

CRTC New Media Broadcasting eConsultation Report
Nanos Research
July 2008

CATALOGUE NO. BC92-64/2008E-PDF
ISBN # 978-1-100-11080-6

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	1
1.0 INTRODUCTION	2
2.0 ALL VISITORS SITE ACTIVITY REPORT	3
2.1 PARTICIPATION OVERVIEW BY TOPIC.....	4
2.2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
3.0 DEFINING NEW MEDIA BROADCASTING	8
3.1 ACTIVITY SUMMARY	9
3.2 CONSULTATION MODERATOR	10
3.3 DIALOGUE OVERVIEW	11
3.4 DETAILED METRICS.....	12
3.5 HIGHEST RATED COMMENTS	13
3.6 MOST RATED COMMENT	15
3.7 MOST READ COMMENTS	17
4.0 SUPPORT FOR THE CREATION AND PROMOTION OF CANADIAN NEW MEDIA BROADCASTING	19
4.1 ACTIVITY SUMMARY	20
4.2 CONSULTATION MODERATOR	21
4.3 DIALOGUE OVERVIEW	22
4.4 DETAILED METRICS.....	24
4.5 HIGHEST RATED COMMENTS	25
4.6 MOST RATED COMMENT	27
4.7 MOST READ COMMENTS	28
5.0 BARRIERS TO ACCESSING CANADIAN NEW MEDIA BROADCASTING	29
5.1 ACTIVITY SUMMARY	30
5.2 CONSULTATION MODERATOR	31
5.3 DIALOGUE OVERVIEW	32
5.4 DETAILED METRICS.....	34
5.5 HIGHEST RATED COMMENTS	35
5.6 MOST RATED COMMENT	37
5.7 MOST READ COMMENTS	38
6.0 OTHER ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION	40
6.1 ACTIVITY SUMMARY	41
6.2 CONSULTATION MODERATOR	42
6.3 DIALOGUE OVERVIEW	43
6.4 DETAILED METRICS.....	45
6.5 HIGHEST RATED COMMENTS	46
6.6 MOST RATED COMMENT	47
6.7 MOST READ COMMENTS	49



1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) engaged Nanos Research to conduct an online consultation in support of the CRTC policy consultation on new media. The purpose of the online consultation was to provide the opportunity for the new media constituency to participate in a manner in which they feel at ease – online – and to extend the participation process. The online consultation was held between May 15th and June 15th, 2008. The objective of the online consultation was to help the CRTC listen to the opinions and perceptions of the public regarding the CRTC and Canadian new media broadcasting. The consultation was operated in English and French. This report includes the analysis of both English and French site activity.

The online consultation consisted of four topic sections: Defining New Media Broadcasting; Support for the Creation and Promotion of Canadian New Media; Barriers to Accessing Canadian New Media Broadcasting; and Other Issues for Consideration. Participants were able to post comments on each topic, as well as read and rate other participants' comments. During the period of May 15th to June 15th there were 2,642 unique site visitors to the consultation site. One-hundred and thirty-nine registered participants posted a total of 278 comments in the online consultation. To post a comment, participants had to register in the online consultation. Participants did not have to register to read and rate comments.

Included in this report is a participation overview, a biography of the consultation moderator, dialogue overviews, detailed metrics by topic, and a breakdown of the highest rated, most rated and most read comments by topic. All of the participants' comments are in italics. This research project was completed in accordance with the standards of the Marketing Research and Intelligence Association of which Nanos Research is a Gold Seal Corporate member.



2.0 ALL VISITORS SITE ACTIVITY REPORT

The following tables and map provide a breakdown of the site activity by all visitors to the CRTC New Media Broadcasting eConsultation.

CRTC New Media Broadcasting eConsultation Activity May 15 th to June 15 th , 2008	
Metric	Provided by
Time period	32 days
Unique visitors	2,642
Average visitors per day	83
Site visits	3,541
Average site visits per day	111
Average length of site visit	4 minutes
Average page views per visit	3.57
Participant posted comments	278
Registers users	284
Comments read	5,688
Page views	13,123

Participants came from 223 Canadian cities/towns.

Top Cities (over 100 visits)	Visits
Ottawa	855
Weston (Toronto)	305
East York (Toronto)	246
Montreal	210
Vancouver	194
Calgary	146



2.1 Participation Overview by topic

One way to determine the importance of issues related to the CRTC eConsultation is to gauge the number of comments read by topic and the number of comments made within each topic discussion.

As Table 1.0 identifies, the "What other Issues should be considered" was significantly the most popular topic (42% of all reads). Table 1.1 highlights the breakdown of comments made by topic. The top ranked topic by comments made was "Other Issues for Consideration" (37% of all comments), followed by "Support for the Creation and Promotion of Canadian New Media Broadcasting" (30% of all comments).

