



Telecom Order CRTC 2006-215

Ottawa, 18 August 2006

Bell Canada

Reference: Tariff Notices 6929 and 6929A

Zero-dialed emergency call routing service

Background

1. In *VoIP 9-1-1 call routing*, Telecom Decision CRTC 2006-5, 30 January 2006 (Decision 2006-5), the Commission directed Aliant Telecom Inc.¹ (Aliant Telecom), Bell Canada, MTS Allstream Inc. (MTS Allstream), and Saskatchewan Telecommunications (SaskTel) to file revisions to their respective tariffs to allow voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) service providers access to zero-dialed emergency call routing service (0-ECRS).
2. In Decision 2006-5, the Commission further directed Aliant Telecom, Bell Canada, MTS Allstream, and SaskTel to include provisions in their respective Resale and Sharing tariffs in order to explicitly include the condition that local VoIP service providers are to abide by the directions set out by the Commission in paragraphs 52, 68, 93, 94, and 98 of *Emergency service obligations for local VoIP service providers*, Telecom Decision CRTC 2005-21, 4 April 2005.

The application

3. The Commission received an application by Bell Canada, dated 2 March 2006 and amended 30 May 2006, in which the company proposed revisions to its General Tariff item 24 - Resale and Sharing as well as to its Access Services Tariff item 315 - Zero-Dialed Emergency Call Routing Service in order to reflect the Commission's directives in Decision 2006-5. Bell Canada submitted that the proposed modifications to the 0-ECRS further reflected a rate increase that would enable the company to recover its costs associated with the changes to 0-ECRS.
4. Bell Canada filed an economic study in support of its original application and a revised economic study in support of its amended application (the economic studies).

¹ On 7 July 2006, Aliant Telecom Inc. and BCE Inc. formed Bell Aliant Regional Communications, Limited Partnership, which combined Aliant Telecom's wireline telecommunications operations in Atlantic Canada with Bell Canada's wireline telecommunications operations in Ontario and Quebec, as well as those of Société en commandite Télébec and NorthernTel, Limited Partnership.

Process

5. The Commission received comments from Xit télécom inc., on behalf of itself, Télécommunications Xittel inc., and 9141-9077 Québec inc. (collectively, Xit télécom), dated 27 March 2006, and reply comments from Bell Canada, dated 7 May 2006.
6. The Commission also received comments from the Ontario 9-1-1 Advisory Board (Ontario 9-1-1 Board), dated 18 May 2006, and from l'Association des centres d'urgence 9-1-1 du Québec (l'Association 9-1-1 du Québec), dated 22 May 2006.
7. The Commission addressed interrogatories to Bell Canada on 24 April 2006 and 13 June 2006 with regard to the economic studies. Bell Canada filed responses to these interrogatories dated 4 July 2006.
8. In Telecom Order CRTC 2006-168, 6 July 2006, the Commission approved Bell Canada's application on an interim basis.

Positions of parties

9. Xit télécom suggested technological enhancements to Bell Canada's platform in order to allow more advanced Internet Protocol (IP) applications. Xit télécom also submitted that the Commission should only consider the increase to Bell Canada's 0-ECRS rate if the service could be used to route enhanced 9-1-1 calls.
10. Xit télécom noted that Bell Canada's costs were significantly higher than those of other incumbent local exchange carriers and submitted that the study period should be at least five years to ensure an orderly transition to an environment where centralized emergency call services would be able to handle IP calls on a native basis.
11. The Ontario 9-1-1 Board and l'Association 9-1-1 du Québec noted that Bell Canada's original application had put in place a method for the routing of VoIP calls via the existing provincial system. The Ontario 9-1-1 Board further indicated that this method allowed VoIP 9-1-1 calls to be presented to the Primary Public Safety Answering Points like any other 9-1-1 call and allowed for the use of the 9-1-1 system to route calls to the appropriate emergency service.
12. The Ontario 9-1-1 Board argued, and l'Association 9-1-1 du Québec generally agreed, that the Commission must mandate VoIP service providers to use Bell Canada's 0-ECRS to route VoIP 9-1-1 calls placed within their territory.
13. Bell Canada questioned the relevance of Xit télécom's comments and submitted that the issues Xit télécom raised exceeded the scope of the proceeding. In this regard, Bell Canada submitted that, at the time it filed its application, the evolution of 9-1-1 service in the context of VoIP telephony was the subject of ongoing discussions with the CRTC Interconnection Steering Committee (CISC).

Commission's analysis and determinations

14. The Commission notes that Xit télécom's comments on the transition of emergency call services to IP relate to technical issues that are presently before CISC. Accordingly, the Commission finds these comments to be outside the scope of this proceeding.
15. The Commission considers that the Ontario 9-1-1 Board's and l'Association 9-1-1 du Québec's request that the Commission mandate VoIP service providers to use 0-ECRS for the routing of VoIP 9-1-1 calls is a request for a change in policy that ought to have been filed as a Part VII application. Therefore, the Commission is not addressing this issue in this Order.
16. With respect to Xit télécom's comments on the economic studies and proposed rate changes, the Commission considers that Bell Canada's responses to interrogatories related to the economic studies are satisfactory. The Commission further considers that the amended economic study accurately reflects the company's cost of providing 0-ECRS.
17. The Commission notes that in *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 (Decision 2002-34), 0-ECRS was classified as a Category I competitor services.
18. The Commission notes that the proposed rates reflect a 15 percent mark-up over the costs of providing 0-ECRS. The Commission notes that this is in accordance with the Commission's determinations in Decision 2002-34 with regard to the level of the mark-up specified for Category I competitor services.
19. In light of the above, the Commission **approves on a final basis** Bell Canada's application.

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>