Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission
Conseil de la radiodiffusion et des télécommunications canadiennes

# Telecom Decision CRTC 2018-188

PDF version

Reference: Telecom Regulatory Policy 2017-182

Ottawa, 28 May 2018

*Public record: 8662-P82-201707580*

## New Brunswick 9-1-1 Bureau, on behalf of public safety answering point organizations – Application to review and vary Telecom Regulatory Policy 2017-182 regarding next-generation 9-1-1 services

*The Commission determines that there is substantial doubt as to the correctness of its determination in Telecom Regulatory Policy 2017-182 to exclude secondary public safety answering point (PSAP) connections from next-generation 9-1-1 (NG9-1-1) network access tariffs. The Commission therefore* ***varies*** *that determination to include NG9-1-1-related connections of secondary PSAPs in future NG9-1-1 network access tariffs.*

*In addition, the Commission* ***varies*** *Telecom Regulatory Policy 2017-182 to include a definition of secondary PSAPs and to redefine the NG9-1-1 network boundaries. The Commission also requests that the CRTC Interconnection Steering Committee (CISC) report annually on the number of primary and secondary PSAPs requesting to be connected to NG9-1-1 networks in the future.*

*The determinations in this decision are intended to ensure that the introduction of the NG9-1-1 system will be efficient and timely, and that the service provided will be of high quality.*

### Background

1. When a 9-1-1 call[1] is made in Canada today, it is transmitted first through a telecommunications service provider's (TSP)[2] originating network, which also carries other telephone calls and traffic related to other telecommunications services. The call

[1] Throughout this decision, "9-1-1 call" refers to a wireline, wireless, or voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) call, as well as other means of requesting 9-1-1 assistance, such as Text with 9-1-1.

[2] Today, TSPs offer wireline and wireless local exchange telephone services, including local VoIP services. In the future, the definition of TSPs could be expanded to include other types of providers as new next-generation 9-1-1 (NG9-1-1) services are introduced.

is then routed to a specialized 9-1-1 network, and finally to a local public safety answering point (PSAP) system.[3]

2. Specialized 9-1-1 networks route 9-1-1 calls and ancillary information, such as the caller's telephone number and location, from the TSP's originating network to the appropriate local PSAP. They provide enhanced functionality and reliability while reducing the risk of congestion for emergency communications, since they carry only 9-1-1-related traffic. These networks are currently provided and maintained by incumbent local exchange carriers (ILECs), also known as 9-1-1 network providers.[4]

3. The local PSAPs to which 9-1-1 calls are finally routed use their own internal systems to receive 9-1-1 calls. They are the organizations that receive caller information and dispatch emergency responders such as fire, police, and ambulance.

4. There are generally three types of PSAPs:

    - primary PSAPs first receive a 9-1-1 call and either dispatch emergency responders or transfer the call to another agency for dispatch;
    - secondary PSAPs are a type of dispatch emergency responder to which a primary PSAP can forward a 9-1-1 call; and
    - backup PSAPs serve as fallback contact centres in the event of a planned outage, call overflows, or a catastrophic event.

5. PSAPs can take on more than one role: a primary PSAP can also be a secondary PSAP and a primary or secondary PSAP can serve as a backup of another primary or secondary PSAP. These multiple roles can be on a permanent or temporary basis, depending on the operational need.

### Regulatory environment

6. Provincial and territorial governments are responsible for emergency responders and for establishing and managing PSAPs. In many cases, these governments have delegated responsibility for PSAPs and emergency responders to municipalities. The Commission therefore does not determine internal policies, procedures, and standards for these organizations, although there exists national collaboration and coordination through the CRTC Interconnection Steering Committee's (CISC) Emergency

---

[3] PSAPs are also known as 9-1-1 call centres. They are established by provincial, territorial, or municipal governments and are the first point of contact for all 9-1-1 calls.

[4] Currently, 9-1-1 network providers include Bell Canada, Bell MTS, CityWest Telephone Corporation, Northwestel Inc., Saskatchewan Telecommunications, TBayTel, and TELUS Communications Inc.

