

**C&W Cayman Islands Response to ICTA/Telcordia Round 2 LRIC Interrogatories [Part 3
June 1 submission]**

As noted in our cover letter, delays in getting information from Telcordia and our vendor have meant that some of our responses, to this Part 3 submission will have to be included in our Part 4 submission.

In addition to these responses we also include more of the service costings based on the example, in our response to interrogatories 2.1.6d. These we file as Appendix VIII.

3.4.2 In the first round of interrogatories, C&W was asked to provide explanation and justification for the assumption on the "Technical Assumptions" worksheet of cell C19: Max Lines per MG. In response, C&W noted that "this represents the maximum number of customer lines typically carried by an MG/MSAN and indeed as is currently installed in C&W's network." Please clarify if this is the maximum number of lines possible per MG/MSAN or the maximum currently install on an MBMSAN in C&W's network. If it is the maximum possible, please provide vendor documentation for this limitation.

C&W Response

After further research, it is clear that the technical assumption of 2048 lines currently in cell C19 is based on a previous remote-line unit capacity constraint. The constraint on the MG/MSAN, as we indicated in our response to interrogatory 2.4.3bii is actually around ###. Publicly available documents, ^{for} ^{example--} <http://www.nortel.com/products/01/succession/cs/mg9k/collateral/89034.02-050803.pdf>—indicate that under a "pure POTS" scenario the maximum is 16 shelves carrying 7,936 lines. However, ### specifies a maximum of 12 shelves and ### lines. Also, please note again, the number of MGs is not simply a function of numbers of subscribers, but, more importantly, traffic carried.

Since constructing this model, C&W has found it possible to consolidate a number of lines that were on disparate remote line units as well as sites. The consolidation of lines was discussed in our response to interrogatory 2.4.3bii. Changing the technical assumption to ### might tend to reduce the overall number of MGs at any one site.

Where cost effective, we have also been able to eliminate sites. Seven such sites listed in the model have been or will be eliminated. However, as also mentioned in 2.4.3ii, we have had to add sites as well. With respect to site changes, the FLLRIC modeling is constrained by the scorched node principle. Adding and subtracting, the location of nodes would violate that principle as well as require a review of the transmission network assumptions.

4.2.1 In section 4.2 of C&W's responses to ICTA/Telcordia interrogatories, C&W states that the "site costs" listed in the Mobile Network Model consist of the equipment, rigging and

installation cost of a cellular tower plus any ancillary equipment such as cable trays, cabinets, platforms, etc. Please show the calculation of these costs in detail.

C&W Response

We have reviewed recent cost components for the site costs and can provide the following breakdowns:

Site Costs

	Omni (in CI\$)	Sectorised (in CI\$)
Monopole/Tower	###	###
Landing Cost	###	###
Erecting Pole-capitalised labour	###	###
Grounding of tower	###	###
Power facilities (generator, inc installation, electricals)	###	###
Civils (foundation, enclosures, cable trays) w/o building	###	###
Civils with building	###	###
Capitalised Architect fees, Gov't planning approval, constr. Mang.; legal fees	###	###
Cables	###	###
Total Cost	###	###