Table 1.0 - Topics by the Number of Comment Readings

Topic	Frequency	Percent
Defining New Media Broadcasting	376	6%
Support for the Creation and Promotion of Canadian New Media Broadcasting	1,588	27%
Barriers to Accessing Canadian New Media Broadcasting	1,466	25%
Other Issues for Consideration	2,478	42%
Total	5,908	100%

Table 1.1- Topics by the Number of Comments Posted

Topic	Frequency	Percent
Defining New Media Broadcasting	21	8%
Support for the Creation and Promotion of Canadian New Media Broadcasting	83	30%
Barriers to Accessing Canadian New Media Broadcasting	70	25%
Other Issues for Consideration	104	37%
Total	278	100%



Defining New Media Broadcasting

Summary of Discussion

When asked to define the meaning of new media broadcasting, 13 out of 18 participants for this topic mentioned the importance of net neutrality when giving their definition. Six participants expressed concern over Internet Service Providers and creators of traditional media trying to control traffic on the Internet in order to make a profit. Five participants said that a fund should be created to promote the promotion of new media in Canada. The three most common articulated elements for defining new media were that it is was a grassroots media (4 out of 18), that it provided more quantity to smaller audiences (3 out of 18) and that a sense of community was an important element of new media (3 out of 18).

Highest Rated Comment

Rated by 2 participants, 4/4

"This question is, potentially, a loaded and I think even dangerous question. Because "broadcasting" is a REGULATED activity in Canada: you have to be licenced to "broadcast." And the traditional television broadcasters (like CTV and Global, for example), have reason to fear that their exclusive rights to such a licence is threatened by our free and unrestricted access to the Internet. That is, a filmmaker or writer can publish videos, films, stories, news, for the world to see without having the same licence as a traditional broadcaster. And I fear that there is a strong lobby building that will prevent entrepreneurial start-ups over the Internet and even prevent free speech. Because if a "content distributor" on the Internet is deemed to be a "broadcaster," they can be shut down.

So my answer to the question at hand, "What is new media broadcasting?" can only be, "There is no definition of media broadcasting. It's a territory marked by an invisible line that can only be drawn when certain powers are seeking to shut it down. Everything is new media broadcasting, and nothing is. Put most simply, it's an old-world terminology that doesn't have an application in the new media world.

If there is concern that Canadians aren't seeing enough "Canadian Internet media," then financial incentives to promote such media and putting money directly into content-creators' hands might make real sense. In fact, "cutting out the middle-men" between content and distribution could provide tens of millions more dollars that can directly into the production of better documentary, news, and narrative fiction on film.

The Internet is currently a "free economy," and the best content has a fighting chance to find audiences everywhere, not just in Canada. That content might be generated from an Indian Reserve in B.C., or a small farmtown in Alberta, or university campus in Toronto, or the basement of a starving artist in Hull. It might still take a lot of money to make the best content, but the fact is great content can come from anywhere, and we should not allow for regulation that might prevent stories from getting out to Canadians. Defining who is a "broadcaster" might end up doing more damage to the life-blood of Canadian stories by controlling who can distribute those stories online."

Support for the Creation and Promotion of Canadian New Media Broadcasting

Summary of Discussion

Thirty-five out of 50 participants for this topic said that they did not believe that the creation and promotion of Canadian new media broadcasting should be supported, while 11 out of 50 participants believed that it should be supported. Twenty-one participants felt that the CRTC had no role regulating Canadian content, while 18 out of 50 participants believed that good quality Canadian content would survive without support. Seventeen out of 50 participants said that there should be no new regulation or that there was already too much media regulation in Canada, while 16 out of 50 participants said that regulation of new media limited free speech. Other commonly



articulated comments were that the Internet needed to be more of a free market with more competition (15 out of 50), that net neutrality must be maintained (14 out of 50), that Internet Service Providers should not be allowed to throttle bandwidth (14 out of 50) and that government funding should not be used to support Canadian new media (14 out of 50).

Barriers to Accessing Canadian New Media Broadcasting

Summary of Discussion

The vast majority of participants (48 out of 51 for this topic) believed that there were barriers to accessing Canadian new media broadcasts. Thirty-two out of 51 participants believed that there was too much control and censorship of new media in Canada by creators of traditional media and Internet Service Providers. Twenty-six participants believed that bandwidth throttling and traffic shaping creates barriers, while 25 participants believed that net neutrality must be maintained. Sixteen participants felt that large corporations created barriers to accessing new media so they can make a profit. Twelve participants believed that creating a freer market and more competition would eliminate barriers to access, while 10 participants believe that government involvement and regulation created barriers.

