



**PUBLIC INTEREST ADVOCACY CENTRE**  
**LE CENTRE POUR LA DEFENSE DE L'INTERET PUBLIC**

**ONE Nicholas Street, Suite 1204, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1N 7B7**

Tel: (613) 562-4002. Fax: (613) 562-0007. e-mail: [piac@piac.ca](mailto:piac@piac.ca). <http://www.piac.ca>

Michael Janigan  
Counsel for VECC  
613 562-4002 ext. 26

January 5, 2012

**VIA E-MAIL**

Ms. Kirsten Walli  
Board Secretary  
Ontario Energy Board  
P.O. Box 2319  
2300 Yonge St.  
Toronto, ON  
M4P 1E4

Dear Ms. Walli:

**Re: Board File No.: EB-2011-0120**  
**Canadian Distributed Antenna Systems Coalition (CANDAS)**  
**Interrogatories of the Vulnerable Energy Consumers Coalition (VECC)**  
**Re: Reply Evidence of Patricia D. Kravtin**

We have enclosed the Interrogatories of VECC with respect to the Reply Evidence of Patricia D. Kravtin. We have also directed a copy of the same to the applicant, their counsel and all registered intervenors via-mail.

Yours truly,

  
Michael Janigan  
Counsel for VECC

**Canadian Distributed Antenna Systems Coalition (CANDAS)**

**EB-2011-0120**

**January 5, 2012**

**INTERROGATORIES**

**of the**

**VULNERABLE ENERGY CONSUMERS COALITION (VECC)**

**for the Reply Evidence**

**of**

**Patricia D. Kravtin**

**Interrogatory #1**

In your evidence, you submit that utility poles are a natural monopoly that makes it “necessary, efficient, and practical for their shared occupancy”(page 2). In your view, is attachment space on utility poles thus an essential facility in that it is alleged that the use of the space is a bottleneck requirement, controlled by a monopoly that cannot be economically duplicated by wireless providers? If this is not an issue that concerns essential facilities, why should access be mandated under this heading of relief?

**Interrogatory #2**

- (a) What is your precise definition of the product market? Are there any substitutes available to CANDAS as per your definition?
- (b) What is your understanding of the definition of product market proposed by Mr. Starkey and Dr. Yatchew?
- (c) Please explain your statements concerning the impact of convergence and dynamism in the telecommunications market on the definition of product market (page10). Intuitively, these concepts would seem to enlarge the product market to include all wireless attachments.

**Interrogatory #3**

- (a) Please confirm that CANDAS' advocacy of the public interest standard (pp 11-15) is a separate ground for the relief requested in this proceeding.

(b) Please provide the precedential support for the statement in paragraph 26 that :

“Where government regulation of industry occurs, as in the case of public utilities, the overarching decision-making criteria to be applied by the regulator is a public interest standard.”

(c) The standard set out in paragraph 26 appears to imply a measurement of the interests of the utility and access seeking stakeholders, as well as the greater public good including the interests of ratepayers. Is this a quantitative measurement of each that must be performed, or does the enhancement of the public good always prevail? How do reductions to the revenue requirement brought about by possible premiums associated with market based attachment rates fit in this analysis?

#### **Interrogatory #4**

Does the threat of abuse of dominant position, advanced on page 15 of your evidence, fall under the “natural monopoly” or the “public interest standard” grounds for relief, or constitute a third ground to substantiate the same?

**\*\*\*End of Document\*\*\***