

**Abstract**

This Determination Notice contains the Office's decision regarding a number of technical issues in RIO4. While the focus of this document is largely on technical issues, principles relating to some pricing issues are also addressed. The Office has decided to extend the consultation on the pricing issues and the timetable for this exercise is set out on page 5 of this document. The revised date for the publication of the Office's determination on the pricing issues is May 3, 2002.

# CONTENT

|   | <b>Page</b>                         |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| <b>CHAPTER 1:INTRODUCTION .....</b>                       | <b>3</b>                            |
| REGULATORY FRAMEWORK .....                                | 3                                   |
| PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT .....                            | 4                                   |
| ISSUES FOR FUTURE CONSULTATION .....                      | 5                                   |
| OUR DOCUMENT NUMBERING CONVENTION .....                   | 5                                   |
| <br>  |                                     |
| <b>CHAPTER 2: PRICING ISSUES.....</b>                     | <b>6</b>                            |
| INTRODUCTION .....  | 6                                   |
| NON-UNIFORM RETAIL RATES FOR FIXED TO MOBILE CALLS .....  | 6                                   |
| FREEPHONE AND 1-888-CALLS.....                            | 7                                   |
| VOLUME DISCOUNT FOR OUTGOING INTERNATIONAL CALLS .....    | 8                                   |
| <br>  |                                     |
| <b>CHAPTER 3: TECHNICAL RIO ISSUES.....</b>               | <b>9</b>                            |
| QUALITY OF SERVICE STANDARDS & PENALTIES.....             | 9                                   |
| JOINING SERVICES .....                                    | 9                                   |
| DIRECT CONNECTION TO C&WJ'S MOBILE NETWORK .....          | 10                                  |
| DIRECT CONNECTION TO C&WJ'S INTERNATIONAL GATEWAYS .....  | 11                                  |
| 64KHZ TERMINATING ACCESS SERVICE.....                     | 12                                  |
| PLMN TERMINATING ACCESS SERVICE.....                      | 13                                  |
| 56 KBIT/S MESSAGING BEARER SERVICE .....                  | 13                                  |
| INTERNATIONAL SIGNALLING SERVICE.....                     | 13                                  |
| DIRECTORY NUMBER INCLUSION AND PUBLICATION SERVICE.....   | 13                                  |
| JOINT WORKING MANUAL (JWM) SCHEDULE .....                 | 14                                  |
| CLARIFICATION AND AMENDMENTS TO JOINT WORKING MANUAL..... | <b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b> |
| <br>  |                                     |
| <b>ANNEX A: GLOSSARY OF TERMS.....</b>                    | <b>16</b>                           |

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

### Regulatory Framework

- 1.0 Interconnection is a necessary condition for effective competition since it enables consumers of one network to be able to successfully complete a call to another consumer or service irrespective of whose network the originator of the call is using or to whose network the call recipient is connected.
- 1.1 In Jamaica the legal framework governing interconnection between carriers is specified in Part V of the Telecommunications Act, 2000. The Act at Section 29(1) makes it obligatory for each public voice carrier to provide interconnection with its network on request by another public voice carrier.
- 1.2 Interconnection is defined in the Act as the physical or logical connection of public voice networks of different carriers. Section 29(2) of the Act stipulates that interconnection between public voice networks must be provided in accordance with the following principles: *any-to-any* (customer of a network are able to make and receive calls to/from subscribers on different networks); *end-to-end operability* (communication should be seamless across networks); and *equality of responsibility* (carriers are equally responsible for establishing interconnection and doing so as speedily as is reasonably practicable).
- 1.3 In addition to the above principles, a dominant public voice carrier is required to provide interconnection on terms and conditions that are:-
  - ? non-discriminatory; and
  - ? reasonable and transparent.
- 1.4 Additionally, interconnect charges should be cost oriented and there should be no unfair arrangements for cross subsidies. Finally, where technically and economically reasonable, interconnection services should be sufficiently unbundled so that an interconnect seeker is not forced to pay for network components or facilities that it does not require.
- 1.5 Section 30(2) requires each dominant public voice carrier to keep separate accounts in such a form and containing such particulars as will enable the Office to assess if interconnection is being provided on the basis of the required principles.