Highest Rated Comment

Rated by 12 participants, 4/4

"No one should have the right to be able to dictate which internet traffic is "important" and which internet traffic is not "important". Traffic that may not seem to be so important to one person or entity could be extremely important to someone else. The internet must be maintained as a level playing field for all.

The CRTC must preserve net neutrality for the Canadian people by preventing the manipulation of our internet access by Internet service providers."

Other Issues for Consideration

Summary of Discussion

When asked what other issues should be considered, nearly half of the participants said that net neutrality was important and needed to be maintained. Twenty-four out of 67 participants said that Internet Service Providers should not be able to throttle bandwidth. Eighteen participants said that Internet Service Providers and creators of traditional media are trying to control the internet in order to make a profit. Sixteen participants said that the CRTC should force Internet Service Providers to adhere to their service promises. Twelve participants said that the CRTC should not be involved in the regulation of the internet, while another 12 participants said that the lack of competition among Internet Service Providers hurts all Canadian consumers.

Highest Rated Comment

Rated by 14 participants, 4/4

"The CRTC needs to step in, and prevent ISPs from continuing their practice of traffic shaping.

The internet needs to preserve it's neutrality - allowing ISPs to decide what traffic is important, or allowing them to decide what is right and wrong for their subscribers, should not be allowed!

They cannot do it correctly either - the common example of a mis-managed piece of technology being BitTorrent. They are throttling it because they claim that people using it are doing so for illegal purposes - but as the CBC proved, as well as many Linux distributions have done and continue to do so, this is simply not the case. The



people it is hurting are the people who are using this service legally - those people using it illegally can, and do, find ways around these limits.

In the end, _private companies_ should not be the ones to make the decision - that is why the CRTC exists! A body responsible for "regulating Canada's broadcasting and telecommunications systems" and making certain that the rights of Canadians using those systems are preserved.

Net neutrality is defined as a network that is "free of restrictions on the kinds of equipment that may be attached, on the modes of communication allowed, which does not restrict content, sites or platforms, and where communication is not unreasonably degraded by other communication streams." This is one of the most important things we can have.

The internet is a wonderful tool - but only if it is allowed to remain open, and free of any restrictions imposed by a company, or government, acting in between the web and the user trying to use it."



3.0 DEFINING NEW MEDIA BROADCASTING

This online consultation was conducted between May 15th and June 15th 2008. The following information was presented to participants.

Defining “new media broadcasting” is important. On the Internet, a wide variety of new media broadcasting content providers have emerged, along with new ways to distribute content from traditional and new providers.

The Commission’s main focus is on professionally-produced content similar to what is available on television and radio. What issues and relevant questions will help the Commission in defining the scope of new media broadcasting?

For example:

- How are the various kinds of content found on the Internet similar to, or different from, traditional radio and television content?
- What specific types of new media broadcasting services and content require particular attention?

What do you think?

Question:

What is New Media Broadcasting?

This section will provide an overview of the Defining New Media Broadcasting consultation and includes the following:

- Activity Summary
- Consultation Moderator Biography
- Dialogue Overview
- Detailed Metrics
- Highest Rated Comments
- Most Rated Comments
- Most Read Comments



3.1 Activity Summary

Site Activity Breakdown Defining New Media Broadcasting

Site Activity	Activity	Percentage of Total Consultation
Number of Comments Posted	21	8%
Number of Comment Readings	376	6%
Number of Comment Ratings	12	3%
Number of Commenters	18	13%



3.2 Consultation Moderator

Nik Nanos

Nik Nanos was the independent moderator for this topic.

Nik is one of Canada's leading research and consultation experts. He has facilitated a broad range of very complex and sensitive consultation initiatives ranging from legislative consultations through to national roundtables.

He became the consultation moderator on May 15th, 2008.



3.3 Dialogue Overview

Summary of Discussion

When asked to define the meaning of new media broadcasting, 13 out of 18 participants in this topic mentioned the importance of net neutrality when giving their definition. Six participants expressed concern over Internet Service Providers and creators of traditional media trying to control traffic on the Internet in order to make a profit. Five participants said that a fund should be created to support the promotion of new media in Canada. The three most commonly articulated elements for defining new media were that it is was a grassroots media (4 out of 18), that it provided more quantity to smaller audiences (3 out of 18) and that a sense of community was an important element of new media (3 out of 18).

Dialogue Overview Tables

18 Participants posted comments on this topic.

Question:

What is New Media Broadcasting?

