



National Telecommunications Regulatory Commission
St. Vincent and the Grenadines

Ref. No.COR/ECTEL

August 3, 2011.

Mr. Embert Charles
Managing Director
ECTEL
Vide Boutielle
P. O. Box 1886
St. Lucia

Dear Mr. Charles,

Consultation on Confidential Aspects of Approved Interconnection Agreements

The Commission, having reviewed the Consultation on Confidential Aspects of Approved Interconnection Agreements, wishes to comment as follows:

1. The first part of the document deals with the issue of keeping certain parts of Interconnection Agreements confidential; and in so doing, not being made available to the Public. The existing Interconnection Regulations allows for certain sections of Interconnection Agreements to be deemed confidential. This is an issue our NTRC had raised with ECTEL when the initial regulations were drafted on Interconnection and also when they were amended recently. Regulations are supposed to be inline with the parent Act, which in this case our Telecommunications Act of 2001. Our Telecommunications Act clearly outlines that Interconnection Agreements were to be publicly available.

In this new consultation document, it appears that ECTEL now shares the same view and wants to make all Agreements publicly available. In this situation our NTRC has no problems with the new view on the matter since it is inline with our NTRC's view. Our NTRC supports the move to make all Interconnection agreements publicly available including being online.

2. The second part of the consultation document refers to the issue of LIME making available a RIO (Reference Interconnection Offer). This issue our NTRC believe maybe not applicable to our current market situation. The purpose of RIOs (as we understand it) are for when markets are being opened up and new entrants have to negotiate Interconnection Agreements with the incumbent who would have been the dominant and only provider at the time. Such a document would have made negotiations easier as the rates and other details would have been made publicly available upfront and not subject to long negotiations as occurred in our situation when no RIO was present. Presently, our market is at the stage where we have Interconnection Agreements that are already in place and serve for all practical purposes as RIOs for any new entrant that comes into the market.

If some persons are still of the view that a RIO is still needed at this time, then it cannot be solely for LIME. Is LIME the only dominant player in our markets? Another fact that must be taken into consideration is that there is no requirement for a new entrant to have an Interconnection Agreement with LIME if they desire to enter our market. This is clearly evident where Karib Cable has entered the fixed line market in St.Vincent and the Grenadines but has no Interconnection Agreements with LIME. This however does not prevent traffic to flow from LIME to Karib Cable and vice versa, since Karib Cable has an Interconnection Agreement with Digicel who has an agreement with LIME. As such traffic flows through a third party.

In closing, our Commission would just like to confirm our support for ensuring that all parts of an Interconnection Agreement are made available to the Public. Additionally, we do not believe there is a practical need for a RIO at this time and specifically one for LIME only. Our existing Interconnection Agreements serve the same purpose of a RIO. It might also be the opportune time to carefully look at our market to see which provider(s) are really dominant.

Sincerely yours,



Apollo Knights
Secretary/Director
NTRC