- 1.6 The Act also provides (Section 32 (4)) that a RIO or part thereof, shall take effect on approval by the Office and (section 31) that terms and conditions for interconnect agreements should be determined in accordance with an approved RIO or part thereof that is in effect. Where no RIO or part thereof is in effect the parties may arrive at a mutual agreement or failing this the Office may be asked to arbitrate.

### **Purpose of this Document**

- 1.7 Cable & Wireless Jamaica Limited (C&WJ) submitted a revised Reference Interconnection Offer (RIO4) on August 28, 2001. The RIO sets out a list of services, charges, and general terms and conditions under which Cable & Wireless Jamaica proposes to interconnect with other public voice carriers (fixed and mobile).
- 1.8 Interconnection arrangements affect all providers of telecom services. The Office has therefore sought comments from interested parties on the proposed terms and conditions set out in the RIO document. As was the case with previous versions of C&WJ's Reference Interconnect Offer (RIO), the Office issued a consultative document in which it outlined its position with regard to pricing and technical issues. Respondents were asked to comment on issues of relevance, indicate areas of disagreements, set out reasons for any such disagreements and to point out other issues that the Office may have failed to include or consider.
- 1.9 Comments were submitted by Digicel, Centennial Digital Jamaica (CDJ), and C&WJ. Respondents to the consultative document were also invited to submit comments on responses submitted by third parties. Digicel and C&WJ took up this invitation.
- 1.10 This Determination Notice contains the Office's decision regarding a number of technical issues pertaining to RIO4. The Office has decided to extend the consultation on the pricing issues and the timetable for this exercise is set out on page 5. This decision has been taken because it was deemed that further assessment was required in order to conclude on some complex matters in RIO4. The revised date for the publication of the Office's determination on these issues is May 3, 2002.
- 1.11 This Notice sets out a number of changes to the existing interconnect regime in Jamaica and the Office anticipates that these changes will be reflected in the revised version of the RIO. In keeping with the extended time allowed for further assessment of the pricing issues, however, the Office takes the view that publication of the revised RIO may be delayed

until the determination with regard to pricing issues are final. It should be understood, however, that the determination contained herein should apply as of the date of this notice (unless otherwise stated) and accordingly shall apply in respect of all interconnection agreements.

**Determination 1.0: The Office requires C&WJ to make a number of changes to the existing interconnect regime in Jamaica and submit to the Office a revised RIO reflecting these changes. However, in keeping with the extended time allowed for further assessment of the pricing issues the Office believes that the publication of the revised RIO may be delayed until the determination with regard to pricing issues is final. The determination, herein shall apply, however, as of the date of this notice unless otherwise indicated.**

**Issues For Future Consultation**

1.12 The Office proposes to issue a consultation document on RIO4 pricing on March 15, 2002 and intends to issue a determination notice no later than May 3, 2002. This document may also take account of any non-pricing issues relating to RIO4.

| <i>Activity</i>   | <i>Date</i>    |
|---|----------------|
| Issue of consultative document by the OUR               | March 15, 2002 |
| Response to consultative document by Interested parties | April 12, 2002 |
| Comments on Respondents' Response                       | April 22, 2002 |
| Issue of Determination Notice                           | May 3, 2002    |

**OUR Document Numbering Convention**

1.13 Digicel in its comments on the consultative document suggested that the Office implement a numbering convention in order to “simplify the tracking and referencing of publications.” C&WJ also supported the idea of a document numbering convention along the lines suggested by Digicel. The Office accepts this proposal and has implemented such a system beginning with this document.