Comments Posted on this Topic*		
Comment	Number of Individuals Who Expressed Comment	Percentage of Individuals Who Expressed Comment
Net neutrality must be maintained	13	72%
ISPs and creators of traditional media are trying to control the internet to make a profit	6	33%
A fund should be created to promote the creation of new media	5	28%
New media broadcasting is a grassroots media	4	22%
New media broadcasting provides higher quantity to smaller audiences	3	17%
Sense of community is an important element of new media broadcasting	3	17%
CRTC must define differences between new media types (professional produced vs. independently produced)	2	11%
The internet allows for the involvement of more people in production of media	2	11%
New media cannot be considered a broadcast in the traditional sense	2	11%
Regulation of new media limits free speech	2	11%

* Only comments that were posted more than once by more than one participant are included in the dialogue overview tables.



3.4 Detailed Metrics

To follow are the metrics for Defining New Media Broadcasting portion of the online consultation.

Explanation of Comment Ratings

Participants were able to rate whether they agreed, somewhat agreed, somewhat disagreed or disagreed with a statement. Each agreement/disagreement rating was given a numeric value:

- agree = 4;
- somewhat agree = 3;
- somewhat disagree = 2; and,
- disagree = 1.

Participants could also give unsure ratings. The higher the comment rating, the higher the level of agreement with that comment. The closer a comment is to 1 the greater the level of disagreement with that comment.

Number of Comment Ratings

The 21 comments in this topic received a total of 12 ratings. The mean number of ratings per comment in this topic was 0.6. The most ratings received by any comment was 5 ratings – one of the comments in this topic received five ratings.

Number of Comment Readings

The 21 comments in this topic were read 376 times. The mean number of readings per comment was 17.9, while the most read comment had 78 readings.

Most Active Participants

Eighteen participants posted comments in this topic, three of whom posted more than one comment. Russell McOrmond, fmenard123, and Lorne were the most active participants on this topic. Fmenard123 received 38 comment readings and 1 comment rating. Russell McOrmond received 17 comment readings and 0 comment ratings. Lorne received 6 comment readings and 0 comment ratings.



3.5 Highest Rated Comments

To follow are the highest rated comments for Defining New Media Broadcasting consultation.

Rated by 2 participants, 4/4

"This question is, potentially, a loaded and I think even dangerous question. Because "broadcasting" is a REGULATED activity in Canada: you have to be licenced to "broadcast." And the traditional television broadcasters (like CTV and Global, for example), have reason to fear that their exclusive rights to such a licence is threatened by our free and unrestricted access to the Internet. That is, a filmmaker or writer can publish videos, films, stories, news, for the world to see without having the same licence as a traditional broadcaster. And I fear that there is a strong lobby building that will prevent entrepreneurial start-ups over the Internet and even prevent free speech. Because if a "content distributor" on the Internet is deemed to be a "broadcaster," they can be shut down.

So my answer to the question at hand, "What is new media broadcasting?" can only be, "There is no definition of media broadcasting. It's a territory marked by an invisible line that can only be drawn when certain powers are seeking to shut it down. Everything is new media broadcasting, and nothing is. Put most simply, it's an old-world terminology that doesn't have an application in the new media world.

If there is concern that Canadians aren't seeing enough "Canadian Internet media," then financial incentives to promote such media and putting money directly into content-creators' hands might make real sense. In fact, "cutting out the middle-men" between content and distribution could provide tens of millions more dollars that can directly into the production of better documentary, news, and narrative fiction on film.

The Internet is currently a "free economy," and the best content has a fighting chance to find audiences everywhere, not just in Canada. That content might be generated from an Indian Reserve in B.C., or a small farmtown in Alberta, or university campus in Toronto, or the basement of a starving artist in Hull. It might still take a lot of money to make the best content, but the fact is great content can come from anywhere, and we should not allow for regulation that might prevent stories from getting out to Canadians. Defining who is a "broadcaster" might end up doing more damage to the life-blood of Canadian stories by controlling who can distribute those stories online."

Rated by 5 participants, 3.8/4

"In traditional radio and television production, one often distinguishes between levels of content according to how far it is broadcast (local or national or international). This can be done because the technology has geographical limitations that create such a division, so there are natural divisions between creators of content for each level. A large part of present CRTC policy is to prevent the increased resources of global broadcasting interests from smothering the creation of local and national content. This has worked very well in Canada, to the point that Canada is a global leader in production of such content.

The Internet does not have such a natural division which means all content is globally available, whether created by a individual or a multi-national corporation. This has been perceived as a real problem for existing content creators. The old economics of broadcasting, where revenue was in the natural limitation of competition by the cost of entry into the market, no longer seem to apply. Broadcasting is now limited by the capacity of the channel, rather than the capacity of the content producer.

