



Telecom Decision CRTC 2009-400

Route reference: Telecom Notice of Consultation 2009-6

Ottawa, 2 July 2009

Establishment of a model tariff for the 9-1-1 emergency response service offered by competitive local exchange carriers

File number: 8661-C12-200900094

Introduction

1. On 8 January 2009, the Commission issued Telecom Notice of Consultation 2009-6, in which it invited parties to comment on whether it would be appropriate to have a single model tariff to cover all provinces for the 9-1-1 emergency response service (ERS) offered by competitive local exchange carriers (CLECs). The Commission also invited parties to comment on a proposed model tariff that was based in part on an amalgamated tariff proposed by MTS Allstream Inc. (MTS Allstream).¹
2. The Commission received submissions from the Canadian Association of the Deaf (CAD); the City of Calgary (Calgary); Cogeco Cable Inc. (Cogeco); MTS Allstream, Quebecor Media Inc. (QMI) on behalf of Videotron Ltd.; Rogers Cable Communications Inc. (RCCI); and TELUS Communications Company (TCC).
3. The public record of this proceeding, which closed on 19 February 2009, is available on the Commission's website at www.crtc.gc.ca under “Public Proceedings” or by using the file number provided above.
4. The Commission has identified the following two issues to be addressed in its determinations:
 - I. Is it appropriate to have a single 9-1-1 ERS model tariff for CLECs?
 - II. If so, should modifications be made to the content of the proposed tariff?

Background

5. In Telecom Decision 97-8, the Commission established entry obligations for CLECs that included, among other things, the requirement to provide 9-1-1 service. In order to provide this service, CLECs are required either to enter into an agreement with the local authority – such as the municipality or provincial government – where the 9-1-1 service is to be provided or to file a tariff with the Commission for approval. These options were reaffirmed by the Commission in Telecom Decision 2008-72.

¹ Item 503 – 9-1-1 Emergency Response Service

6. Between 1998 and 2001, the Commission approved standard-form 9-1-1 CLEC-municipality agreements for the provinces of Alberta, British Columbia, Ontario, and Quebec. These agreements, which were developed by the CRTC Interconnection Steering Committee (CISC), outline the roles and responsibilities of each party regarding the provision of 9-1-1 ERS by CLECs.
7. On 10 September 2008, MTS Allstream filed Tariff Notice 659, in which the company proposed to amalgamate its six existing provincial 9-1-1 ERS tariffs into a single tariff that would apply in all areas where it operates as a CLEC. On 16 October 2008, RCCI filed Tariff Notice 12, in which it also proposed a single tariff for 9-1-1 ERS that would apply in all areas in which it operates.

I. Is it appropriate to have a single 9-1-1 ERS model tariff for CLECs?

8. None of the parties opposed the establishment of a single 9-1-1 ERS model tariff for CLECs. MTS Allstream, QMI, and TCC submitted that such a tariff could improve consistency in the provision of 9-1-1 ERS and allow for more efficient use of industry and Commission resources. RCCI submitted that a model tariff would be appropriate since it had become increasingly difficult for CLECs to negotiate agreements with some local authorities.
9. The Commission agrees with the view that a single model tariff for all provinces would help ensure that 9-1-1 ERS is provided consistently across the country and that it would ease the administrative burden for both the CLECs and the Commission.
10. The Commission notes that an approved model tariff would not preclude a CLEC from executing an agreement for the provision of 9-1-1 ERS with the local authority.

II. What modifications should be made to the content of the proposed tariff?

Section 1 – Definitions and section 2 – Service Description

11. The Commission considers that certain changes proposed by TCC and RCCI to the definitions set out at section 1 and to the service description set out at section 2 would improve clarity and ensure that consistent terminology is used throughout the tariff. These modifications, which have been incorporated into the model tariff, are set out at Appendix 2.
12. RCCI submitted that the definition of “end-user subscriber” should state that telecommunications services can be provided on a wholesale basis, as well as on a retail basis.
13. The Commission notes that the definition of “end-user” encompasses anyone who purchases telecommunications services provided on a retail basis. Accordingly, RCCI's proposed modification is unnecessary. The Commission also notes that it has replaced the term “end-user subscriber” with “end-user.”
14. RCCI proposed adding to the description of 9-1-1 ERS that the service is available to municipalities and/or other local authorities, as well as to end-users.