## CHAPTER 2: PRICING ISSUES

### Introduction

- 2.0 Based on the comments received the Office is of the view that it is now in a position to set out its determination with regard to three of the pricing issues covered in the consultative document. These are:-
- ? Non-uniform Retail Rates for Fixed to Mobile Calls;
  - ? Freephone & 1-888-Calls; and
  - ? Volume Discount for Outgoing International Calls

### Non-uniform Retail Rates for Fixed to Mobile Calls

- 2.1 In the Consultative Document of December 2001 the Office indicated its intention to maintain the non-uniform retail rate regime for fixed to mobile calls. The current practice is that all mobile carriers are free to charge any price up to a predetermined maximum retail rate. Under this regime each mobile carrier receives the retail rate less C&WJ's fixed retention rate.
- 2.2 Both CDJ and C&WJ have chosen to charge less than the maximum allowed retail rate. C&WJ supports the position that mobile carriers should have pricing flexibility. Digicel believes that a uniform rate is preferable, as it will minimize public confusion. However, Digicel offers no evidence to support the allegation that consumers are confused with the prevailing non-uniform pricing regime. Digicel asserts that C&WJ should not be allowed to charge a price below its costs, and that the Office should set a minimum cost oriented retail price for calls from C&WJ's fixed network to its mobile network. CDJ continues to support the position of pricing flexibility
- 2.3 The Office continues to believe that the public interest is best served by the current non-uniform arrangement that permits carrier pricing flexibility below a determined maximum. There is no evidence of customer confusion to date. Neither is there evidence that C&WJ's rates are predatory (below marginal cost). Moreover, if Digicel believes that predation is taking place it has remedies available under the Fair Competition Act. In summary, the Office is not convinced that there is reasonable justification for changing the regime along the lines suggested by Digicel.

**Determination 2.0: The Office is of the view that there is no justifiable reason for changing the non-uniform regime for fixed to mobile calls and for this reason the present pricing regime will remain unchanged. Neither will it set a minimum price at this time below which C&WJ is not permitted to set its prices for fixed to mobile calls.**

## **Freephone and 1-888-Calls**

- 2.4 Freephone and 1-888 charges (at the terminating end) are meant to cover all the costs of switching and transmission on the fixed network. Where the freephone or 1-888 call originates on another operator's network C&WJ should compensate that carrier for any costs that C&WJ would have saved. If the carrier connects at the end office (line side connection) then no costs are saved and no payment is warranted. If the connection is at a tandem, then there are some savings in local switching and transmission. If the originating carrier is a mobile carrier, the Office proposes that there be no requirement to compensate the carrier for mobile origination in excess of the costs saved by the terrestrial carrier. Mobile carriers may, however, elect to charge their customers for airtime.
- 2.5 C&WJ agrees with the Office's proposed approach, and indicated its intention to submit tariffs with the revised version of RIO4. C&WJ also suggests that the arrangement be reciprocal – that is, C&WJ would be compensated in the same manner if the Freephone or 1-888 customer were served by another carrier. Digicel asserts that the originating carrier should be compensated for its costs in handling the call. CDJ agrees with the proposal of the Office. In their response to C&WJ's comments, Digicel requests clarification of C&WJ's request that the arrangement be reciprocal. It also sought clarification on whether the tariffs to be filed will be cost-based.
- 2.6 There appears to be no substantive reason why the arrangement outlined in the consultative document should not be adopted. Under that arrangement, the cost savings to the fixed network resulting from mobile origination (or origination by a fixed carrier that interconnects at the tandem office) are factored into the pricing structure. Thus, the arrangement should provide appropriate market signals for the caller's choice of whether to originate the call on C&WJ's fixed network or another network.
- 2.7 Mobile carriers can, and presumably will, charge their customers for airtime on Freephone and 1-888 calls. Thus, the calls will not be "free" for mobile users but the users will not have to pay long-distance charges.
- 2.8 The amount of compensation for carriers that originate Freephone and 1-888 services and interconnect at a tandem office will be determined by the Office as part of its broader determination of pricing issues associated with RIO4. In the interim the rate of compensation will be one-half the fixed termination rate, as determined for RIO3.