Services Working Group (ESWG) for policies, procedures, and standards that are directly related to the services provided by TSPs and 9-1-1 network providers.[5]

7. However, the Commission has exercised regulatory oversight over TSPs' originating networks and 9-1-1 network providers' specialized 9-1-1 networks. This oversight includes establishing and enforcing national 9-1-1 policies, standards, conditions of service, and eligibility to operate, as well as approving 9-1-1 tariffs and agreements. The Commission oversees 9-1-1 network providers' costs, terms, and conditions through approval of their network access tariffs and agreements with TSPs, including the network access tariffed rates that TSPs pay to them.

8. In Telecom Regulatory Policy 2017-182, the Commission established a regulatory framework for next-generation 9-1-1 (NG9-1-1) in Canada that would take into account the evolving public safety needs of Canadians and provide access to new and innovative 9-1-1 services and capabilities. That decision set out important determinations on the implementation and provision of NG9-1-1 networks and services in Canada, including governance and funding, the introduction of new NG9-1-1 services, and network reliability, resiliency, and security.

9. Some of the Commission's determinations in Telecom Regulatory Policy 2017-182 related to secondary PSAPs. The Commission considered that the interconnection of secondary PSAPs to NG9-1-1 networks would assist in the provision of end-to-end NG9-1-1 services to Canadians; however, it determined that the costs of such connections should be recovered from the relevant provincial, territorial, or municipal government and not from TSPs through Commission-approved NG9-1-1 network access tariffs. The Commission stated that these governments are best positioned to determine what constitutes a secondary PSAP, as the definition of a secondary PSAP varies across the country.

## Application

10. On 25 August 2017, the Commission received an application from the New Brunswick 9-1-1 Bureau, on behalf of the PSAPs and emergency management authorities listed in the Appendix to this decision (the PSAP organizations), requesting that the Commission review and vary Telecom Regulatory Policy 2017-182. Specifically, the PSAP organizations submitted that there is substantial doubt as to the correctness of certain determinations in that decision, as follows:

    - there was an error of fact and a failure to properly consider a basic principle – that is, the definition of a primary PSAP – as well as a failure to properly consider the intertwined and co-dependent role of secondary PSAPs; and

[5] The ESWG is an open forum that includes TSPs, 9-1-1 network providers, PSAPs, and 9-1-1 industry specialists. It was formed to address issues that relate to the provision of 9-1-1 services, such as the technical and operational implementation of these services.

- the exclusion of secondary PSAPs' NG9-1-1-related connections from future NG9-1-1 network access tariffs represents a new principle that did not result from consultation with stakeholders.

11. The PSAP organizations therefore requested that the Commission

    - correct the definition of a primary PSAP in Telecom Regulatory Policy 2017-182; and
    - reverse its determination to exclude the NG9-1-1-related connections of secondary PSAPs from future NG9-1-1 network access tariffs.

12. The Commission received interventions from Alberta Health Services, l'Association des centres d'urgence du Québec, Calgary 9-1-1, le Conseil provincial du secteur municipal (CPSM) du Syndicat canadien de la fonction publique, la Fédération québécoise des municipalités, the Hamilton Fire Department, Ministère de la Culture et des Communications/Ministère de la Sécurité publique/Ministère de la Santé et des Services sociaux/Ministère des Affaires municipales et de l'Occupation du territoire (agencies representing the Government of Québec), Rogers Communications Canada Inc. (RCCI), Shaw Telecom G.P. (Shaw), le Service de la sûreté municipale de Thetford Mines, l'Union des municipalités du Québec, and Urgences-santé Québec.

13. Bell Canada, Saskatchewan Telecommunications (SaskTel), and TELUS Communications Inc. (TCI)[6] (i.e. future NG9-1-1 network providers) complemented the record by responding to various requests for information.

## Review and vary criteria

14. In Telecom Information Bulletin 2011-214, the Commission outlined the criteria it would use to assess review and vary applications filed pursuant to section 62 of the *Telecommunications Act*. Specifically, the Commission stated that applicants must demonstrate that there is substantial doubt as to the correctness of the original decision, for example due to (i) an error in law or in fact, (ii) a fundamental change in circumstances or facts since the decision, (iii) a failure to consider a basic principle which had been raised in the original proceeding, or (iv) a new principle which has arisen as a result of the decision.

## Issues

15. The Commission has identified the following issues to be addressed in this decision:

    - Is there substantial doubt as to the correctness of the definition of a primary PSAP in the original decision?