15. The Commission notes that the 9-1-1 ERS model tariff describes the service that is made available to end-users. Accordingly, RCCI's proposal has not been incorporated into the model tariff. The Commission has modified the service description to indicate that service is made available to the CLEC's end-users with the cooperation of the 9-1-1 service provider and the local authority.
16. TCC submitted that subsection 2.3.3 refers to a function that does not involve the CLEC or the CLEC's end-user customer and argued that this item should be deleted. This subsection indicates that the 9-1-1 service provider provides an integrity check feature that allows public safety answering points (PSAPs) to verify that the 9-1-1 access lines to its bureaus are in working order.
17. The Commission notes that 9-1-1 ERS is provided in co-operation with the 9-1-1 service provider. Subsection 2.3, as part of the service description, indicates the features provided by the 9-1-1 service provider that support answering attendants at the emergency response agencies (ERAs). Subsection 2.3.3 describes one of these features, the integrity check. The Commission considers that subsection 2.3.3 should remain in the tariff to ensure that subsection 2.3 is complete, notwithstanding the fact that it does not specifically involve the CLEC or its end-users. The Commission has modified subsection 2.3.3 as follows: i) the term "call answer centre" has been inserted since these features support call answer centre attendants as well as ERA attendants; and ii) the term "PSAP" has been changed to "call answer centre" to ensure consistency with the terms used in the tariff.

Section 3 – Object

18. TCC noted that the proposed model tariff included language that would allow a CLEC-local authority agreement that was consistent with the Commission's standard-form agreement to supersede the provisions of the tariff. TCC submitted that that a negotiated agreement that is not identical to the standard-form agreement should also prevail over the model tariff in the event of a conflict. TCC noted that a negotiated agreement might more accurately describe the provision of 9-1-1 ERS in a particular area.
19. Accordingly, TCC submitted that the phrase "and in a form approved by the CRTC" should be removed. Calgary also submitted that this phrase should be removed.
20. The Commission considers that the parties should be able to negotiate changes to the standard form 9-1-1 CLEC-municipality agreement to reflect their particular circumstances. For greater clarity, the Commission has modified subsection 3.1 to indicate that the model tariff will apply unless the CLEC and local authority have executed an agreement for the provision of 9-1-1 ERS.

Section 4 – Conditions of Service

21. Section 4 of the model tariff sets out obligations of the CLEC in relation to 9-1-1 ERS. Subsection 4.1.6 indicates that CLECs will be responsible for "any other requirements that are not specifically identified in the tariff and are related to matters of the kind listed in Item 503.4.1."

22. RCCI and TCC proposed removing subsection 4.1.6 and suggested that the item should be referred to the CISC Emergency Service Working Group for further consideration.
23. The Commission expects CLECs to provide any function within their operations that may be required to ensure the proper operation of 9-1-1 ERS. Accordingly, the Commission has retained this item.

Section 5 – Characteristics of Service

24. RCCI proposed adding a clause to indicate that the availability and reliability of certain features is dependent on advance notification of any changes in the location of the PSAP/call answer centre, the borders of the serving area, or the emergency service zone (ESZ).
25. The Commission notes that subsection 5.1.3 already refers to the “accuracy of the data” which is dependent on information provided by various sources, including the local authority. The Commission considers that this would include information related to the location of the PSAP/call answer centre, the borders of the serving area, or the ESZ. Accordingly, the Commission considers that it is not necessary to add such a clause to the model tariff.