**Determination 2.1: The amount of compensation for carriers that originate Freephone and 1-888 services and interconnect at a tandem office will be determined by the Office as part of its broader determination of pricing issues associated with RIO4. In the interim the rate of compensation will be one-half the fixed termination rate, as determined for RIO3. The amount of compensation received by C&WJ when the service provide is another carrier shall be the same amount paid by C&WJ. Mobile carriers may elect to charge customers for air time.**

### **Volume Discount for Outgoing International Calls**

2.9 In the Consultative Document the Office sought the views of the industry on the rationale for volume discounts as well as how a regime of this nature should apply. In its response of January 17, 2002, C&WJ's objected to volume discounts on the grounds that it would put smaller entrants at a competitive disadvantage. In its response to the submission made by Digicel, C&WJ argued that discounts be based on commercial negotiations. Digicel on the other hand argued that volume discounts are a normal business practice and cited C&WJ's Performer Plus calling package for its mobile customers as an example. Digicel urged the Office to implement a volume discount regime for resellers of C&WJ's outgoing international minutes. However, neither Digicel or CDJ have indicated how a regime of this nature ought to be implemented. Equally, the Office has not received comments on this matter from resellers of C&WJ's outgoing minutes who are not carriers. The Office has therefore elected to leave this matter to commercial negotiation. It is anticipated, however, that in the event of a dispute the Office may be asked to intervene.

**Determination 2..2: The Office has elected to leave this matter to commercial negotiation.**



## CHAPTER 3: TECHNICAL RIO ISSUES

### Quality of Service Standards & Penalties

- 3.0 CDJ raises the question of quality of service issues, and suggests that the Office should set standards and penalties for failure to meet them. C&WJ maintains that the quality of service standards in the RIO are more than adequate, but indicates that it is open to discussion on penalties which would be reciprocal and inclusive of forecasting issues. The Office is of the view that as a first step carriers should seek to resolve this matter via commercial negotiation. It is anticipated, however, that in the event of a dispute the Office may be asked to intervene.

**Determination 3.0: The Office has determined that this matter should be the subject of commercial negotiation with a resort to the Office if this fails.**

### Joining Services

- 3.1 The Office's position is that the requirement that the Telco ISL and C&WJ ISL be in the same service area should apply only if C&WJ provides the joining service. Alternatively, the Telco can provide a Point of Presence (POP) in the same service area as the C&WJ ISL. It should also be made clear that either party can provide the Joining Service, and that any technology meeting appropriate standards is acceptable.
- 3.2 C&WJ agrees but wishes to use the term Virtual ISL in lieu of POP. C&WJ also proposes a change in pricing. It proposes that in order to simplify the calculation the cost should be divided 50-50 between the parties instead of by the relative traffic in each direction.
- 3.3 Digicel supports the Office's proposal but objects to C&WJ's proposed pricing modification on the grounds that the cost causer should pay.
- 3.4 The Office holds to the position set out in the consultative document with regard to ISLs but accepts C&WJ's clarification. That is, the Office accepts C&WJ's proposal to split the costs of the joining service 50-50. This approach obviates the need for measurement costs. It is also consistent with C&WJ's calculation of its retention rate, so long as the costs of retention are (as they should be) calculated on the assumption that joining costs are split 50-50. Any other approach would require that C&WJ's retention rate be calculated on the basis of relative usage and adjusted from time to time if relative usage changes. This treatment of joining costs does not affect the mobile industry as a whole because the

mobile industry ultimately bears the entire cost of joining services, either through direct charges or through C&WJ's retention.

**Determination 3.2: The Office holds to the position set out in the consultative document with regard to ISLs and accepts C&WJ's proposal that the costs of the joining service should be split 50-50. Either party can provide the Joining Service, and any technology meeting appropriate standards is acceptable.**

