CONSULT21

BT wholesale

BRIEFING

Summary of responses to Consultation Document C21-IP-031 SVLANs for Call Conveyance (PSTN Emulation) Commercial Consultation

Issue 1 : Briefing C21-IP-039

Date: 26th June 2007

Author : John Davey, BT Wholesale

IMPORTANT NOTE

This document is supplied by BT to Communications Providers, being customers of BT Wholesale and or Openreach, as part of the Consult21 consultation process.

Details within it may be subject to change as a result of that process and / or for technical, commercial or operational reasons.

CONTENTS

1 Background

BT is developing Next Generation Network (NGN) Interconnect Products to enable Communications Providers (CPs) to Interconnect with 21CN, BTs Next Generation Network. This Interconnection will be enabled through the development of a Multi Service Interconnect Link (MSIL). For NGN Call Conveyance (PSTN Emulation) NGN CC(PE), Service VLANs (SVLANs) will be needed for media paths and signalling paths with Stream Control Transmission Protocol (SCTP) associations. These SVLANs will extend from the MSIL to the Point of Service Interconnect (PoSI) at the Border Gateways for the media path and to the Signalling Firewalls for the signalling path.

BT issued Consultation Document C21-IP-031 on 30 May 2007, outlining the proposed charging principles that would be applied to SVLANs. This document summarises the four responses that have been received. The next step is for BT to publish its conclusions, for which the target date is 16 July 2007

The proposals in this document relate exclusively to the interim charging arrangements and are without prejudice to BT's position in relation to the Replacement Charging Methodology which is subject to discussion at NGNuk, which could affect charging for signalling and media SVLANs, SCTP associations and reciprocity.

2 Industry Consultation

2.1 What did we consult on?

The Interconnect and Portfolio Working Group of Consult21 set up an experts group to develop the commercial principles that will apply to SVLANs. The proposals in this document are based on the output of this group and subject to the feedback received from industry, will be used for feasibility and subsequently to develop the relevant processes and procedures required, and prices

2.2 Process for Handling Consultation Queries

Any questions from Communications Providers on this briefing should be sent to john.a.davey@bt.com and chris.evans@bt.com and julian.wootten@bt.com

2.3 Consultation Timings

Consultation document issued to CPs	30 May 2007
Bilateral discussions Begin	2 June 2007
Bilateral Discussions End	20 June 2007
CP responses required by	20 June 2007
BT Publishes Summary of Responses	26 June 2007
BT Publishes Conclusions	16 July 2007

3 Summary of Proposals

3.1 BT intends to develop the following products:

1. Media VLAN to a Border Gateway associated with a logical PoSI at a parent Metronode - see Annex 1
2. Signalling VLAN to a Signalling Firewall associated with a logical PoSI at a parent Metronode.
3. Metronode to Metronode Extension SVLANs will be available from the parent Metronode site to any other Metronode site for both media and signalling SVLANs using Media bandwidths as described in Annex 1. It should be noted that BT does not now believe any CP will require an extension SVLAN for signalling.
4. Signalling Routes (SCTP associations) will be specified across signalling SVLANs

3.2 BT proposes the following commercial arrangements for these products:-

3.2.1 The signalling SVLANs and setting up the STCP associations will not be chargeable by BT, nor will CPs charge BT for similar facilities for BT owned traffic on their side of the interconnect.

3.2.2 The media SVLANs will be chargeable, and CPs will be entitled to charge BT on a reciprocal basis for In Building SVLANs on their side of the interconnect, for BT owned traffic. If there is demand for SVLANS used by traffic owned by both parties the costs will be split in proportion to *bandwidth for* the traffic owned *by each party*

3.2.3 CPs will be responsible for purchasing MSILs. During the interim charging period the same cost sharing arrangements that currently apply for PSTN interconnect will apply to MSIL use for NGN CC (PE). In Span Handover and In Building Handover MSILs used only for NGN CC (PE) will attract a full rebate (excluding any distance related charge). The costs of Customer Sited Handover MSILs will be shared in proportion to bandwidth for traffic owned by each party. The costs of MSILs used for both Voice and any other services such as Broadband will be split in proportion to bandwidth in use.

4 Summary of Responses to Questions

Question 1 – Do you agree that the same charging principles as are currently used for PSTN Interconnect should be applied to NGN CC(PE) Interconnect for the period of interim charging until a Replacement Charging Methodology is implemented? If not, what alternative do you propose?

All four respondents agreed in principle. One respondent commented that the charging principles must take into account the additional bandwidth overhead required to deliver the same amount of calls against the present TDM interconnect. Another asked for confirmation that all the proposed charging arrangements were set out at 3.2 of the consultation. Another commented that the same principles might be carried forward into the Replacement Charging Methodology.