---

[6] In this proceeding, submissions were received from TELUS Communications Company (TCC). However, effective 1 October 2017, TCC's assets were legally transferred to TCI and TCC ceased to exist. For ease of reference, "TCI" is used in this decision.

- Is there substantial doubt as to the correctness of the original decision to exclude connections to secondary PSAPs from future NG9-1-1 network access tariffs?

### Is there substantial doubt as to the correctness of the definition of a primary PSAP in the original decision?

16. Telecom Regulatory Policy 2017-182 included the following definition:

> A primary PSAP is a PSAP to which 9-1-1 calls are routed directly as the first point of contact. In most cases, the primary PSAP then contacts the appropriate agency to dispatch emergency responders. However, in cases where local authorities determine that specialized expertise is required to handle the 9-1-1 call, such as emergency medical services, 9-1-1 calls are then transferred to a secondary PSAP.

#### Positions of parties

17. The PSAP organizations submitted that the definition of PSAPs is a basic principle that was not sufficiently explored during that proceeding and that it should be as follows:

> A primary PSAP receives the 9-1-1 call and determines which emergency service is needed first. Once the emergency service is identified, in many cases the primary PSAP transfers the call and associated data to the downstream secondary PSAP, i.e., Police, Emergency Medical Services, or Fire. The secondary PSAP then collects further information and, if required, dispatches the appropriate emergency service. In the case of hang-up and open line calls, the majority of non-police primary PSAPs in Canada transfer the call with very little information to a secondary PSAP (Police) that must determine if there is an emergency and take appropriate action.

18. The PSAP organizations submitted that the definition in Telecom Regulatory Policy 2017-182 should be amended and the decision should be modified to reflect the distinction between primary and secondary PSAPs due to the overall and genuinely intertwined requirements to manage and handle call setup, evaluation, and transfer functions leading to emergency dispatch. They added that many secondary PSAPs are de facto backup primary PSAPs, which will be an even more prevalent situation in an NG9-1-1 real-time call overflow environment.

19. Finally, the PSAP organizations submitted that, from a technical standpoint, an emergency call centre is deemed to be a PSAP when it is interconnected directly to a province-wide and centralized network that is designed to handle 9-1-1 voice calls, using dedicated and specialized 9-1-1 voice access lines/trunks, and to receive and display associated 9-1-1 call data, known as the Automatic Number Identification/Automatic Location Information (ANI/ALI) record. They added that they do not consider emergency call centres to be PSAPs if those centres do not have such dedicated, direct, and specialized interconnection arrangements.

20. Shaw expressed the view that the Commission's definition recognizes that a primary PSAP receives a 9-1-1 call and transfers it to a secondary PSAP when further expertise is required, and that the Commission did consider the intertwined and co-dependent role of secondary PSAPs in this regard.

21. Le CPSM, the agencies representing the Government of Québec, Urgences-santé Québec, and RCCI agreed with the PSAP organizations' proposed definition, arguing that it provides a more accurate description of reality, more specifically the roles played by both primary and secondary PSAPs in Canada. They submitted that the proposed definition highlights that secondary PSAPs are currently part of the fully integrated, end-to-end 9-1-1 network and must continue to be so in the future NG9-1-1 environment.

22. Bell Canada, SaskTel, and TCI each provided a PSAP definition reflecting a common view that a primary PSAP receives the initial emergency call and transfers it to a secondary PSAP for dispatching purposes.

#### Commission's analysis and determinations

23. The definition of a primary PSAP included in Telecom Regulatory Policy 2017-182 is very similar to the definitions provided by Bell Canada, SaskTel, and TCI in this proceeding. It is also virtually identical to the following definition set out in Telecom Regulatory Policy 2016-165:

> A primary PSAP is a PSAP to which 9-1-1 calls are routed directly as the first point of contact for all 9-1-1 calls. The primary PSAP contacts the appropriate agency to dispatch the emergency response. In cases where local authorities determine that certain emergency responses require specialized expertise to handle the 9-1-1 call, such as emergency medical services, 9-1-1 calls are transferred to a secondary PSAP.