Section 6 – Confidentiality

26. TCC proposed removing “on a call-by-call basis” from subsection 6.2, indicating that only automatic number identification (ANI) is provided on a call-by-call basis to the 9-1-1 service provider. TCC stated that the other information is provided on an administrative basis, such as when a customer is added.
27. The Commission modified this section to address TCC's concern and to accurately reflect the CLEC's role with respect to the provision of customer information.

Section 7 – Quality of 9-1-1 ERS

28. TCC proposed removing the quality standards from section 7 of the model tariff since these are not included in all of the standard-form 9-1-1 CLEC-municipality agreements.
29. The Commission notes that the quality standards in this section are only examples of the generally accepted North American 9-1-1 ERS standards. Accordingly, they will remain in the model tariff.

Section 9 – Limitation of Liability

30. The Commission notes that subsection 9.2 of the model tariff states that the CLEC is required to maintain sufficient insurance to cover its obligations under the tariff and to provide evidence of such insurance to the local authority. TCC proposed removing subsection 9.2, submitting that the tariff should not provide any benefits to the local authority.
31. The Commission considers that this obligation benefits all persons to whom the CLEC may be liable under the tariff. Accordingly, the Commission has retained this item.

Section 11 – 9-1-1 Municipal Charges

32. Cogeco, QMI, RCCI, and TCC argued that Item 503.11 – 9-1-1 Municipal Charges should be removed entirely from the proposed model tariff.
33. Cogeco and QMI argued that the collection of 9-1-1 fees in Quebec would be carried out pursuant to legislative changes made by *An Act to amend various legislative provisions respecting municipal affairs*,² rendering this tariff item unnecessary for that province. QMI further submitted that tailoring this item to each province's legislation would be too complicated, defeating the purpose of a single tariff intended to reduce administrative burden.
34. TCC noted that a section for 9-1-1 Municipal Charges is not included in all the standard-form 9-1-1 CLEC-municipality agreements developed for individual provinces. The company submitted that it should therefore not be included in a model tariff that would apply to all provinces. The company also submitted that since billing and collection service is generally mandated by provincial legislation, there is no need to duplicate the obligation in the model tariff.
35. The Commission notes that not all provinces have legislation requiring CLECs to provide a billing and collection service for 9-1-1 fees. The Commission considers it important that, upon request, CLECs provide a billing and collection service to local authorities that charge 9-1-1 fees. Furthermore, regarding those provinces with such legislation, the Commission does not consider the fact that the model tariff also requires CLECs to provide a billing and collection service to be problematic since the service would be optional for local authorities. Accordingly, the Commission considers that it is appropriate to retain this item.
36. RCCI proposed several modifications to this item if it were retained.
37. RCCI proposed that subsection 11.2 be modified to indicate that the local authority will provide its accounts receivable for 9-1-1 municipal charges to the CLEC for an amount equivalent to their full value less an approved fee or a discount.
38. The Commission considers that the existing reference to a discount is sufficient to indicate that there is a charge for the billing and collection service offered by CLECs. The Commission further notes that it does not regulate the rates for this service offered by CLECs. Accordingly, RCCI's proposed addition of "an approved fee" will not be included in the model tariff. The Commission has modified the wording in this section so that CLECs are not required to indicate a specific percentage discount.
39. RCCI also proposed to indicate in subsection 11.3 that the billing and collection service may also be provided under provincial legislation.
40. The Commission considers that provincial legislation, where it exists, will apply regardless of whether it is referred to in the tariff. Therefore, the Commission considers this change

² S.Q. 2008, ch. 18.

unnecessary and will not include it in the model tariff.

