



## **Telecom Order CRTC 2007-51**

Ottawa, 16 February 2007

### **Bell Canada and Bell Aliant Regional Communications, Limited Partnership**

Reference: Bell Canada Tariff Notice 6993  
Bell Aliant Tariff Notice 48

#### **Destandardization of Station Message Detail Recording – Manual Delivery service and Electronic Transfer of Centrex Station Message Detail Recording service**

*In this Order, the Commission approves applications by Bell Aliant Regional Communications, Limited Partnership and Bell Canada to destandardize Station Message Detail Recording – Manual Delivery service and Electronic Transfer of Centrex Station Message Detail Recording service.*

#### **Introduction**

1. The Commission received an application by Bell Aliant Regional Communications, Limited Partnership (Bell Aliant) and an application by Bell Canada (collectively, the Companies), both dated 18 October 2006, proposing revisions to their respective versions of General Tariff item 675 – Centrex III Service – Rates and Charges in order to destandardize their Station Message Detail Recording – Manual Delivery (SMDR/MD) service. The Companies also proposed revisions to their respective versions of General Tariff item 677 – Electronic Transfer Capability for Centrex in order to destandardize their Electronic Transfer of Centrex Station Message Detail Recording (ET) service.
2. The Companies noted that SMDR/MD and ET services provided customers with details of all long distance and special service calls made by every station in their Centrex system.
3. The Companies also noted that calling details provided by SMDR/MD service were provided to customers via magnetic tape on a monthly basis and that calling details provided by ET service were delivered to a secure, password-protected customer mailbox in the Companies' systems within two business days from the time the records were generated.

#### **Background**

4. In *New procedures for disposition of applications dealing with the destandardization and/or withdrawal of tariffed services*, Telecom Circular CRTC 2005-7, 30 May 2005 (Circular 2005-7), the Commission indicated that in order to properly assess a proposal for the destandardization and/or withdrawal of a tariffed service, the applicant must file an application containing the following information:
  - a) service proposed to be destandardized and/or withdrawn;

- b) proposed date for destandardization;
  - c) proposed date for ultimate withdrawal of service;
  - d) type of destandardization;
  - e) rationale for the application;
  - f) availability of a substitute, with rationale as to why it is reasonable in terms of equivalent functionality, availability in the same geographical area, and cost (including the initial outlay and ongoing costs to the customer);
  - g) the transition plan;
  - h) relevant information concerning existing customers, such as the number of customers affected;
  - i) a copy of the notice to affected customers; and
  - j) any other information the applicant believes is relevant.
5. The Commission further indicated that if the applicant considered that certain criteria should not apply to a particular application, the applicant was expected to provide submissions regarding why it believed those criteria should not apply.
  6. The Commission stated in Circular 2005-7 that the applicant must provide notice to each customer affected by its application to destandardize and/or withdraw a particular service and that the notice should be sent to affected customers on the date the application was filed. The Commission specified that the notice must include items a) to g) as set out in paragraph 4 above, as well as clear and detailed information regarding how an affected customer could participate in the Commission's process, including the date by which comments must be received by the Commission. The Commission also specified that interested parties should be allowed 45 calendar days to comment on an applicant's destandardization and/or withdrawal application.

#### **The Companies' applications**

7. The Companies submitted that their applications were consistent with the criteria established in Circular 2005-7 and provided the following information to support their requests:
  - a) service proposed to be destandardized and/or withdrawn

The Companies proposed to modify their respective versions of General Tariff item 675 – Centrex III Service – Rates and Charges in order to destandardize SMDR/MD service. The Companies also proposed to modify their respective versions of General Tariff item 677 – Electronic Transfer Capability for Centrex in order to destandardize ET service.

b) proposed date for destandardization

The Companies requested approval to destandardize SMDR/MD and ET services 45 business days from the date of their applications.

c) proposed date for ultimate withdrawal of service

The Companies indicated that they were not proposing to withdraw SMDR/MD and ET services at this time.

d) type of destandardization

The Companies proposed to destandardize SMDR/MD and ET services, making them unavailable to new customers. The Companies submitted that new customers would be referred to the Companies' SMDR – File Distribution (SMDR/FD) service. The Companies also submitted that customers who currently received SMDR/MD or ET services would continue to do so in accordance with General Tariff items 675 and 677 respectively. The Companies further submitted, however, that additions or changes to SMDR/MD and ET services would no longer be available to existing customers.

e) rationale for the application

The Companies submitted that there were no differences between the types of calling details provided by SMDR/MD and ET services and the type of calling details provided by SMDR/FD service. The Companies indicated, however, that the majority of hardware components used by the SMDR/MD and ET platforms had been discontinued by the manufacturer and were no longer available. The Companies submitted that should a failure of either platform occur, they would be unable to restore the SMDR/MD and ET services. The Companies also submitted that such a failure would directly affect existing SMDR/MD and ET customers since the Companies would be unable to deliver SMDR data through these services.