Early in the pread of the Internet, there was an assumption that it would generally be mainly a broadcast medium, with a few large servers and developers of content and many consumers of content, similar to the traditional broadcast model.

This was relatively true from about 1994-2004. But since the development of peer to peer protocols like Bit Torrent, content is being shared directly between consumers, without a central server needed. As well, the ability of ordinary



*Canadians to create videos and blogs at the local level has reduced the ability of traditional producers of content to sell the "eyeballs for advertisers" which was the main source of revenue for these producers.
Internet content is now local items for a world audience rather than world items for all audiences.*

What the CRTC needs to do to help Canadian producers is to prevent technological impediments to the dissemination of local Canadian content to other Canadians.

Since the largest Internet conduit providers in Canada ,cable providers and telephone providers, are often also owners of the traditional broadcast providers, there are attempting to limit the provision of local content in favour of content produced by their affiliates.

As there is a finite capacity of the conduit provider's networks, there are reasons for such limitations, but they need to be set by usage not source or content.

Limitations by time of day or fees set by bandwidth usage are good. limitations set by contents type (P2P versus HTTP) or source (secondary suppliers versus direct customers) are not."



3.6 Most Rated Comment

To follow are the most rated comments for Defining New Media Broadcasting consultation.

Rated by 5 participants, 3.8/4

"In traditional radio and television production, one often distinguishes between levels of content according to how far it is broadcast (local or national or international). This can be done because the technology has geographical limitations that create such a division, so there are natural divisions between creators of content for each level. A large part of present CRTC policy is to prevent the increased resources of global broadcasting interests from smothering the creation of local and national content. This has worked very well in Canada, to the point that Canada is a global leader in production of such content.

The Internet does not have such a natural division which means all content is globally available, whether created by an individual or a multi-national corporation. This has been perceived as a real problem for existing content creators. The old economics of broadcasting, where revenue was in the natural limitation of competition by the cost of entry into the market, no longer seem to apply. Broadcasting is now limited by the capacity of the channel, rather than the capacity of the content producer.

Early in the pread of the Internet, there was an assumption that it would generally be mainly a broadcast medium, with a few large servers and developers of content and many consumers of content, similar to the traditional broadcast model.

This was relatively true from about 1994-2004. But since the development of peer to peer protocols like Bit Torrent, content is being shared directly between consumers, without a central server needed. As well, the ability of ordinary Canadians to create videos and blogs at the local level has reduced the ability of traditional producers of content to sell the "eyeballs for advertisers" which was the main source of revenue for these producers.

Internet content is now local items for a world audience rather than world items for all audiences.

What the CRTC needs to do to help Canadian producers is to prevent technological impediments to the dissemination of local Canadian content to other Canadians.

Since the largest Internet conduit providers in Canada, cable providers and telephone providers, are often also owners of the traditional broadcast providers, there are attempting to limit the provision of local content in favour of content produced by their affiliates.

As there is a finite capacity of the conduit provider's networks, there are reasons for such limitations, but they need to be set by usage not source or content.

Limitations by time of day or fees set by bandwidth usage are good. limitations set by contents type (P2P versus HTTP) or source (secondary suppliers versus direct customers) are not."

Rated by 2 participants, 4/4

"This question is, potentially, a loaded and I think even dangerous question. Because "broadcasting" is a REGULATED activity in Canada: you have to be licenced to "broadcast." And the traditional television broadcasters (like CTV and Global, for example), have reason to fear that their exclusive rights to such a licence is threatened by our free and unrestricted access to the Internet. That is, a filmmaker or writer can publish videos, films, stories, news, for the world to see without having the same licence as a traditional broadcaster. And I fear that there is a strong lobby building that will prevent entrepreneurial start-ups over the Internet and even prevent free speech. Because if a "content distributor" on the Internet is deemed to be a "broadcaster," they can be shut down.



So my answer to the question at hand, "What is new media broadcasting?" can only be, "There is no definition of media broadcasting. It's a territory marked by an invisible line that can only be drawn when certain powers are seeking to shut it down. Everything is new media broadcasting, and nothing is. Put most simply, it's an old-world terminology that doesn't have an application in the new media world.

If there is concern that Canadians aren't seeing enough "Canadian Internet media," then financial incentives to promote such media and putting money directly into content-creators' hands might make real sense. In fact, "cutting out the middle-men" between content and distribution could provide tens of millions more dollars that can directly into the production of better documentary, news, and narrative fiction on film.