41. RCCI further proposed to indicate in subsection 11.4 that the billing and collection service may not be available in all provinces.
42. The Commission considers that CLECs should provide, upon request, the billing and collection service in all areas in which they operate. Accordingly, the subsection will not be modified as suggested and the phrase “it is not available to municipalities in the province of Ontario” has been removed.
43. Calgary also proposed several modifications to this section.
44. Calgary proposed to remove subsection 11.2, which refers to billing and collection service, arguing that it is beyond the Commission's jurisdiction. The Commission notes that since this is a telecommunications service provided by CLECs, it falls within the Commission's jurisdiction. Accordingly, this item will remain in the model tariff.
45. Calgary further proposed to define the phrase “municipal charges” to include both landline fees (\$0.35 per line) and an equivalent wireless and voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) fee. The Commission notes that municipal 9-1-1 charges are not subject to Commission approval. The Commission further notes that the model tariff applies to CLECs offering wireline services, and not wireless or access-independent VoIP services. Accordingly, the proposed changes will not be incorporated into the model tariff.

Other matters

46. The Commission notes RCCI's proposals to incorporate into the model tariff language related to the provision of wireless 9-1-1 ERS. However, as noted above, this tariff is meant to apply to the 9-1-1 ERS offered by CLECs who provide wireline services. The Commission therefore considers these proposals to be outside the scope of this proceeding.
47. The Commission considers that should a CLEC offering wireless services be unable to execute agreements for the provision of 9-1-1 service with all local authorities where it operates the company must file a tariff for 9-1-1 ERS for Commission approval. The tariff should be based on the model tariff set out in Appendix 1 to this decision modified as necessary to reflect that it applies to wireless services.
48. The Commission acknowledges comments received regarding the implementation of Enhanced 9-1-1 service. However, the Commission notes that these comments refer to matters that are outside of the scope of this proceeding.
49. The Commission also acknowledges comments received from CAD requesting that the proposed model be amended to make clear that deaf subscribers using TTY or other non-voice technology are included in the requirement for access. The Commission notes that the concerns presented by CAD are being considered under Telecom Public Notice 2008-8 and are therefore outside of the scope of this proceeding.

Conclusion

50. The 9-1-1 ERS model tariff, with the appropriate modifications as determined by the Commission, is set out in Appendix 1 to this decision. The Commission directs CLECs who have not executed agreements for 9-1-1 ERS with all local authorities in the territories in which they operate to file for Commission approval, within 30 days of the date of this decision, tariff pages reflecting the attached 9-1-1 ERS model tariff.
51. The Commission notes that its consideration of MTS Allstream's Tariff Notice 659 and RCCI's Tariff Notice 12 was suspended pending completion of Notice of Consultation 2009-6. The Commission also notes that there are differences between the model tariff set out in Appendix 1 and the proposed 9-1-1 ERS tariffs in the companies' applications. The Commission considers that it would be efficient for MTS Allstream and RCCI to submit new applications reflecting the model tariff. Accordingly, MTS Allstream's Tariff Notice 659 and RCCI's Tariff Notice 12 are closed.

Secretary General

Related documents

- *Call for comments on a proposed model tariff for the 9-1-1 emergency response service offered by competitive local exchange carriers*, Telecom Notice of Consultation CRTC 2009-6, 8 January 2009
- *Review of the regulatory requirement for CLEC-municipality agreements for the provision of 9-1-1 service*, Telecom Decision CRTC 2008-72, 11 August 2008
- *Unresolved issues related to the accessibility of telecommunications and broadcasting services to persons with disabilities*, Telecom Public Notice CRTC 2008-8, 10 June 2008, as amended by Telecom Public Notice CRTC 2008-8-1, 24 July 2008, and Telecom Public Notice CRTC 2008-8-2, 17 October 2008
- *Local competition*, Telecom Decision CRTC 97-8, 1 May 1997

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>

ITEM 503 9-1-1 Emergency Response Service (ERS)

1. Definitions

1.1 For the purposes of this tariff, the following terms have the meanings as defined below:

“9-1-1 database” is the database operated by the 9-1-1 service provider that provides selective routing information based on ANI, ALI, and SAG information.

“9-1-1 service provider” is the incumbent local exchange carrier (ILEC) that provides 9-1-1 emergency response service to the local authority pursuant to a tariff and/or agreement. The 9-1-1 service provider's tariff and/or agreement makes access to 9-1-1 emergency calling available to the ILEC's end-users located within the serving area.

