

This is an unofficial translation. The legally binding text is the original Czech version.



Czech Telecommunication Office
headquartered at Sokolovská 219, Prague 9
P.O. Box 02, 225 02 Prague 025

[Stamp and Signature:



THIS DECISION BECAME FINAL
on [handwritten] 13. 6. 2006
Czech Telecommunication Office
Economic Regulation Department
Date [signature: Smrkovská]

Prague, 23 May 2006
Ref.: 15 858/2006-611/IV.vyř.

In proceedings initiated *ex officio* with GTS Novera Next s.r.o. (to 31 March registered as trade name NEXTRA Czech Republic s.r.o), with registered office at V Celnici 10, 117 21 Prague 1, Reg. Number 25683691 on 23 March 2006 in the matter of the imposition of obligation related to price regulation on an undertaking with significant market power, the Council of the Czech Telecommunication Office as the appropriate state administration body under Section 107(8)(b)(5) of Act No. 127/2005 on Electronic Communications and on Amendment to Certain Related Acts (Electronic Communications Act), as amended (the "Act") and under Section 10 of Act No. 500/2004, Rules of Administrative Procedure, as amended, hereby issues this

Decision on Price No. CEN/9/05.2006-57:

I.

(1) Under Section 51(3)(g) and Section 59 of the Act and in accordance with the results of the analysis of the relevant market of "Call Termination in Individual Public Telephone Networks at a Fixed Location", issued in Czech Telecommunication Office's Measure of General Nature No. A/9/04.2006-19, the obligation to negotiate charges for interconnection in its public telephone network for the call termination service (hereinafter referred to as "termination prices") is hereby imposed on GTS Novera Next s.r.o. (to 31 March registered as trade name NEXTRA Czech Republic s.r.o), with registered office at V Celnici 10, 117 21 Prague 1, Reg. Number 25683691 (hereinafter referred to as the "Party to the Proceedings") so as to avoid exceeding the maximum prices specified below:

Termination with interconnection at:	Traffic time	Maximum termination price [CZK/min] excl. of VAT
a) local switch (HOST)	peak	0.30
	off peak	0.15
b) last transit switch	peak	0.38
	off peak	0.19

- a) termination with interconnection at local switch means a case where the end point in the interconnected publicly accessible telephone network to which the call is routed is located in the access area of the gateway switch in which the networks are interconnected, the gateway switch being the local switch;
- b) termination with interconnection at the last transit switch means a case where the end point in the interconnected publicly accessible telephone network to which the call is routed is located in the access area of the gateway switch in which the networks are interconnected, the gateway switch being the transit switch.

The peak time is the period from 7:00 to 19:00 hours on workdays. The off peak time is the period from 19:00 to 7:00 hours of the following day on workdays and the entire 24 hour period on Saturdays, Sundays and on holidays recognised by the Government.

This is an unofficial translation. The legally binding text is the original Czech version.

(2) Regulation based on maximum prices as referred to in Paragraph 1 above applies to calls to the end point of the public telephone network of the Party to the Proceedings, to which the terminal equipment of the called subscriber is connected, which calls are incoming calls from another public electronic communication network.

II.

(1) For newly concluded agreements, the Party to the Proceedings shall negotiate prices in compliance with the price regulation based on Part I of the Decision award and shall start doing so from the effective date of the Decision.

(2) In the remaining cases the Party to the Proceedings shall negotiate prices in compliance with the price regulation based on Part I of the Decision award and shall start doing so within two months of the effective date of the Decision.

Substantiation

In accordance with Section 51(1) and (2) of the Act, the Czech Telecommunication Office (“the Office”) carried out an analysis of Market No. 9 - Call Termination in Individual Public Telephone Networks at a Fixed Location (“Market No. 9”), which it made public on the official board on 16 March 2006 under Ref. No. 1 514/2006-609/III vyř. and, upon notification to the European Commission, it issued it as Measure of General Nature No. A/9/04.2006-19 of 19 April 2006. The results of the analysis showed that Market No. 9 is not an effectively competitive market because there are undertakings with significant market power doing business on it. The analysis also showed that prices disproportionately high and unfair to the end users are used on the market in cases where no price regulation is applied. It follows from the nature of Market No. 9 that each service provider is an undertaking with significant market power because each of them has a 100% share of its network. For this reason, the administrative body proposed to apply price-control obligations, which it intends to impose in accordance with Section 51(3) of the Act.

By the administrative body’s Decision No. SMP/9/05.2006-29 of 9 May 2006, which was issued under Ref. No. 11 488/2006-609/ III. vyř. and became final on 17 May 2006, the Party to the Proceedings was determined to be an undertaking with significant market power.

On Part I of the Decision award

On the basis of the result of the analysis, Measure of General Nature No. A/9/04.2006-19 was issued in accordance with Section 51(2) of the Act, proposing to impose the obligation to enable access to specific network elements and associated facilities under Section 84 of the Act, obligation to ensure non-discrimination under Section 81 of the Act, obligation to maintain separate records of costs and revenues under Section 86 of the Act, and price regulation-related obligations under Sections 56 and 57 of the Act.