The Internet is currently a "free economy," and the best content has a fighting chance to find audiences everywhere, not just in Canada. That content might be generated from an Indian Reserve in B.C., or a small farmtown in Alberta, or university campus in Toronto, or the basement of a starving artist in Hull. It might still take a lot of money to make the best content, but the fact is great content can come from anywhere, and we should not allow for regulation that might prevent stories from getting out to Canadians. Defining who is a "broadcaster" might end up doing more damage to the life-blood of Canadian stories by controlling who can distribute those stories online."



3.7 Most Read Comments

To follow are the most read comments for Defining New Media Broadcasting consultation.

Read 78 times, rated by 5 participants, 3.4/4

"In traditional radio and television production, one often distinguishes between levels of content according to how far it is broadcast (local or national or international). This can be done because the technology has geographical limitations that create such a division, so there are natural divisions between creators of content for each level. A large part of present CRTC policy is to prevent the increased resources of global broadcasting interests from smothering the creation of local and national content. This has worked very well in Canada, to the point that Canada is a global leader in production of such content.

The Internet does not have such a natural division which means all content is globally available, whether created by an individual or a multi-national corporation. This has been perceived as a real problem for existing content creators. The old economics of broadcasting, where revenue was in the natural limitation of competition by the cost of entry into the market, no longer seem to apply. Broadcasting is now limited by the capacity of the channel, rather than the capacity of the content producer.

Early in the pread of the Internet, there was an assumption that it would generally be mainly a broadcast medium, with a few large servers and developers of content and many consumers of content, similar to the traditional broadcast model.

This was relatively true from about 1994-2004. But since the development of peer to peer protocols like Bit Torrent, content is being shared directly between consumers, without a central server needed. As well, the ability of ordinary Canadians to create videos and blogs at the local level has reduced the ability of traditional producers of content to sell the "eyeballs for advertisers" which was the main source of revenue for these producers.

Internet content is now local items for a world audience rather than world items for all audiences.

What the CRTC needs to do to help Canadian producers is to prevent technological impediments to the dissemination of local Canadian content to other Canadians.

Since the largest Internet conduit providers in Canada, cable providers and telephone providers, are often also owners of the traditional broadcast providers, there are attempting to limit the provision of local content in favour of content produced by their affiliates.

As there is a finite capacity of the conduit provider's networks, there are reasons for such limitations, but they need to be set by usage not source or content.

Limitations by time of day or fees set by bandwidth usage are good. Limitations set by content's type (P2P versus HTTP) or source (secondary suppliers versus direct customers) are not."

Read 53 times, rated by 2 participants, 4/4

"This question is, potentially, a loaded and I think even dangerous question. Because "broadcasting" is a REGULATED activity in Canada: you have to be licenced to "broadcast." And the traditional television broadcasters (like CTV and Global, for example), have reason to fear that their exclusive rights to such a licence is threatened by our free and unrestricted access to the Internet. That is, a filmmaker or writer can publish videos, films, stories, news, for the world to see without having the same licence as a traditional broadcaster. And I fear that there is a strong lobby building that will prevent entrepreneurial start-ups over the Internet and even prevent free speech. Because if a "content distributor" on the Internet is deemed to be a "broadcaster," they can be shut down.



So my answer to the question at hand, "What is new media broadcasting?" can only be, "There is no definition of media broadcasting. It's a territory marked by an invisible line that can only be drawn when certain powers are seeking to shut it down. Everything is new media broadcasting, and nothing is. Put most simply, it's an old-world terminology that doesn't have an application in the new media world.

If there is concern that Canadians aren't seeing enough "Canadian Internet media," then financial incentives to promote such media and putting money directly into content-creators' hands might make real sense. In fact, "cutting out the middle-men" between content and distribution could provide tens of millions more dollars that can directly into the production of better documentary, news, and narrative fiction on film.

The Internet is currently a "free economy," and the best content has a fighting chance to find audiences everywhere, not just in Canada. That content might be generated from an Indian Reserve in B.C., or a small farmtown in Alberta, or university campus in Toronto, or the basement of a starving artist in Hull. It might still take a lot of money to make the best content, but the fact is great content can come from anywhere, and we should not allow for regulation that might prevent stories from getting out to Canadians. Defining who is a "broadcaster" might end up doing more damage to the life-blood of Canadian stories by controlling who can distribute those stories online."

Read 30 times, rated by 1 participant

"Everyone is a "new media broadcasting" in internet. Trying to apply the TV model will just create segregation among publishers of content.

Funding professionnals should not be based on the "broadcasting", but rather on the "audience" or unique visitors. Many European countries use the "billeterie" to fund their feature films. Simply explained, the "billeterie" is an advance on possible ticket sales. Similar models could be applied to internet. "



4.0 SUPPORT FOR THE CREATION AND PROMOTION OF CANADIAN NEW MEDIA BROADCASTING

This online consultation was conducted between May 15th and June 15th 2008. The following information was presented to participants.

