



Telecom Decision CRTC 2015-332

PDF version

Ottawa, 23 July 2015

File number: 8663-H4-201504556

Huron Telecommunications Co-Operative Limited – Implementation of local competition for Bruce Telecom

*The Commission **approves** Huron Telecommunications Co-Operative Limited's (HuronTel) implementation plan for local competition, including local number portability, for Bruce Telecom in the exchange of Ripley, Ontario. The Commission's decision enables customers in Ripley to benefit from competition in the local services market by allowing them to choose among the services, options, and prices offered by different service providers.*

Background

1. In Telecom Decision 2006-14, the Commission, among other things, set out the framework for local competition implementation in the territories of the small incumbent local exchange carriers (ILECs). That decision included directives that the small ILECs must follow when submitting their implementation plans.
2. The Commission reviewed this framework and determined, in Telecom Regulatory Policy 2011-291, that local competition should continue to be introduced in the serving territories of all the small ILECs based on the existing framework, subject to the modifications set out in that decision.

Application

3. The Commission received an implementation plan for local competition, including local number portability (LNP) [the implementation plan], dated 30 April 2015, from Huron Telecommunications Co-Operative Limited (HuronTel).¹ In accordance with the framework set out in Telecom Decision 2006-14, as modified in Telecom Regulatory Policy 2011-291, the plan was submitted in response to a formal signed expression of interest from Bruce Telecom, which indicated that it wished to interconnect with HuronTel to provide local services as a competitive local exchange carrier in the exchange of Ripley, Ontario.
4. In its implementation plan, HuronTel identified the services and network components that it planned to make available to Bruce Telecom.

¹ HuronTel filed a revised version of its implementation plan on 1 June 2015.

5. The Commission received no interventions regarding HuronTel's proposed implementation plan. The public record of this proceeding, which closed on 15 June 2015, is available on the Commission's website at www.crtc.gc.ca or by using the file number provided above.

Should the Commission approve HuronTel's local competition implementation plan for Bruce Telecom?

6. In its implementation plan, HuronTel indicated that it would file its proposed wholesale service tariffs 30 days following the date of the Commission's approval of its implementation plan. HuronTel also indicated that to implement local competition in Ripley, it would require 60 days following the date of the Commission's approval of its plan to meet Bruce Telecom's requested start date of 1 October 2015.
7. HuronTel stated that although it will incur costs to implement local competition in Ripley, it is not proposing to recover these costs as part of its implementation plan.²

Commission's analysis and determinations

8. The services and network components that HuronTel has proposed to make available to Bruce Telecom are similar to those that the Commission has approved for other small ILECs that have implemented local competition in their serving territories.
9. HuronTel's proposed timelines for local competition implementation, including those related to the filing of its proposed wholesale service tariffs, are appropriate and will enable HuronTel to meet Bruce Telecom's proposed start date of 1 October 2015.
10. HuronTel's proposed implementation plan is reasonable and meets the criteria set out in Telecom Decision 2006-14, as modified in Telecom Regulatory Policy 2011-291.

Conclusion

11. In light of the above, the Commission **approves** HuronTel's implementation plan. The Commission **directs** HuronTel to
 - file for Commission approval all **required** wholesale service tariffs, in accordance with the principles set out in Telecom Regulatory Policy 2013-160,³ within **30 days** of the date of this decision;
 - provide information and assistance to Bruce Telecom, as required, to implement local competition as quickly as possible so that Bruce Telecom

² Small ILECs have the option of either absorbing their costs to implement local competition or recovering them through the regulatory mechanisms available pursuant to Telecom Regulatory Policy 2011-291.

³ In that decision, the Commission found it appropriate that the initial rates for competitor services offered by small ILECs be established by matching Commission-approved rates for the same service, with supporting rationale. The supporting rationale must address the appropriateness of the proposed small ILEC rates in light of rates in an adjacent large ILEC serving territory for the same service.

may begin operating in HuronTel's serving territory by no later than **1 October 2015**; and

- when implementing all aspects of local competition in Ripley, including but not limited to technical and network interconnection, abide by the industry consensus items outlined in the various CRTC Interconnection Steering Committee documents related to interconnection, as well as the existing rules as outlined in the various decisions, orders, and letters issued by the Commission pertaining to local competition.

Compliance with the Policy Direction

12. The Commission considers that its approval of HuronTel's implementation plan for local competition allows customers in Ripley to benefit from competition in the local services market by enabling them to choose among the services, options, and prices offered by different service providers. As a result, the Commission considers that its determinations in this decision will advance the policy objectives set out in paragraphs 7(b), (f), and (h) of the *Telecommunications Act*.⁴
13. In light of the above, the Commission considers that its determinations are consistent with the Policy Direction⁵ requirements that the Commission should (i) rely on market forces to the maximum extent feasible as the means of achieving the telecommunications policy objectives; and (ii) when relying on regulation, use measures that are efficient and proportionate to their purpose and that interfere with the operation of competitive market forces to the minimum extent necessary to meet the policy objectives.

Secretary General

Related documents

- *Regulatory framework for the small incumbent local exchange carriers and related matters*, Telecom Regulatory Policy CRTC 2013-160, 28 March 2013
- *Obligation to serve and other matters*, Telecom Regulatory Policy CRTC 2011-291, 3 May 2011, as amended by Telecom Regulatory Policy CRTC 2011-291-1, 12 May 2011

⁴ These objectives are the following: 7(b) to render reliable and affordable telecommunications services of high quality accessible to Canadians in both urban and rural areas in all regions of Canada; 7(f) to foster increased reliance on market forces for the provision of telecommunications services and to ensure that regulation, where required, is efficient and effective; and 7(h) to respond to the economic and social requirements of users of telecommunications services.

⁵ *Order Issuing a Direction to the CRTC on Implementing the Canadian Telecommunications Policy Objectives*, P.C. 2006-1534, 14 December 2006

- *Revised regulatory framework for the small incumbent local exchange carriers,*
Telecom Decision CRTC 2006-14, 29 March 2006