



## Telecom Decision CRTC 2014-8

PDF version

Ottawa, 10 January 2014

### **Bruce Telecom – Implementation of wireless number portability for Rogers Communications Partnership**

File numbers: 8620-B7-201312298 and 8620-R28-201308750

*In this decision, the Commission approves Bruce Telecom's plan for the implementation of wireless number portability in the Ontario exchanges of Kincardine, Paisley, and Tiverton.*

#### **Introduction**

1. The Commission received a wireless number portability (WNP) implementation plan, dated 21 August 2013, from Bruce Telecom. The plan was filed in response to a formal signed expression of interest from Rogers Communications Partnership (RCP), which confirmed its interest in obtaining WNP in the Ontario exchanges of Kincardine, Paisley, and Tiverton (the exchanges), where Bruce Telecom is the incumbent local exchange carrier (ILEC).
2. The Commission received an intervention from RCP. The public record of this proceeding, which closed on 7 October 2013, is available on the Commission's website at [www.crtc.gc.ca](http://www.crtc.gc.ca) under "Public Proceedings" or by using the file numbers provided above.

#### **Background**

3. Number portability enables customers to keep the same telephone number when changing service providers and is an integral component of retail competition in the local exchange market.
4. In Telecom Decision 2008-122, the Commission, among other things, set out the framework for WNP implementation in the territories of the small ILECs. That decision included directives that the small ILECs must follow when submitting their implementation plans.

5. The Commission reviewed this framework and determined, in Telecom Regulatory Policy 2011-291, that WNP and local competition would continue to be introduced in the territories of the small ILECs based on the existing frameworks, subject to the modifications set out in that decision.<sup>1</sup>
6. In Telecom Regulatory Policy 2012-24, the Commission determined that implementation of WNP in a small ILEC's territory is to be conditional on the wireless carrier directly interconnecting with the small ILEC, unless otherwise negotiated.

### **Should the Commission approve Bruce Telecom's WNP implementation plan?**

7. In its plan, Bruce Telecom indicated that it would require 135 days to implement WNP in the exchanges. The company submitted that it had experienced difficulties in implementing number portability in its Port Elgin exchange, and therefore required additional time to avoid repeating these difficulties in Kincardine, Paisley, and Tiverton. Bruce Telecom also requested that the Commission take into account the fact that it is a small company with limited resources when determining an appropriate implementation time frame.
8. RCP submitted that Bruce Telecom could reduce its proposed time frame by 45 days by combining certain steps of the WNP implementation process.<sup>2</sup> In addition, RCP noted that Bruce Telecom's implementation plan allows for a 30-day window to complete bulk porting activities; however, since no such activities are actually required, the time frame could be reduced by an additional 30 days. RCP had no objections to the other elements of the plan.
9. The Commission notes that based on recent plans filed by other small ILECs, WNP implementation periods have ranged from 30 to 60 business days. In the case of Bruce Telecom, the Commission considers that, given the testing issues in Port Elgin and the company's resource constraints, a longer implementation period would be appropriate. However, the Commission notes that the 135 days proposed by Bruce Telecom includes 30 days for bulk porting, which RCP does not require, and considers that additional time could be saved by combining certain steps. Accordingly, the Commission considers that an implementation period of 90 business days would be appropriate under the circumstances.

---

<sup>1</sup> In that decision, the Commission established certain measures to help mitigate the financial impact on small ILECs of implementing local competition and WNP. In particular, the Commission determined that the number portability start-up costs, including local number portability and WNP, of the small ILECs serving 3,000 or fewer total residential and business network access services (NAS), including the NAS of all their affiliates and/or their parent company, are to be reimbursed by the new entrant(s) over a period of three years.

<sup>2</sup> Specifically, RCP submitted that industry notification could be issued concurrently with Bruce Telecom's NXX updates to the Local Exchange Routing Guide.

10. The Commission considers that the other elements of Bruce Telecom's proposed WNP implementation plan are reasonable and meet the criteria set out in Telecom Decision 2008-122, as modified in Telecom Regulatory Policies 2011-291 and 2012-24. The Commission notes that Bruce Telecom is not entitled to reimbursement for WNP start-up costs because it serves more than 3,000 network access services (NAS).
11. The Commission notes that WNP implementation by Bruce Telecom in the exchanges will enable customers in those exchanges, within a reasonable time period following approval of the company's implementation plan, to retain their telephone numbers if they decide to switch service providers. The Commission considers that this ability will lead to greater choice for these customers, as they will have the opportunity to benefit from choosing among the services, options, and prices offered by different service providers. Accordingly, the Commission considers that approval of the WNP implementation plan would be consistent with the Policy Direction<sup>3</sup> and would advance the policy objectives set out in paragraphs 7(b), (f), and (h) of the *Telecommunications Act*.<sup>4</sup>
12. In light of the above, the Commission **approves** Bruce Telecom's proposed WNP implementation plan. Bruce Telecom is to implement WNP in the exchanges of Kincardine, Paisley, and Tiverton within **90 business days** of the date of this decision.

Secretary General

### Related documents

- *Network interconnection for voice services*, Telecom Regulatory Policy CRTC 2012-24, 19 January 2012
- *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
- *Regulatory framework for the implementation of wireless number portability within the serving territories of the small incumbent local exchange carriers*, Telecom Decision CRTC 2008-122, 18 December 2008

---

<sup>3</sup> *Order Issuing a Direction to the CRTC on Implementing the Canadian Telecommunications Policy Objectives*, P.C. 2006-1534, 14 December 2006

<sup>4</sup> 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.