“ALI” or **“automatic location identification”** is a database feature that displays to call answer centres and ERAs address/location data with respect to the telephone line from which the 9-1-1 call originates.

“ANI” or **“automatic number identification”** is a database feature that displays the telephone number from which the 9-1-1 call originates.

“Call answer centre” is the first point of reception for all 9-1-1 calls in its serving area. It is a communications facility that is open 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, and is responsible for redirecting or transferring emergency calls to ERAs.

“Call control” is a set of features that allow the 9-1-1 operator to maintain control of the 9-1-1 call regardless of calling-party action.

“CRTC” or **“Commission”** is the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission.

“End-user” is the ultimate purchaser of telecommunications services provided on a retail basis by a telecommunications service provider.

“ERA” or **“emergency response agency”** is the communication centre to which emergency calls are transferred from a call answer centre. ERAs normally refer to the fire, police, and ambulance agencies responsible for dispatching emergency personnel.

“ESZ” or **“emergency service zone”** is a defined area consisting of a specific combination of municipality, law enforcement, fire, emergency medical and call answer centre coverage areas.

“Exchange service” is any local telecommunications service offered by the competitive local exchange carrier (CLEC) to its end-users.

Local authority is a municipality, provincial government, or any other authority responsible for operating the call answer centre.

“Local subscriber” is a CLEC end-user located within the local authority’s boundaries who subscribes to any of the CLEC’s exchange services.

“Public safety answering point” or **“PSAP”**: see “Call answer centre.”

“SAG” or **“street address guide”** means the databases that contain street names, address ranges, routing codes (if provided), and other data required to verify street address information which is entered into the 9-1-1 database and which is used for selective routing and transfer.

“Serving area” is the area from which 9-1-1 calls will be directed to a particular call answer centre as determined by the local authority.

2. Service Description

- 2.1 9-1-1 emergency response service (9-1-1 ERS) is provided under the terms of this tariff, with the cooperation of the 9-1-1 service provider and the local authority, to the CLEC's end-users who are connected to the CLEC's network by any of the CLEC's exchange services. The provision of this service is subject to the availability of suitable facilities. This service provides for the transport of 9-1-1 dialed calls to call answer centres.
- 2.2 The service provides the CLEC's end-users with 9-1-1 three-digit-dial access to call answer centres serving their communities. The CLEC provides its end-users with access to the 9-1-1 code from each of its central offices to provide the service coverage specified by the local authority. Call answer and emergency response services are not provided by the CLEC as part of its 9-1-1 ERS.
- 2.3 The 9-1-1 call is delivered by the 9-1-1 service provider to a call answer centre operated by the local authority. The attendant at the call answer centre determines the nature of the emergency and forwards the call to the appropriate ERA. The answering attendants at the call answer centres and ERAs are supported by the following special features provided by the 9-1-1 service provider in accordance with its tariffs and agreements:
 - 2.3.1 Selective routing and transfer: The 9-1-1 service provider maintains a central database in its network that will automatically route the 9-1-1 call to a pre-assigned call answer centre based upon the ANI and/or ALI of the telephone line from which the 9-1-1 call originates.
 - 2.3.2 ALI: The 9-1-1 service provider maintains an ALI database.
 - 2.3.3 Integrity Check: This allows the call answer centre to verify that the 9-1-1 access lines to its bureaus are in working order.

The operation of the selective routing and transfer and ALI features is dependent upon the accuracy of the CLEC's records and information received from the local authority and others, such as new street information and boundary changes.

3. Object

- 3.1 In accordance with the terms and conditions of the CLEC's General Tariff, the CLEC shall fulfill its obligations under this tariff to make 9-1-1 ERS available to its end-users and shall be bound by the provisions of the tariff, unless a written agreement for the provision of 9-1-1 ERS is executed by the CLEC and the local authority.

