

Your response

Volume 1: Market review

Contemporary Interface (CI) Access

Question	Your response
Question 4.1: Do you agree with our proposed approach to product market definition? Please provide evidence to support your views.	Dark Fibre as a service seems to be treated in same way as other CI Access services. This seems to underplay the value of dark fibre in the access space.

	<p>The architecture of the Openreach access network needs to be understood. There is very low penetration of full-fibre access to the customer premise, however, a very high penetration of fibre to the distribution point (street cabinet / junction box) driven by the Fibre-to-the-Cabinet (FTTC) superfast architecture.</p> <p>Alternative operators may wish to offer full-Fibre-to-the-Home/Premise (FTTH/FTTP) services by utilising the fibre to the cabinet infrastructure already in place and supplementing by digging/installing the last drop fibre from DP to home/premise. The BCMR should consider this situation.</p> <p>It may be countered that the forthcoming Openreach PIA / Duct and Pole Access product will address all access fibre requirements. This may not be the case – why overlay fibre from the Access node/Exchange when there is surplus of Openreach fibre already installed? Also, if the Access node/Exchange to DP ducts are already full then PIA/DPA may not be a solution and providing a Dark Fibre Access product to the DP will be a necessity.</p>
<p>Question 4.2: Do you agree with our proposed CI Access product market definition? Please provide evidence to support your views.</p>	<p>In general agreement. Nothing to add.</p>
<p>Question 5.1: Do you agree with our proposed approach to geographic market analysis for CI</p>	<p>In general agreement. Nothing to add.</p>

<p>Access? Please provide evidence to support your views.</p>	
<p>Question 5.2: Do you agree with our proposed definition of geographic markets for CI Access? Please provide evidence to support your views.</p>	<p>In general agreement. Nothing to add.</p>

<p>Question 6.1: Do you agree with our proposed approach to SMP assessment for CI Access in the UK excluding the Hull Area? Please provide evidence to support your views.</p>	<p>In general agreement. Nothing to add.</p>
<p>Question 6.2: Do you agree with our proposed SMP findings for CI Access in each of the geographic markets defined? Please provide evidence to support your views.</p>	<p>In general agreement. Nothing to add.</p>

CI Inter-exchange connectivity

<p>Question 7.1: Do you agree with our assessment of inter-exchange connectivity? Please provide evidence to support your views.</p>	<p>In general agreement. Nothing to add.</p>
<p>Question 7.2: Do you agree with the proposed market definition? Please provide evidence to support your views.</p>	<p>In general agreement. Nothing to add.</p>

Question 7.3: Do you consider that our list of BT exchanges for de-regulation is correct? Please provide evidence to support your views.

In general agreement. Nothing to add.

Question 7.4: Do you agree with our list of Principal Core Operators (PCOs)? Please provide evidence to support your views.

In general agreement. Nothing to add.

Traditional interface (TI) services

Question 8.1: Do you agree with our proposal not to regulate the low bandwidth TI services market on the basis that it no longer fulfils the three-criteria test set out in the European Commission Recommendation? Please provide evidence to support your views.

In general agreement. Nothing to add.

Hull Area

Question 9.1: Do you agree with our proposal to deregulate the retail market for CI services at all bandwidths in the Hull Area? Please provide evidence to support your views.

No comments to make.

Question 9.2: Do you agree with our analysis and proposed findings in relation to the wholesale market for CI Access services at all bandwidths in the Hull Area? Please provide evidence to support your views.

No comments to make.

Question 9.3: Do you agree with our proposal to deregulate wholesale TI services at all bandwidths in the Hull Area? Please provide evidence to support your views.

No comments to make.

Approach to remedies

Question 10.1: Do you agree with our proposed approach to remedies? Please provide reasons and evidence in support of your views.

Yes, there is agreement in your approach to remedies.

Two comments to make:

1. CI Interexchange dark fibre – The availability on CI dark fibre between BT exchanges is to be welcomed for all the reasons listed.

Certainly, dark fibre availability at BT-only exchanges is a given, but consideration should be given to BT+one exchanges also. Will the alternative carriers / dark fibre providers at BT+N exchanges be published information? If these are not made known and/or these alternative carriers / dark fibre providers are not willing to make their assets available then what is OFCOM policy in these instances?

Regarding the design and implementation of this product it is important that it is multi-hop A-Z end-to-end service terminating at a BT-only exchange at 'A' and an BT-only exchange at 'B'. It must not be just a one-hop A-B service between adjacent BT-only exchanges.

