombier	Colombier
2	QC	Gros Morne	Mont-Louis
3	QC	Lac Sacré-Coeur	St-Apollinaire
4	QC	Marsoui	La Martre
5	QC	St-Jean de la Lande	St-Georges
6	QC	St-Théophile	St-Théophile