Broadcasters and television distributors all contribute toward the creation and promotion of Canadian content.

Cable and satellite television companies, for instance, contribute a portion of their revenues to a fund that helps finance Canadian television shows. Both radio and television broadcasters are required to show a minimum level of Canadian content or spend a certain level of their revenues on Canadian content. Radio stations pay a portion of their revenues toward the development of new Canadian recording talent.

Given that the Internet is global, and consumers can increasingly get access to the programming they want, when they want, from whatever provider they want, what issues and questions should the Commission explore to support Canadian new media broadcasting content?

What do you think?

Question:

Should the Creation and Promotion of Canadian new media broadcasting content be supported? If so, How?

This section will provide an overview of the Support for the Creation and promotion of Canadian New Media Broadcasting consultation and includes the following:

- Activity Summary
- Consultation Moderator Biography
- Dialogue Overview
- Detailed Metrics
- Highest Rated Comments
- Most Rated Comments
- Most Read Comments



4.1 Activity Summary

Site Activity Breakdown Support for the Creation and Promotion of Canadian New Media Broadcasting

Site Activity	Activity	Percentage of Total Consultation
Number of Comments Posted	83	30%
Number of Comment Readings	1,588	27%
Number of Comment Ratings	101	24%
Number of Commenters	50	36%



4.2 Consultation Moderator

Nik Nanos

Nik Nanos was the independent moderator for this topic.

Nik is one of Canada's leading research and consultation experts. He has facilitated a broad range of very complex and sensitive consultation initiatives ranging from legislative consultations through to national roundtables.

He became the consultation moderator on May 15th, 2008.



4.3 Dialogue Overview

Summary of Discussion

Thirty-five out of 50 participants who posted comments on this topic said that they did not believe that the creation and promotion of Canadian new media broadcasting should be supported, while 11 out of 50 participants believed that it should be supported. Twenty-one participants felt that the CRTC had no role regulating Canadian content, while 18 out of 50 participants believed that good quality Canadian content would survive without support. Seventeen out of 50 participants said that there should be no new regulation or that there was already too much media regulation in Canada, while 16 out of 50 participants said that regulation of new media limited free speech. Other commonly articulated comments were that the internet needed to be more of a free market with more competition (15 out of 50), that net neutrality must be maintained (14 out of 50), that Internet Service Providers should not be allowed to throttle bandwidth (14 out of 50) and that government funding should not be used to support Canadian new media (14 out of 50).

Dialogue Overview Tables

50 Participants posted comments on this topic.

Question:

Should the creation and promotion of Canadian new media broadcasting content be supported?
If so, How?

Comments Posted on this Topic*		
Comment	Number of Individuals Who Expressed Comment	Percentage of Individuals Who Expressed Comment
No, the creation and promotion of Canadian new media broadcasting content should not be supported	35	70%
The CRTC has no role regulating Canadian content	21	42%
Good quality Canadian content will survive without support	18	36%
There should be no new regulation, there is too much media regulation already	17	34%
Regulation of new media limits free speech	16	32%
The Internet needs to be more of a free market and with more competition	15	30%
Net neutrality must be maintained	14	28%
I am against taxation as a method to support Canadian new media	14	28%
ISPs should not be able to throttle bandwidth	14	28%
Yes, the creation and promotion of Canadian new media broadcasting content should be supported	11	22%

* Only comments that were posted more than once by more than one participant are included in the dialogue overview tables.



Comments Posted on this Topic*		
Comment	Number of Individuals Who Expressed Comment	Percentage of Individuals Who Expressed Comment
We need to focus on providing tools and resources to support Canadian content, not control content	8	16%
There needs to be some form of regulation	8	16%
The creation and promotion of Canadian content requires Government involvement/legislation	7	14%
Providers main concern is money/profit, not the creation or promotion of Canadian content	7	14%
Bell customer service complaint	6	12%
Canadian media/content is poor quality	5	10%
There should be no Government involvement/legislations	5	10%
There needs to be a separation between public and private	4	8%
I don't watch a lot of television	2	4%

* Only comments that were posted more than once by more than one participant are included in the dialogue overview tables.



4.4 Detailed Metrics

To follow are the metrics for the Support for the Creation and Promotion of Canadian New Media Broadcasting portion of the online consultation.

Explanation of Comment Ratings

Participants were able to rate whether they agreed, somewhat agreed, somewhat disagreed or disagreed with a statement. Each agreement/disagreement rating was given a numeric value:

- agree = 4;
- somewhat agree = 3;
- somewhat disagree = 2; and,
- disagree = 1.