The Companies submitted, therefore, that SMDR/MD and ET services had become obsolete, and in view of the lack of replacement parts for the SMDR/MD and ET platforms, they proposed to destandardize those services.

The Companies submitted that by destandardizing SMDR/MD and ET services, they would ensure that affected customers would be provided with a new, more reliable service that would enable customers to receive their calling details at favourable rates.

- f) availability of a substitute, with rationale as to why it is reasonable in terms of equivalent functionality, availability in the same geographical area, and cost (including the initial outlay and ongoing costs to the customer)

The Companies submitted that SMDR/FD service provided a quick, convenient and cost-effective method for Centrex customers to retrieve their SMDR data. The Companies indicated that SMDR/FD was a Web-based delivery service used to transmit customer-specific calling details to a secure Company website. The Companies also indicated that SMDR/FD service enabled customers to access their SMDR data and to download those files for processing.

The Companies indicated that SMDR/FD service was available in the same geographic areas as SMDR/MD and ET services, and provided calling details in the same format and structure as the Companies' SMDR/MD and ET services. The Companies also noted that SMDR/FD service provided customers with the ability to download only the records they wanted within one day from the time the records were generated.

The Companies submitted that the cost of SMDR/FD service was comparable to the costs of SMDR/MD and ET services. The Companies indicated that SMDR/MD customers paid a \$2,000 service charge for subsequent SMDR installations, a \$75.00 monthly recurring charge per Centrex system, and a \$0.50 monthly recurring charge per local per system for the monthly manual delivery of call records, while ET customers paid a minimum of \$2,015 in service charges for the initialization and activation of SMDR, and a \$0.0015 charge per call record transmitted to the Companies' secure website.

The Companies indicated, however, that SMDR/FD customers paid only a \$1,000 initialization service charge and a \$0.0012 charge per call record transmission.

- g) the transition plan

The Companies indicated that since they were not proposing to withdraw SMDR/MD or ET services, they would not proactively migrate existing SMDR/MD or ET customers to SMDR/FD service. The Companies noted, rather, that they would continue to provide SMDR/MD and ET services to existing customers.

The Companies also indicated that they would work with existing SMDR/MD and ET customers that would have to transition to SMDR/FD as a result of additions or changes to their SMDR/MD or ET service.

- h) relevant information concerning existing customers, such as the number of customers affected

No information was filed.

- i) a copy of the notice to affected customers

The Companies provided a copy of their customer notification letter with their applications. The Companies indicated that the letter had invited customers to comment within 45 calendar days, as required in Circular 2005-7. The Companies further noted that they had sent copies of their respective applications to affected customers.

- j) any other information the applicant believes is relevant

No additional information was filed.

- 8. The Commission received no comments regarding these applications.

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

- 9. The Commission notes the Companies' proposal that additions or changes to SMDR/MD and ET services would no longer be available, and that customers would have to migrate to the SMDR/FD service if they required any modifications. The Commission considers this proposal reasonable in light of the discontinuation of the hardware components for the SMDR/MD and ET platforms and the Companies' limited supply in these components.
- 10. The Commission also considers that the Companies have identified a reasonable substitute for SMDR/MD and ET services. In The Commission' view, SMDR/FD service is a cost-effective alternative for customers who use SMDR/MD or ET services to collect SMDR data associated with their Centrex systems. The Commission notes that none of the existing SMDR/MD and ET customers commented on the Companies' applications.
- 11. The Commission considers that the Companies have fulfilled the customer notification and evidentiary requirements of Circular 2005-7 and considers the Companies' applications to destandardize SMDR/MD and ET services to be reasonable.
- 12. In light of the above, the Commission **approves** Bell Aliant's and Bell Canada's application, effective the date of this Order.

Secretary General

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