24. Furthermore, the Commission stated in Telecom Regulatory Policy 2017-182 that, in principle, the interconnection of secondary PSAPs to primary PSAPs through the NG9-1-1 networks would assist in the end-to-end provision of NG9-1-1 services. This statement, coupled with the definition of a primary PSAP included in that same decision, demonstrates that the Commission did consider the intertwined and co-dependent role of secondary PSAPs in making its determinations.

25. In light of the above, the Commission finds that the definition of a primary PSAP included in Telecom Regulatory Policy 2017-182 is fundamentally correct. As such, there was no error of fact nor a failure to properly consider a basic principle in this regard, and there is no substantial doubt as to the correctness of that definition. The Commission therefore **denies** the PSAP organizations' request to correct the Commission's definition of a primary PSAP.

**Is there substantial doubt as to the correctness of the original decision to exclude connections to secondary PSAPs from future NG9-1-1 network access tariffs?**

**Positions of parties**

26. The PSAP organizations indicated that current enhanced 9-1-1 (E9-1-1)[7] service provider tariffs and the underlying municipal agreements include tariffed interconnection to all primary and secondary PSAPs. They submitted that the Commission did not provide sufficient notice, during the proceeding that led to Telecom Regulatory Policy 2017-182, that it was considering changing the status quo by excluding the NG9-1-1-related connections of secondary PSAPs from future tariffs. They submitted that had such notice been given, they would have indicated during the proceeding that the following risks are involved in unbundling secondary PSAPs from NG9-1-1 network access tariffs:

    - Canadians would pay a much higher cost for the future NG9-1-1 system, as secondary PSAPs would move from a regulated tariffed service to an unregulated commercial interconnection service, which would likely include much higher markups paid for in the end by consumers.

    - The 9-1-1 system may be fragmented, insecure, unmanageable, and unreliable compared to today's reliable and resilient end-to-end 9-1-1 system, since an open-market approach for the interconnection of secondary PSAPs would eliminate the opportunity for end-to-end surveillance and troubleshooting, possibly increasing emergency service outages and restoration times.

    - End-to-end NG9-1-1 functionality would not be possible, as secondary PSAPs may not be in a position to retrieve and transmit sensitive information if the system is not secure from end to end. This could impede a complete transition to NG9-1-1 across Canada.

    - The Commission's published deployment timelines would not be met, regardless of the readiness of core NG9-1-1 systems, as primary PSAPs may be unable to move forward due to the exclusion of their secondary PSAP partners.

    - There would be potentially lengthy delays for Canadians requiring emergency assistance as a result of increased call handling times because primary PSAPs would need to verbally provide caller information to downstream secondary PSAPs.

27. Shaw submitted that sufficient consultation was conducted during the Telecom Regulatory Policy 2017-182 proceeding on the issue of whether connections to

---

[7] E9-1-1 service includes Basic 9-1-1 service, which enables callers to be connected to 9-1-1 operators in PSAPs, but also automatically provides those operators with the telephone number and location of the caller.

secondary PSAPs should be included in the NG9-1-1 network access tariffs, as many interveners were asked who should pay for these interconnections.

28. RCCI agreed with the PSAP organizations that a new principle has arisen as a result of Telecom Regulatory Policy 2017-182 without sufficient consultation with stakeholders (i.e. excluding NG9-1-1-related connections of secondary PSAPs from future NG9-1-1 network access tariffs).

29. Although Bell Canada and TCI did not comment on this issue directly, they confirmed that their current 9-1-1 network access tariffs apply to connections to secondary PSAPs in all provinces where secondary PSAPs have been established, subject to agreements with the appropriate provincial and municipal authorities. SaskTel, on the other hand, submitted that connections to secondary PSAPs are not currently included in its 9-1-1 tariffs, although it does offer them at commercial rates through general tariffs.

30. With regard to the cost of the future NG9-1-1 system, Shaw submitted that there is no evidence that costs will increase and outages will occur if the PSAP organizations' request is denied, noting that there are other ways of providing connections to secondary PSAPs that may be less expensive than connections provided by the ILECs.

31. Le Service de la sûreté municipale de Thetford Mines and Urgences-santé Québec submitted that the Commission's policy change regarding secondary PSAPs could represent considerable recurring costs that would increase costs for their constituents. Le CPSM argued that the Commission's decision to exclude secondary PSAPs from NG9-1-1 network access tariffs is contrary to the Commission's objective of introducing NG9-1-1 solutions that are cost-effective as well as reliable, resilient, and secure.