With respect to this proposal, the administrative body considered the proposed obligations. The obligation specified in Part I of the Decision award was imposed on the Party to the Proceedings through this Decision with reference to what is stated below. The imposition of obligations under Sections 51(3)(a) to (f) is the subject of separate administrative proceedings.

The applied method of price regulation using maximum prices for termination based on Section 58(1)(a) of the Act was chosen, because determination of a price using the LRIC model applied to the termination services requires large amounts of data to fill the model. Their specific levels must be verified in detail by the administrative body in order to ensure that they are used correctly. In such a situation the determination of the maximum price appears to be the only possible solution.

To determine the maximum prices for interconnection for the call termination service, the Office used the costing model (LRIC), based on the principle of long-term incremental costs. The LRIC method was chosen in order to identify an efficient operator’s costs.

This is an unofficial translation. The legally binding text is the original Czech version.

To fill the LRIC model with data, when determining the maximum price on the market, the Office used as a basis the topology of the network of ČESKÝ TELECOM, a.s. as the largest provider (largest in terms of the public telephone network subscriber lines). The application of this method to other operators relied on the generally accepted principle by which the remaining operators' networks were built in a competitive environment and their efficiency is therefore at least as high as that of ČESKÝ TELECOM, a.s.

The determined prices reflect the effectively and efficiently spent funds, the specific risks and the recovery of investments within a reasonable period of time in compliance with Section 57(3) of the Act. The return on capital investment before tax (weighted average cost of capital WACC) was set at 11.18%, which is the amount set out in Regulation [Measure] of General Nature No. OOP/4/03.2006-3. The determination of the WACC is in keeping with general practice in the electronic communications sector. Its value was determined as the arithmetic mean for the values used in the studies by Raiffeisenbank a.s. and CENTRAL EUROPEAN CAPITAL CZ, s.r.o. Both these studies were prepared for the Czech Telecommunication Office in 2005. The mean also comprised the WACC values determined for ČESKÝ TELECOM, a.s. by another four independent qualified entities, including Deutsche Bank, Patria Finance a.s., WOOD & Company Financial Services, a.s., and Morgan Stanley.

Part I of the awarded Decision defines the maximum termination prices. The prices are differentiated by the location of the access gateway switch and the end point of the interconnected publicly accessible telephone network and also by the peak and off peak time. For the purposes of this Decision on Price, there are definitions of the termination prices in the first paragraph of the Decision award. In the second paragraph of that part of the Decision the administrative body defined the calls regulated by the price cap (the maximum prices determined in the first paragraph).

In the event that interconnection for termination takes place in a switch other than the local or last transit switch, the prices should be negotiated so that the resultant price is a sum of the agreed termination price (respecting the proposed Decision on Price) and the price for the corresponding transit.

On Part II of the Decision award

For the contracts to be newly concluded, the Party to the Proceedings must negotiate prices in compliance with price regulation from the effective date of the Decision. In the remaining cases the Party to the Proceedings must negotiate the prices in compliance with price regulation within two months after the effective date of the Decision.

* * *

With respect to the above, administrative procedure under Section 51(3)(g) of the Act was instituted against the Party to the Proceedings on 23 March 2006 in respect of the imposition of obligations related to price regulation on undertakings with significant market power. As set out in Section 51 of the Act, the undertaking whose rights and obligations are to be decided on should be the Party to the Proceedings. Notification of the commencement of the administrative proceedings was sent to the Party to the Proceedings and it contained an invitation for the Party to the Proceedings to express its view and propose relevant evidence. For this, the Party to the Proceedings was granted a period of 7 days after the date of delivery of the notification.

On 28 March 2006, the Party of Proceedings expressed its opinion to the commencement of the administrative proceedings.

The Party to the Proceedings did not submit any comments to these administrative proceedings.

With respect to the above, the administrative body drew up a draft decision in that matter.

* * *

This is an unofficial translation. The legally binding text is the original Czech version.

Under Section 130 of the Act and in accordance with the Czech Telecommunication Office's rules for maintaining consultations, the administrative body published on 7 April 2006 its draft Decision at the discussion site, including invitation to submit comments at the site.

The administrative body received comments from two entities. Their comments were primarily related to methodological issues, including in particular the method of determination of the maximum termination prices and prices for call transmissions between two transit switches in the case of the call termination service. The administrative body adjusted the proposed decision to reflect the outcomes of the public consultation.

All the comments and the manner they were addressed were made public in the comment settlement table at the discussion site on 3 May 2006.

The Party to the Proceedings was given an opportunity to express its view in accordance with Section 122(5) of the Act. The Party to the Proceedings familiarised with the file on 3 May 2006 and did not submit any comments.

* * *

The administrative body decided as indicated in the Decision award. It did so, with respect to the above, in compliance with the key principles based on the legal framework of the European Communities, seeking to substitute for the absent action of economic competition, to create conditions for appropriate functioning of economic competition and to protect users and other market players until a fully competitive environment is created.

Advice on Remedies:

No remedy is allowed against this Decision.

[round seal]
Czech Telecommunication
Office
-1-

[signature] Pavel Dvořák
PhDr. Pavel Dvořák, CSc.
Chairman of the Council of the
Czech Telecommunication Office