To expand on the above - take for example a dark fibre service between exchanges A to D through intermediate exchanges B & C. Exchanges A & D are BT-only but B & C are BT+N. The new dark fibre service A-D must traverse all intermediate exchanges irrespective of the intermediate exchanges being BT-only or BT+N.

2. CI Access dark fibre

As stated in Q4.1 the architecture of the Openreach access network needs to be understood. There is very low penetration of full-fibre access to the customer premise, however, a very high penetration of fibre to the distribution point (street cabinet / junction box) driven by the Fibre-to-the-Cabinet (FTTC) superfast architecture.

Alternative operators may wish to offer full-Fibre-to-the-Home/Premise (FTTH/FTTP) services by utilising the fibre to the cabinet infrastructure already in place and supplementing by digging/installing the last

	<p>drop fibre from DP to home/premise. The BCMR should consider this situation.</p> <p>It may be countered that the forthcoming Openreach PIA / Duct and Pole Access product will address all access fibre requirements. This may not be the case – why overlay fibre from the Access node/Exchange when there is surplus of Openreach fibre already installed? Also, if the Access node/Exchange to DP ducts are already full then PIA/DPA may not be a solution and providing a Dark Fibre Access product to the DP will be a necessity</p>
--	---

General remedies

<p>Question 11.1: Do you agree with the general remedies that we propose? Please provide reasons and evidence in support of your views.</p>	<p>In general agreement. Nothing to add.</p>
--	--

Specific dark fibre remedy for inter-exchange connectivity

<p>Question 12.1: Do you agree with the aims and effect of our proposed dark fibre remedy? Please provide evidence to support your views.</p>	<p>Please refer to answer to question 10.1 in this context.</p>
--	---

<p>Question 12.2: Do you agree with our proposed scope of the remedy? Please provide evidence to support your views. Please provide evidence to support your views.</p>	<p>The previous Openreach Dark Fibre Access product which was curtailed by BT at tribunal had created huge expectation in the market. Alternative operators and equipment vendors had ramped up to meet the nascent demand.</p> <p>CI Interexchange dark fibre provides an important piece to getting the market back to where it should be. However, that can only be completed with a dark fibre to the DP product (not necessarily all the way to the premise)</p>
<p>Question 12.3: What scope do you expect to have for cost savings as a result of the proposed dark fibre remedy? How large do you expect any cost savings to be? Please provide evidence to support your views.</p>	<p>[X] Redacted for publication</p>
<p>Question 12.4: How many orders for dark fibre would you envisage placing during the two-year review period? Please provide evidence to support your views.</p>	<p>[X] Redacted for publication</p>
<p>Question 12.5: Do you agree with our proposed timeline for dark fibre implementation? Please provide evidence to support your views.</p>	<p>[X] Redacted for publication</p>

Specific remedies for active products

Question 13.1: Do you agree with the specific network access remedies that we propose for CI services at all bandwidths in the business connectivity markets? Please provide evidence to support your views.

In general agreement. Nothing to add.

Specific remedies for interconnection and accommodation

Question 14.1: Do you agree with the specific remedies for interconnection and accommodation that we propose? Please provide evidence to support your views.

In general agreement. Nothing to add.

Quality of services (QoS) remedies

Question 15.1: Do you agree with our proposals regarding the application of QoS standards, KPIs, SLAs and SLGs over the period of this review? Please provide evidence to support your views.

In general agreement. Nothing to add.

Remedies in the Hull Area

Question 16.1: Do you agree with the remedies in the Hull Area that we propose? Please provide evidence to support your views.

No comments to make.

Volume 2: Leased line charges control

Objectives and approach in setting the leased lines charge controls

Question 2.1: Do you agree with the proposed form of charge controls? Please provide evidence to support your views.

Charge control design

Question 3.1: Do you agree with each of our proposals in relation to the design of charge controls for active services at 1 Gbit/s and below? Please provide evidence to support your views.

In general agreement. Nothing to add.

Question 3.2: Do you agree with each of our proposals in relation to the design of charge controls for active VHB services? Please provide evidence to support your views.

In general agreement. Nothing to add.

Question 3.3: Do you agree with each of our proposals in relation to the design of charge controls for accommodation services, Excess Construction Charges and Time Related Charges? Please provide evidence to support your views.

In general agreement. Nothing to add.

Inter-exchange dark fibre charge control

Question 4.1: Do you agree with our proposals in relation to the design of a charge control for inter-exchange dark fibre? Please provide evidence to support your views.

In general agreement. Nothing to add.

Implementation, compliance and legal tests

Question 5.1: Do you agree with each of our proposals in relation to the implementation of charge controls? Please provide evidence to support your views.