32. Bell Canada submitted that requiring secondary PSAPs to source their own connections to the NG9-1-1 network would likely result in additional and unnecessary costs and risks to PSAPs, 9-1-1 authorities, and Canadians, as alternative providers would have to reproduce the scope and diversity of existing networks.

33. Bell Canada also submitted that all primary, secondary, and backup PSAPs in Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island currently have access to Text with 9-1-1 and In-Call Location Update (ICLU) via existing Internet Protocol Virtual Private Network (IP-VPN) connections.[8] As such, Bell Canada noted that the physical infrastructure for the NG9-1-1 network is essentially already complete across its entire network. The company added that the incremental work required to prepare primary and secondary PSAPs is the same and that these details are currently being finalized through the ESWG.

---

[8] ICLU is a feature that allows 9-1-1 operators to request an update to a wireless 9-1-1 caller's location. The Commission mandated wireless service providers and ILECs to support this feature in Telecom Decision 2013-124. IP-VPN extends a private network across a public IP network, enabling users to send and receive data across shared or public networks as if their computing devices were directly connected to the private network.

34. SaskTel agreed that if secondary PSAPs are not included in the NG9-1-1 network access tariffs, they will incur higher costs. It submitted that under an NG9-1-1 network access tariff, access circuits would be provided at public good wholesale rates, which tend to be lower than commercial rates.

35. Regarding the PSAP organizations' concern that the NG9-1-1 system may be fragmented, insecure, unmanageable, and unreliable, Shaw submitted that the vast majority of complexity in interworking primary and secondary PSAPs is dealt with by the equipment at each PSAP, so even if the ILEC pays for transport, the complexity issues will remain the same.

36. Le CPSM submitted that if secondary PSAPs connect to NG9-1-1 networks via commercial Internet connections, those networks could be vulnerable to cyberattacks. It added that since Internet traffic passes across the border between Canada and the United States, differing jurisdictional approaches to the protection of privacy could mean that personal information exchanged between primary and secondary PSAPs would be disclosed unintentionally.

37. Bell Canada submitted that the use of third-party providers without suitable resiliency and diversity characteristics may degrade the public's faith in the NG9-1-1 system, which would negatively impact the public's use of the system and thereby impair its effectiveness.

38. SaskTel and TCI submitted that their ability to monitor the network and diagnose any errors would be reduced if secondary PSAPs use alternative providers, which may in turn result in a less reliable and resilient network.

39. RCCI submitted that one major goal of the implementation of NG9-1-1 is that various methods of communication will be supported in order for PSAPs to send new information or further details to first responders (e.g. pictures and medical records). To achieve that goal, primary and secondary PSAPs require similar access to connect to the NG9-1-1 networks in Canada. RCCI added that maintaining the existing tariff structure for secondary PSAPs under the new regime (i.e. including their connections in network access tariffs) would greatly assist in the timing and deployment of NG9-1-1 in Canada by ensuring coordination at the PSAP level.

40. Bell Canada submitted that if connections to secondary PSAPs are not included in the NG9-1-1 network access tariffs, those PSAPs could elect to delay or forgo NG9-1-1 connectivity. Bell Canada argued that any regime that involves this risk is inappropriate, as it is potentially harmful to the rollout and public adoption of NG9-1-1.

41. Alberta Health Services submitted that excluding secondary PSAPs from NG9-1-1 network access tariffs may delay or prevent the implementation of technology that facilitates the transfer of NG9-1-1 information from primary PSAPs.

42. Le CPSM submitted that NG9-1-1 services may not be made available to all Canadians if the provinces, territories, or municipalities are not able to assume the costs of secondary PSAP connections, or if they choose not to deploy these services.

#### Commission's analysis and determinations

43. With regard to the PSAP organizations' submission that insufficient consultation was conducted to warrant the determination to exclude secondary PSAPs' connections from future NG9-1-1 network access tariffs, the Commission notes that the specific question of who should pay for these connections was in fact posed to a limited number of interveners during the original proceeding. However, the Commission acknowledges that the impacts of this determination may not have been fully explored.