### **Direct Connection to C&WJ's Mobile Network**

- 3.5 Under the current regime competing mobile operators must traverse C&WJ's fixed network in order to access its mobile customers. This means that they pay C&WJ fixed a transit fee for traversing its fixed network. Mobile to mobile interconnection was previously a matter of consultation and it was determined by the Office that direct connection to C&WJ's mobile network would not commence in Phase I but be delayed until March 1, 2002. The Office also reiterated this position in the December 2001 RIO Consultative Document in response to a statement at section 1.1.2 of the PLMN Terminating Access Service of RIO4 which appeared not to allow direct connections to the C&WJ mobile network. C&WJ in its response to the consultative document, indicated that direct mobile-to-mobile connection should be further delayed and cited a host of implementation issues that would have to be resolved before mobile-to-mobile interconnection is possible. As an alternative, it has proposed changing the pricing by removing the cost of transport across the fixed network, and filing a separate RIO incorporating these changes.
- 3.6 In a subsequent letter to the Office C&WJ speculated that it might not be dominant in the mobile market and that interconnection negotiations between itself and competing mobile operators should be the subject of commercial negotiations. The company argued that until the issue of dominance is settled, it should be allowed to negotiate commercially with mobile operators for terms and conditions. C&WJ also requested that the Office reconsider the direction that terms and conditions regarding mobile-to-mobile interconnection be filed by January 15, 2002.
- 3.7 The Office's position is that the Telecommunications Act at section 32 declares the existing telecommunications carrier, Cable & Wireless Jamaica Limited (a provider of both fixed and mobile services) to be a dominant player in the Jamaican telecommunications market, and specifically requires the Company to file a RIO with the Office within 30 days of the appointed day of the Act.
- 3.8 C&WJ offers no evidence to support its claim that it might not be dominant in the mobile market. The entry of Digicel and CDJ in the mobile market does not automatically make for a sufficiently competitive market.

A host of factors would have to be considered in assessing dominance in the mobile market, including but not limited to market share or geographic coverage. The Office would need to know whether C&WJ is dominant in the supply of mobile termination, even if it is not dominant in the supply of mobile services to its mobile customers. In addition, C&WJ's dominance in the fixed market may be considered to be relevant especially with regard to whether mobile-to-mobile calls must traverse the PSTN.

- 3.9 In any event, the Act at Section 28 makes specific provisions for the process to consider an application to declare a carrier non-dominant. To date, no such application has been submitted and until such a declaration is made, direct interconnection of C&WJ's mobile network will be done under the applicable provisions of the Act for dominant carriers.
- 3.10 C&WJ may wish to exercise its rights as per section 28(3) of the Act and file an application with the Office to be declared non-dominant in mobile. In the event of such an application, the company should set out detailed financial, economic, and technical arguments in support of its contention that it be treated as non-dominant in the mobile market. Upon receipt of this application the Office will establish a timetable to review the application which will be the subject of public consultation.
- 3.11 The Office's position is that as of 1 March, 2002 transit charges shall be eliminated and C&WJ is directed to provide the Office and interested parties (by February 28, 2002) the proposed terms and conditions specific to mobile-to-mobile interconnection.

**Determination 3.4: Effective March 1, 2002 the fixed network charge should be removed from the Terminating PLMN service. C&WJ is to provide the Office and interested parties (by February 28, 2002) with the proposed terms and conditions specific to mobile-to-mobile interconnection.**

### **Direct Connection to C&WJ's International Gateways**

- 3.12 C&WJ has proposed that, because of technical difficulties, such connections will be implemented when its network architecture is upgraded. Meanwhile, it proposes to reduce the wholesale price for outgoing international minutes by removing the fixed network transit charges. C&WJ proposed to file revised tariffs on 1 March, 2002. The Office finds the proposal to lower the wholesale rate acceptable, so long as there is no service quality degradation and is directing C&WJ to file the tariffs no later than February 21, 2002.
- 3.13 Digicel insists that overseas callers are having difficulty reaching its customers and that it is unable to determine the cause of the problem. It

therefore needs direct connections to overseas gateways in order to maintain service quality.