4. Conditions of Service

- 4.1 As conditions of providing 9-1-1 ERS, the CLEC shall

4.1.1 Make 9-1-1 ERS accessible to all local subscribers in the serving area;

4.1.2 Provide 9-1-1 ERS through the network of the 9-1-1 service provider;

4.1.3 Provide ANI and/or ALI data, routing data, and other necessary data to the 9-1-1 service provider which, in turn, shall provide such data to the call answer centre and ERAs as deemed appropriate by the CLEC, the local authority, and the 9-1-1 service provider;

4.1.4 Maintain and update the SAG upon receipt of information provided and validated by the local authority regarding geographic data, including street names, addresses, and the borders of the serving areas and ESZs;

4.1.5 Provide to the local authority at its designated call answer centre, in writing and in advance of offering local exchange services

4.1.5.1 A telephone number that is accessible 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, for the purpose of reporting trouble with the 9-1-1 emergency calling system, and

4.1.5.2 A facsimile number and/or alternative address, such as an e-mail address, to deal with problems with local subscribers' information and the SAG, and to update such information as requested; and

4.1.6 Be responsible for any other requirements that are not specifically identified in the tariff and are related to matters of the kind listed in Item 503.4.1.

5. Characteristics of Service

- 5.1 9-1-1 ERS permits the use of features including, but without being limited to, ANI and/or ALI, selective routing and transfer, and call control features. The availability and reliability of these features depend on the following:

- 5.1.1 The terminal systems and the operating mode selected for the call answer centre and ERAs;
- 5.1.2 The type of exchange service and the equipment and/or telephone systems from which 9-1-1 calls originate;
- 5.1.3 The accuracy of the data, which itself is dependent upon the information provided by various sources (the CLEC, the local authority, the 9-1-1 service provider, other telecommunications carriers, the CLEC's end-users, etc.); and
- 5.1.4 The characteristics and reliability of the 9-1-1 service provided by the 9-1-1 service provider, to the extent that the CLEC's participation in the provision of 9-1-1 ERS is dependent upon the 9-1-1 service provided by the 9-1-1 service provider.

6. Confidentiality

- 6.1 Any information provided by the CLEC to the local authority, its employees, servants, agents, and/or co-contractors pertaining to the design, development, implementation, operation, and maintenance of 9-1-1 ERS is confidential and shall be provided only to those persons who need to know the information for the purposes of providing 9-1-1 ERS.
- 6.2 The CLEC provides to the 9-1-1 service provider, for the operation of 9-1-1 ERS, the name, telephone number, class of service, and service location shown on the CLEC's ANI and ALI records as the address for the CLEC exchange services. The CLEC provides this information for all of its end-users. The 9-1-1 service provider in turn provides this information, and when required, the class of service, to the local authority when a 9-1-1 call is placed by one of the CLEC's end-users. The class of service and the service location, if it differs from the listed address, are provided on a confidential basis to the 9-1-1 service provider and, in turn, to the local authority for the sole purpose of responding to 9-1-1 emergency calls.
- 6.3 The information consisting of names, addresses, and telephone numbers of the CLEC's end-users whose listings are not published in directories or listed in directory assistance records is confidential. The party calling 9-1-1 waives the right to privacy under any of the CLEC's tariffs or agreements to the extent that the name, location, and telephone number associated with the originating telephone are furnished to the local authority operating a call answer centre.
- 6.4 The CLEC shall abide by all applicable legislation in effect with respect to the protection of privacy.

7. Quality of 9-1-1 ERS

- 7.1 The CLEC shall install and operate 9-1-1 ERS in a manner that meets quality standards generally accepted in North America for such services. The following are examples of the content of quality standards generally accepted in North America:

- 7.1.1 Average of 0.1% blocking within the network;
 - 7.1.2 Diverse telephone networking capabilities;
 - 7.1.3 Updated ANI and/or ALI records in the 9-1-1 service provider's database; and
 - 7.1.4 Special call control features, such as bureau hold, emergency ringback, calling party disconnect signal, and forced disconnect.
- 7.2 The CLEC agrees to restore service as quickly as possible on a priority basis should there be any interruption, delay, mistake, or defect in its transmission or in its network facilities.