44. Secondary PSAPs whose connections to 9-1-1 networks have been included in 9-1-1 network access tariffs have not been paying ILECs for those connections; rather, the TSPs obtaining the connections under the tariffs assume those costs. Accordingly, the Commission's determination in Telecom Regulatory Policy 2017-182 that secondary PSAPs should be responsible for future NG9-1-1 connection costs represents a departure from current practice for the majority of those PSAPs.

45. Currently, local government authorities, not 9-1-1 network providers, are responsible for primary and secondary PSAPs. The primary PSAPs receive 9-1-1 calls, determine the nature of those calls, and route them to the appropriate emergency response agency, whether that is a secondary PSAP or a dispatcher. The policies and arrangements between primary and secondary PSAPs fall outside the Commission's jurisdiction. No party to the current proceeding suggested altering this situation in an NG9-1-1 environment, and the Commission considers that the responsibility for deciding which calls to route to secondary PSAPs should continue to lie with the primary PSAPs.

46. With regard to the PSAP organizations' submission that Canadians would pay more for emergency services if the costs of secondary PSAP connections were assumed by provincial, territorial, or municipal governments, there is no quantifiable evidence on the record that this would be the case. However, the Commission considers, as argued by Bell Canada and SaskTel, that alternative providers would likely charge secondary PSAPs higher markups for connections than what would be approved under NG9-1-1 network access tariffs. This would be inconsistent with the Commission's objective of introducing cost-effective NG9-1-1 solutions.

47. The Commission also considers that if secondary PSAPs source their connections to the NG9-1-1 network from alternative providers, it may be difficult to monitor and troubleshoot the 9-1-1 network from end to end, which could result in less reliable, resilient, and secure service to Canadians. Such a result would also be inconsistent with the Commission's objective of introducing high-quality NG9-1-1 solutions.

48. The Commission recognizes that excluding secondary PSAPs from NG9-1-1 network access tariffs poses a risk to the deployment of NG9-1-1, as some of those PSAPs may not be in a position to make the necessary upgrades to their systems. This could

lead to delays or impede the transfer of critical information between primary and secondary PSAPs.

49. In light of the above, the Commission determines that there is substantial doubt as to the correctness of its determination in Telecom Regulatory Policy 2017-182 that the costs of NG9-1-1-related connections of secondary PSAPs be recovered from the relevant provincial, territorial, or municipal government and not through any Commission-approved NG9-1-1 network access tariffs.

50. The Commission therefore **varies** that determination and, accordingly, **varies** the condition imposed on the offering and provision of telecommunications service by ILECs set out in paragraph 71 of Telecom Regulatory Policy 2017-182 so as to require that the ILECs "connect their NG9-1-1 networks to the primary ***and secondary*** PSAPs in their operating territories" (changes highlighted in bold italics).

51. The Commission's determinations regarding this issue give rise to several other matters, which are set out below.

## Other matters

### Definition of a secondary PSAP

52. Bell Canada, SaskTel, and TCI generally agreed that the majority of the physical infrastructure is already in place to connect E9-1-1-enabled secondary PSAPs (i.e. those that currently receive caller and location information along with the call transfer from the primary PSAP) to the 9-1-1 network. Evidence has been brought to light regarding the difference between these PSAPs and other types of secondary PSAPs, including dispatch centres that currently do not have access to, or require, the same level of caller information. As such, although the definition of a secondary PSAP does vary across the country, as stated in the original decision, the number of secondary PSAPs that require automatic provision of caller information is known to be 179 at this time.

53. All parties that commented on this issue agreed that the number of secondary PSAPs requiring full-featured NG9-1-1 functionality is expected to either remain relatively stable or decrease, based on the recent industry trend of local governments consolidating PSAPs to increase operational efficiency. Parties expect that the transition to NG9-1-1, including the technical and operational modernizations that will be required, will likely result in further consolidation.

54. In light of the above, the Commission concludes that it is necessary to clarify the definition of a secondary PSAP in order to ensure that demand for secondary PSAP connections and the resulting cost to Canadians continue to be reasonable in an NG9-1-1 environment.

55. The Commission therefore **varies** footnote 7 of Telecom Regulatory Policy 2017-182 to add the following definition of secondary PSAPs:

A secondary PSAP is a PSAP to which NG9-1-1 calls are transferred from a primary PSAP and which is directly interconnected to an NG9-1-1 network allowing for the receipt and display of NG9-1-1 call data.