- 3.14 In its response to Digicel's complaints, C&WJ identifies a number of possible causes for the alleged failures of incoming calls none of which C&WJ claims can be attributed to use of its fixed network. C&WJ suggests that these issues be brought up in the context of the Joint Working Manual as per the problem handling provisions of the interconnect agreement.
- 3.15 The extent and cause of these alleged problems cannot be determined from the response of the Parties. Absent specific information on service quality, the Office will allow C&WJ to proceed with its proposed arrangement. However, in order to ensure that service quality is not and will not become a problem, C&WJ shall provide regular information on the quality of service it provides for incoming calls to mobile operators. This will entail a regular and continuing measurement program with monthly reporting to the Office. The first report shall be provided to the Office on 1 March 2002. The measurements to be provided shall include (1) probability of calls being blocked at the switch due to traffic congestion, (2) probability of calls being blocked on outgoing trunk groups from the international gateway and (3) probability of blocking on trunk groups connecting the fixed network to the mobile network (fixed to mobile direction).
- 3.16 CDJ sought a clarifying statement concerning the Office's position regarding connection to non-C&WJ international gateway facilities after March 2003. The Office considers this premature and outside the scope of this proceeding.

**Determination 3.5: C&WJ's request for direct connection to await upgrading of its network infrastructure is granted on the following conditions: (i) Reduce the wholesale price for outgoing international minutes by removing the fixed network transit charges and file the tariffs with the Office no later than February 21, 2002. (ii) Submit regular information on the quality of service it provides for incoming calls to mobile operators. This will entail a regular and continuing measurement program with monthly reporting to the Office. The first report shall be provided on 1 March 2002. The measurements to be provided shall include (1) probability of calls being blocked at the switch due to traffic congestion, (2) probability of calls being blocked on outgoing trunk groups from the international gateway and (3) probability of blocking on trunk groups connecting the fixed network to the mobile network (fixed to mobile direction).**

### **64Khz Terminating Access Service**

- 3.17 The general Service Description indicates that this should be denoted 64 kbps Terminating Access Service. The Office also objects to the flat

prohibition of supplementary services. Although supplementary services do not need to be specified at this time, there should be an opportunity to consider them on a case-by-case basis. Additionally, if any supplementary services are offered to C&WJ's retail customers, they should be included in the RIO.

**Determination 3.6: C&WJ is required to change the designation to 64 kbps. There should be an opportunity to consider provision of supplementary services when requested on a case-by-case basis. Supplementary services should be provided for in the RIO as they become available to retail.**

### **PLMN Terminating Access Service**

3.18 The Office directs that an omitted sentence in Section 1.2 of the PLMN Terminating Access Service concerning billing of retention payments be restored. C&WJ has agreed to restoring this in the next version of RIO 4.

**Determination 3.7: The omitted sentence in Section 1.2 of the PLMN Terminating Access Service concerning billing of retention payments should be restored.**

### **56 Kbit/s Messaging Bearer Service**

3.19 Digicel argued that this should be defined as an interconnect service and its charge should be based on LRIC. The Office is of the view that defining this as an interconnect service is consistent with the Telecommunications Act and therefore determines that it be treated as such. The issue of pricing will be considered in the Office's forthcoming document on RIO pricing.

**Determination 3.8: The Office has determined that the 56 kbit/s messaging Bearer Service should be defined as an interconnect service.**

### **International Signalling Service**

3.20 Digicel argued that this should be defined as an interconnect service and its charge should be based on LRIC. The Office is of the view that defining this as an interconnect service is consistent with the Telecommunications Act and therefore determines that it be treated as such. The issue of pricing will be considered in the Office's forthcoming document on RIO pricing.

**Determination 3.9: The Office has determined that the 56 kbit/s messaging Bearer Service should be defined as an interconnect service.**

### **Directory Number Inclusion and Publication Service**

3.21 Digicel argued that this should be defined as an interconnect service and its charge should be based on LRIC. The Office is of the view that defining this as an interconnect service is consistent with the

Telecommunications Act and therefore determines that it be treated as such. The issue of pricing will be considered in the Office's forthcoming document on RIO pricing and will take account of responses to the consultation on DQ liberalization.

**Determination 3.9: The Office has determined that the 56 kbit/s messaging Bearer Service should be defined as an interconnect service.**

### **Joint Working Manual (JWM) Schedule**

During the consultation, clarification and answers were supplied with respect to a number of matters. These are set out below. C&WJ is directed to amend the RIO to reflect these clarifications consistent with the answers supplied.

