

Transport services – assessment methodology

This document contains the blank structure of the transport link-level output analysis. The analysis drew on provider-supplied node, link, network, GIS, service, co-location and interconnection information, together with our assessment of whether identified alternatives were practically usable.

For ease of reference, the output table is presented below in segments. In the underlying working database, these fields formed part of a single table. Some fields were populated only where relevant and supported by the available information.

The table includes both provider-supplied information and Commission analysis.

Broadly:

- **Provider-supplied information** included the regulated provider, nodes and links, dependencies, network and GIS information, existing infrastructure and routes, and information relevant to interconnection.
- **Commission-derived information** included potential or logical paths, spatial and distance analysis, assessments of connectability and practical usability, validation issues, and link-level outcomes.

1. Link under review – Provider supplied and Commission-derived

Candidate Area	Regulated Provider	Node A	Node B	A–B distance	Dependency
POI area used for assessment and aggregation	Provider whose regulated link was assessed	Start node	End node	Endpoint distance used, where relevant, for path comparison	Provider-supplied dependency on another provider or service, used to inform substitutability and validation

2. Competitor evidence – Provider-supplied and Commission-derived

Competitor	Competitor evidence type	Existing competing infra?	Existing route/link name	Potential/logical service path	Path evidence basis
Alternative provider	Existing infrastructure or potential path	Whether relevant existing infrastructure or a service was identified	Existing route or link, where identified	Constructed or logical path, for example Node A–Node C–Node B	Evidence supporting the identified path

3. Handoff/usability – Provider-supplied evidence and Commission assessment

Incumbent interconnectable?	Incumbent handoff point	Handoff basis	Competitor receiving point	Competitor connectability basis
Whether traffic could leave the regulated provider's network	Relevant handoff location (node)	Evidence supporting handoff or interconnection	Location at which the alternative provider could receive traffic (node)	Evidence of existing or credibly formable interconnection

4. Physical path evidence – Commission-derived

Relevant distance to competitor infra	Distance basis	Tail/extension feasible?	Alt path distance	Physical/path fit
Distance relevant to the possible connection	Evidence for the distance	Was an appropriate length tail/extension possible to form/support this link (where needed)	Estimated alternative-path length	Supporting qualitative assessment of the path

5. Onward path – Provider-supplied evidence and Commission assessment

Onward handover at/status	Handover point type	RSP handover location
Whether traffic could be carried to a usable handover point	Type of handover location or arrangement	Location at which the access seeker could receive traffic (node)

6. Outcome – Commission assessment

Alternative evidence tier	Threshold-eligible competitor?	Validation issue	Final link outcome	Single outcome
Assessment as to whether there is evidence for this alternative being credible or not	Working indication of whether the alternative could qualify or required validation	Quantification of any outstanding issue, such as handoff, connection feasibility, availability, distance, access-seeker usability, or reliance on a service leased from the regulated provider	Working outcome recorded against the relevant alternative provider or path	Consolidated outcome for the regulated link

A regulated link could have multiple records where more than one provider or path was considered. Multiple paths from the same provider did not result in that provider being counted more than once. The records were consolidated into a single outcome of **LFC only**, **LFC + ≥ 1** or **LFC + ≥ 2** , and aggregated by regulated provider and assessed area.

Distance, proximity and physical-path information supported the assessment but was not determinative. The principal question was whether the evidence established practical handoff, competitor connectability, any necessary connection or extension, onward carriage, and delivery to a handover point the access seeker could use. Where a proposed path relied on a service leased from the regulated provider, we considered whether it provided an independent alternative for the Transport function under review.

Hypothetical examples

The examples below are illustrative only and do not represent any provider information or actual assessment record.

Example	Evidence considered	Illustrative conclusion
No usable alternative	No relevant alternative infrastructure was identified, or infrastructure was nearby but no practical connection or handoff was established.	Provider not counted; LFC only if no other usable alternative was identified.
Usable alternative	Traffic could leave Node A, be received and carried by another provider, and reach a handover point the access seeker could use.	Provider counted; link met LFC + ≥ 1 .
Two usable alternatives	Two distinct providers each had a usable end-to-end path.	Both counted; link met LFC + ≥ 2 .