### NG9-1-1 network boundaries

56. In Telecom Regulatory Policy 2017-182, the Commission defined the boundaries of NG9-1-1 networks as ending at the demarcation points between the NG9-1-1 networks and the primary PSAPs. Those boundaries must be redefined to reflect the Commission's determination to include the costs of NG9-1-1-related connections of secondary PSAPs in future NG9-1-1 network access tariffs.

57. The Commission therefore **varies** the definition set out in paragraph 121 of Telecom Regulatory Policy 2017-182 as follows:

> … the boundaries of the NG9-1-1 network are defined as beginning at and including the points of interconnection between the originating networks and the NG9-1-1 networks, and ending at the demarcation points between the NG9-1-1 networks and the primary ***and secondary*** PSAPs. (changes highlighted in bold italics)

### CISC reports

58. In order to ensure that the number of primary and secondary PSAPs requesting to be connected to NG9-1-1 networks in the future is appropriate, the Commission requests that CISC report annually all changes to these numbers from the previous year, taking into consideration the Commission's new definition of secondary PSAPs. The reports should include the names of individual primary, secondary, and backup PSAPs, by province or territory.

59. To enable the Commission to track the number of primary and secondary PSAPs appropriately, a baseline list of those PSAPs connected to NG9-1-1 networks must be established. The first CISC report is to be submitted to the Commission on **30 June 2020** and should include all primary and secondary PSAPs that are connected to NG9-1-1 networks and are in service on that date. Subsequent annual reports identifying all changes in these PSAPs from the previous year are to be submitted to the Commission on **30 June** of each year, beginning in 2021.

Secretary General

## Related documents

- *Next-generation 9-1-1 – Modernizing 9-1-1 networks to meet the public safety needs of Canadians*, Telecom Regulatory Policy CRTC 2017-182, 1 June 2017

- *Matters related to the reliability and resiliency of the 9-1-1 networks*, Telecom Regulatory Policy CRTC 2016-165, 2 May 2016

- *CISC Emergency Services Working Group – Consensus report regarding the In-Call Location Update feature trial and implementation*, Telecom Decision CRTC 2013-124, 14 March 2013

- *Revised guidelines for review and vary applications*, Telecom Information Bulletin CRTC 2011-214, 25 March 2011

# Appendix to Telecom Decision CRTC 2018-188

## PSAP organizations that were signatories to the application filed by the New Brunswick 9-1-1 Bureau

Alberta E9-1-1 Advisory Association

Barrie Police PSAP

Belleville Police PSAP

Brockville Police PSAP

Calgary 9-1-1

Chatham-Kent Police PSAP

Coalition pour le service 9-1-1 au Québec

Cornwall Police PSAP

County of Hastings (Ontario) PSAP

Durham Regional Police PSAP

E-Comm 9-1-1 (BC)

Edmonton Police PSAP

Espanola Police PSAP

Gananoque Police PSAP

Greater Sudbury Police PSAP

Grande Prairie Fire PSAP

Hamilton Police PSAP

Kawartha Lakes Police PSAP

Kingston Police PSAP

Lethbridge Police PSAP

London Police PSAP

Manitoba Provincial 9-1-1

New Brunswick 9-1-1

Niagara Regional Police PSAP

North Bay Police PSAP

Nova Scotia 9-1-1

Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care PSAPs

Ontario Provincial Police PSAPs

Orangeville Police PSAP

Owen Sound Police PSAP
Peel Regional Police PSAP
Peterborough Police PSAP
Prince Edward Island 9-1-1
RCMP ‘E’ Division Operational Communications Centre (BC)
Red Deer Fire PSAP
Sault Ste. Marie Police PSAP
Sarnia Police PSAP
Sask911 (Saskatchewan) PSAPs
Service de police de la Ville de Montréal
Smiths Falls Police PSAP
Strathroy-Caradoc Police PSAP
St. Thomas Police PSAP
Timmins Police PSAP
Toronto Police PSAP
Thunder Bay Police PSAP
Victoria Police PSAP
Waterloo Police PSAP
West Nipissing Police PSAP
Windsor Police PSAP
Winnipeg Police PSAP
Woodstock Police PSAP
York Regional Police PSAP