Question 2 – Do you agree that the interim call conveyance Pence Per Minute (PPM) charging arrangements for NGN CC(PE) should apply from the logical PoSI to the end user, or transit exit point? If not, what alternative do you propose?

All four respondents agreed. One pointed out the reference to SFW should be removed as this is not a chargeable element in the present charging regime.

Question 3 – Do you agree that Signalling SVLAN costs should lie where they fall on both sides of the Point of Handover, with no money changing hands? If not, what alternative do you propose?

All four respondents agreed. One made the additional point that a LPOSI might require signalling SVLANs to multiple firewalls

Question 4 – Do you agree that media SVLANs will be chargeable by BT, and CPs will be entitled to charge BT on a reciprocal basis for In Building SVLANs on their side of the interconnect, for BT owned traffic? If not, what alternative do you propose?

All four respondents agreed

Question 5 – Do you anticipate requiring shared media SVLAN? If so please give some indication of likely volumes.

None of the four respondents thought they would require SVLANs for voice traffic owned by both parties (shared media SVLANs for Voice only)

Question 6 – Do you agree with the proposed charging structure for SVLANs? If not, what alternative do you propose?

All four respondents agreed, one subject to clear sight of the various elements and their associated costs.

Question 7 Are you likely to have a requirement for Metronode to Metronode SVLANs? If so are you likely to require bandwidth in excess of 500 Mbit/s for a single metronode to metronode SVLAN?

All four respondents thought they were unlikely to have a requirement in excess of 500Mbit/s

Question 8 – Do you agree with the proposal that no charges be raised for In Span Handover and In Building Handover MSILs used exclusively for NGN CC (PE) and that in the case of Customer Sited Handover MSILs, the charge is rebated in proportion to the bandwidth contracted for BT SVLANs as a proportion of the total bandwidth in use for voice over the MSIL ? If not, what alternative do you propose?

All four respondents agreed. One pointed out that whilst no charges should be raised against an MSIL which is used solely for Voice; commercial arrangements had to be put into place to allow CPs to alter this position at a later date. Also whilst it was understood that voice is the only reciprocal product to date, this should not preclude future products becoming so, in which case they would need to be accounted for.

Question 9 – Do you agree with the proposed charging arrangements for shared use MSILs? If not, what alternative do you propose?

All four respondents supported the proposals in principle, but sought clarification on exactly how the MSIL/SVLAN products and their associated terms & conditions would operate in practice.

1. One respondent sought clarity on whether no charge would be raised, or a charge raised and then rebated. They expected any rebate to be made via immediate discounts off the MSIL bill. They also sought clarification regarding the rebate periods i.e. if Day 0 is the time at which an MSIL becomes chargeable, changes in Days 1-90 will receive a full rebate, 91-180 95% rebate etc
2. Another respondent said they would rather have the BT costs defined by the forecast process. The rebate would fix the error (one way or the other) at a later date. If BT preferred to stick with its existing proposals, they would expect to be paid interest at commercial rates.
3. Another respondent said that for Voice only MSILs BT should have in place a mechanism which stops any charging in the first instance.
4. Another put a caveat against the commercial & economic implications of the Replacement Charging Methodology which were unknown

Q10 Do you agree with the charging principles proposed for re-dimensioning/reconfiguring SVLANs? If not, what alternative do you propose?

All four respondents agreed with the principles. One commented that they would need a better understanding of how the MSIL/SVLAN products and their associated terms & conditions will operate in practice. Another said the approach was fair but fairly complex and reviews between account managers would need to be formalised. Another noted that the proposal would require the ability to link the old and new SVLANs within the billing system.

Fair Use

One respondent was not comfortable with the Fair Use proposal in the document section 4.10 They anticipated receiving a rebate in line with the product they were paying for.

5 Glossary

Abbreviation	Expansions
21CN	Twenty First Century Network
BGW	Border Gateway
C21	Consult 21
CP	Communication Provider
CS	Call Server
FMSAN	Fibre Multi-Service Access Node
IP	Internet Protocol
MSAN	Multi-Service Access Node
MSAP	Multi-Service Access Port (
MSIL	Multi Service Interconnect Link
NGN	Next Generation Network (IP Technology)
NGN CC (PE)	Next Generation Network Call Conveyance (PSTN Emulation)
NGS	BT Next Generation Switch (TDM Technology)
NICC	Network Interoperability Consultative Committee
POC	Point of Connection
POH	Point of Handover
PoSI	Point of Service Interconnect
SCTP	Stream Control Transmission Protocol

Abbreviation	Expansions
SFW	Signalling Firewall
SVLAN	Service Virtual Local Area Network
TDM	Time Division Multiplexing

END