#### *Specification of Availability*

The schedule of availability in Section 1.8.5.2 ii of the JWM is internally inconsistent. The three parties' availability objectives of 99.0% (originating party), 99.2% (transit party) and 99.0% (terminating party) are inconsistent if the overall availability objective is to be 99%. The Office proposed to change the overall availability objective to 97.2%, which is consistent with the individual objectives. The Office is also of the view that the changes proposed by C&WJ will resolve the problem and the amendments to the RIO should reflect these changes.

#### *Relevant Traffic and Operator Service Traffic*

The Office objects to the idea that C&WJ's measurements of Relevant Traffic and Operator Services Traffic shall "be considered definitive and not called into question" as it believes there should be an avenue for legitimate disagreement. C&WJ argues that it has the most reliable information, and therefore its information should be definitive. It agrees, however, to remove the words "and not called into question". This should be reflected in the amendments to the RIO.

The Office continues to hold to its position that connecting operators should be in a position to take issue with C&WJ measurements if they have valid measurements of their own. The operative statement should therefore be modified to say "statements ...produced by C&WJ will be assumed to be accurate unless the Service Taker has bona fide measurements that lead to significantly different results. In the latter case, normal negotiation and arbitration procedures may be invoked."

#### *Fault Restoration*

The Office is also concerned that fault restoration objectives are the same for all services. It believes that there should be some differentiation, depending upon

the importance of the service. Digicel agrees with the Office's position. C&WJ has agreed to review its quality of service measures based on experience over the next six months, leading to possible revision at that time.

### *Specific Word Changes*

All parties have agreed on specific wording changes in Paragraphs 3.3.1.2 and 3.5.1.1 of the JWM and these amendments should be made to the RIO. The final sentence at 3.3.1.2 should read: "Failing this, CDRs for the period and the actual rating for these CDRs will be..." Paragraph 3.5.1.1 of the JWM, first sentence, change the phrase "as late usage" to "as prior."

Paragraph 1.2.3.1: The Office agreed with Digicel that Telco should not be constrained to a single supplier of equipment. C&WJ responds that Circuit Termination Units (the equipment in question here) that are supplied by the Telco can be equipment of any manufacturer, so long as it follows an accreditation procedure, after which it will be added to the list of equipment that can be used without further testing.

Paragraph 1.2.5.1: The statement that "specific ISDN DTC cards" are required is ambiguous. Such cards are only required for primary rate access (PRA). C&WJ responds that it is needed in some cases and most efficient in others.

Paragraph 1.4.1.2: Small carrier systems should go up as far as OC-1. C&WJ states that the radio-based system supports a minimum of 12 T1 Inks, and will accommodate OC-1.

Paragraphs 2.6.2.4: The percentages for Link Failure should be 50% (critical), 15% (major) and <25% (minor). C&WJ states that the values in the JWM were originally put forward by Digicel and that it is willing to revise them to the mutual agreement of C&WJ Network Management and interested parties. The Office await the outcome of this review.

Paragraph 2.9.7: Global translations be supported. C&WJ responds that they are not currently supported. The Office will not require C&WJ to support such translations unless a clear benefit can be demonstrated.

## **ANNEX A: GLOSSARY OF TERMS**

### *C&WJ*

Cable & Wireless Jamaica (formerly known as Telecommunications of Jamaica, TOJ) is the incumbent provider of telecommunications services in Jamaica. It operates a fixed and a (Time Division Multi Access) mobile network and is a subsidiary of C&W Plc of the United Kingdom.

### *CDJ*

Centennial Digital Jamaica is Jamaica's third mobile carrier. It commenced services on November 28, 2001 and employed a Code Division Multi Access (CDMA) technology.

### *DQ*

Directory Enquiry service

### *FTM*

Fixed to Mobile calls. Examples include calls from C&WJ's fixed network to its mobile network or the mobile networks of either Digicel or Centennial Digital Jamaica.

### *PSTN*

Public Switched Telephone Network

### *PLMN*

Public Land Mobile Network

### *RIO*

Reference Interconnect Offer