8. Implementation

- 8.1 The implementation of 9-1-1 ERS within the serving area shall be carried out pursuant to an implementation schedule to be mutually agreed on by the CLEC, the local authority, and the 9-1-1 service provider (the Parties). The implementation schedule may be changed by agreement of the Parties.

9. Limitation of Liability

- 9.1 The CLEC's liability for the performance of its obligations pursuant to this tariff shall be subject to and governed by [CLEC's General Tariff Item # __ –Terms of Service].
- 9.2 The CLEC shall, during the term of this tariff, maintain sufficient insurance to cover its obligations under this tariff and shall provide evidence of same to the local authority, or, if the CLEC is self-insured, provide satisfactory evidence to the local authority that the CLEC is and will be, at all relevant times, in a position to successfully meet its monetary obligations stemming from liability under this tariff.

10. Force Majeure

- 10.1 The CLEC shall not be held responsible for any damages or delays as a result of war, invasion, insurrection, demonstrations, or as a result of decisions by civilian or military authorities, fire, floods, strikes, and, generally, as a result of any event that is beyond the CLEC's reasonable control.
- 10.2 The local authority may designate a back-up call answer centre to which 9-1-1 calls will be directed if the primary call answer centre is unable to accept the calls for any reason.
- 10.3 The CLEC shall, in the event of a disaster or force majeure, co-operate and make all reasonable efforts to provide temporary replacement service until permanent service is completely restored.
- 10.4 The costs required to provide temporary replacement service shall be borne by the CLEC in accordance with the CLEC's obligations as indicated in Item 503.4 of this tariff.

11. 9-1-1 Municipal Charges

- 11.1 Upon request from the local authority, the CLEC will provide a billing and collection arrangement for local authorities participating in 9-1-1 ERS (billing and collection service) so that, subject to Item 503.11.6, it collects 9-1-1 municipal charges on behalf of the local authority monthly from its end-users for each of its exchange services.
- 11.2 The CLEC provides 9-1-1 municipal charges billing and collection service on the basis that the CLEC is given the local authority's accounts receivable for the 9-1-1 municipal charges for an amount equivalent to their full value, less a discount on the billed charges and less those charges that the CLEC's end-users have specifically and expressly refused to pay.
- 11.3 The 9-1-1 municipal charges billing and collection service is provided under the terms of this tariff and/or a billing and collection agreement that the local authority has entered into with the CLEC.
- 11.4 The 9-1-1 municipal charges billing and collection service is provided subject to the availability of suitable facilities.
- 11.5 The CLEC cannot suspend or terminate the provision of any of its exchange services to its end-users solely for the non-payment of these charges.
- 11.6 Notwithstanding Item 503.11.1, the CLEC may decide not to bill 9-1-1 municipal charges to its end-users or to bill only a portion of the municipal charges; however, the CLEC shall make any payments contemplated in Item 503.11.2 as if the municipal charges had been billed by the CLEC to its end-users.

Modifications to Section 1 – Definitions and Section 2 – Service Description that have been incorporated into the model tariff

Changes proposed by TCC:

- added quotation marks around defined terms to ensure consistency with terms in the current CLEC model tariff
- replaced “9-1-1 service” with “9-1-1 emergency response service” in the definition for “9-1-1 service provider”
- modified the definition of “9-1-1 database” in order to more accurately reflect the database’s function
- replaced the definition of “Emergency service zone” with the version used in the majority of the standard-form 9-1-1 CLEC-municipality agreements
- modified the definition of “Street address guide” to delete the phrase “the management of ALI, ANI,”
- modified subsection 2.3 to indicate that the 9-1-1 call is delivered “by the 9-1-1 service provider”

Changes proposed by RCCI:

- added a definition for “Public safety answering point” to conform to the language in the existing standard-form 9-1-1 CLEC-municipality agreements
- removed “under the terms of a tariff or agreement from the definition of “Exchange service”