



Telecom Order CRTC 2013-504

PDF version

Ottawa, 20 September 2013

Wightman Telecom Ltd. – Interoperating Company Trunk Service

File number: Tariff Notice 28

Application

1. The Commission received an application from Wightman Telecom Ltd. (Wightman), dated 7 March 2013, in which the company proposed to introduce General Tariff item 200 – Interoperating Company Trunk Service. Wightman indicated that the service would provide for one-way trunks between it and competitive local exchange carriers (CLECs) operating in its territory. Wightman stated that it would use these trunks to route local traffic that it receives from outside its operating territory and that is intended for CLEC customers.
2. Wightman submitted that the proposed service would fill a gap in the local interconnection regime in its territory. It submitted that the existing local interconnection trunks between itself and a CLEC are intended to exchange local traffic within Wightman’s local interconnection region (LIR),¹ but that there is currently no service that appropriately compensates Wightman for routing local traffic received from outside its operating territory and destined for CLEC customers.
3. The Commission received interventions regarding Wightman’s application from Bragg Communications Inc., operating as EastLink (EastLink); Bruce Telecom; Hay Communications Co-operative Limited (Hay Communications); Mornington Communications Co-operative Ltd. (Mornington); TELUS Communications Company (TCC); and Tuckersmith Communications Co-operative Ltd. (Tuckersmith). The public record of this proceeding, which closed on 22 April 2013, is available on the Commission’s website at www.crtc.gc.ca under “Public Proceedings” or by using the file number provided above.

Should the Commission approve Wightman’s application?

4. Bruce Telecom, Hay Communications, Mornington, and Tuckersmith supported Wightman’s proposal.

¹ In Telecom Decisions 2004-46 and 2006-35, the Commission modified the regulatory framework for interconnection of local exchange carriers by consolidating exchanges to form larger LIRs; an LIR could then consist of many exchanges. Competitors no longer had to interconnect with the incumbent local exchange carrier in each exchange, but could instead interconnect within LIRs.

5. EastLink noted that in Telecom Decision 2004-46, the Commission determined that as long as a call is carried to the point of interconnection in the terminating LIR, the call is exactly the same as a call that originates and terminates in the LIR. It also noted that the Commission had found it reasonable for these calls to be routed on local interconnection trunks for termination in the LIR. EastLink submitted that Wightman should have to identify and provide evidence of the unique costs it claimed to incur that other incumbent local exchange carriers (ILECs) do not incur.
6. TCC submitted that Wightman had not described the arrangements under which it receives transit traffic. The company argued that Wightman must demonstrate that it is not already being compensated by the originating carrier for the completion of these calls. TCC submitted that approving the application without establishing that Wightman is not already being paid could lead to double compensation.

Commission's analysis and determinations

7. In Telecom Order 2012-369, the Commission disposed of an application from CoopTel, a small ILEC, in which the company had proposed that its local interconnection services be used solely to route calls between its subscribers and those of the competitor in its incumbent exchanges. In response to comments by TCC that CoopTel's call routing description was too restrictive, the Commission noted that local traffic includes local calls coming from and terminating in the same local calling area.² The Commission concluded that the wording of CoopTel's proposed tariff would have to be modified to indicate that calls coming from the same local calling area as that of the exchange to which they are routed for termination in CoopTel's incumbent operating territory must be routed through its local interconnection services.
8. The Commission notes that Wightman has proposed a new service to transport local calls that originate outside its operating territory to the terminating CLEC inside its operating territory. The Commission considers that such calls are local calls that originate in Wightman's local calling area. The Commission also considers that its determination in Telecom Order 2012-369 regarding the routing of local calls is relevant in this case. The Commission therefore determines that calls coming from the same local calling area as that of the exchange to which they are routed for termination in Wightman's operating territory must be routed through Wightman's local interconnection services.
9. Accordingly, the Commission **denies** Wightman's application.

Secretary General

² A local calling area is a geographic area, made up of ILEC exchanges, within which residential and business customers can make local telephone calls without incurring long distance charges. The local calling area may include areas that are outside the company's operating territory.

Related documents

- *CoopTel – Access Services Tariff for Local Network Interconnection*, Telecom Order CRTC 2012-369, 9 July 2012
- *Follow-up to Trunking arrangements for the interchange of traffic and the point of interconnection between local exchange carriers*, *Telecom Decision CRTC 2004-46*, Telecom Decision CRTC 2006-35, 29 May 2006
- *Trunking arrangements for the interchange of traffic and the point of interconnection between local exchange carriers*, Telecom Decision CRTC 2004-46, 14 July 2004