Participants could also give unsure ratings. The higher the comment rating, the higher the level of agreement with that comment. The closer a comment is to 1 the greater the level of disagreement with that comment.

Number of Comment Ratings

The 83 comments in this topic received a total of 101 ratings. The mean number of ratings per comment in this topic was 1.2. The most ratings received by any comment was eight ratings. The next most rated comment received six ratings.

Number of Comment Readings

The 83 comments in this topic were read 1,588 times. The mean number of readings per comment was 19.1, while the most read comment had 101 readings.

Most Active Participants

Fifty participants posted comments in this topic; seven of whom posted more than three comments. The most frequent contributor to this topic was Lorne, who posted 10 comments in total. The next most frequent contributor was fmenard123 who posted 4 comments in total.



4.5 Highest Rated Comments

To follow are the highest rated comments for the Support for the Creation and Promotion of Canadian New Media Broadcasting consultation.

Rated by 4 participants, 4/4

"I think that if major ISP's such as Rogers and the various Bells are not regulated they will engage in monopolistic and uncompetitive practices.

We need to guard our bandwidth rights and our privacy from these providers.

First, if an ISP sells you a maximum download speed and a maximum bandwidth allowance, then they should not limit your download speed or volumes unless and until you exceed that allowance regardless of the packet type, source or content.

This means that the current throttling practices based on bittorrent packets and/or encrypted packets should be illegal. Not only are there legal and legitimate uses of this technology, no one appointed or agreed to such limitations.

Second, this is especially true if the ISP is in a conflict of interest with other internet content providers. If an ISP opts to provide content (say video on demand) and they are permitted to throttle traffic - they could and likely will attempt to limit downloads from competitive services (such as iTunes, Netflix or similar services).

Third, it should be illegal for an ISP to perform any deep-packet-inspection. Internet service providers should do that provide services and access to the internet. They should not regulate, throttle or monitor the type, source and/or destination of my internet traffic.

They should not be able to limit how many or what type of traffic my systems can send or receive. Already both Rogers and Sympatico are blocking some ports (notably smtp server ports) and limiting access to third party mail servers - such port blocking should be illegal.

Also, standard criminal rules should be applied to prevent them from probing, scanning or attempting to determine what if any "services" my systems are running. Any Terms of Service that are worded to permit what otherwise would be illegal access to my systems should be declared illegal and void.

Currently the providers arbitrarily and without recourse modify their Terms of Service to permit them to limit access. Blocking one port seems like a small issue but one port is only the beginning of what they will do, if they remain unchecked."

Rated by 4 participants, 4/4

"I find it interesting that just a few short weeks ago Bell was talking about how high volume downloaders (file sharers) were using up too much bandwidth and impacting other user's download speeds. Now Bell has just recently announced that they are providing a for fee service whereby people can watch movies over the internet. I assume these movies will be downloaded and require the same or more bandwidth as movies downloaded by file sharers. If this service becomes successful, will it not have the same effect as those users they are currently throttling?"

It seems obvious that the throttling is just a means of making non-Bell file sharing/entertainment distribution, which is many times perfectly legal, less attractive than Bell's offerings and can therefore be seen more as a blow to competition and net neutrality.



As an example of legal file sharing/movie downloading, CTV is now offering some of its show's episodes for streaming after they are shown by broadcasting."

Rated by 3 participants, 4/4

"In the specific case before the CRTC (2008-04-03 - #: 8622-C51-200805153), Bell Canada is not an "Internet" provider. They are an already regulated provider of last-mile connectivity, and are mandated to provide access to competitors.

This last-mile connectivity is a natural monopoly. It makes no more sense to expect every communications provider to run their own last-mile wires as it would be to expect every retailer to run their own roads to our homes and offices.

Bell Canada is inspecting and manipulating the traffic between these premises and the actual ISPs. They are doing this claiming that the communications network that connects phone switches to each other and to the ISPs is congested.

There are a number of flaws with this claim.

a) The connections between phone switches is actually the cheapest part of the network to build out, so the part of the network where congestion is the least legitimate. Claiming congestion allows the phone companies to charge higher fees for legacy infrastructure rather than providing an incentive to build out this network. We need to remove economic and other disincentives to updating these networks.

b) There is a lot of redundant traffic that is due to mismanagement of the network by Bell and other phone companies. As an example, I have two DSL connections in my home in Ottawa. Bell routes all my DSL traffic via Toronto, rather than enabling ISPs to connect to the DSL network within every major urban center.

There is an Internet Exchange in Ottawa called OttIX <http://www.ottix.net> . Traffic between two Internet customers in Ottawa should be able to stay within Ottawa, and not travel all the way to Toronto and back. None of the phone or cable companies participate in these regional exchanges, even when they are the ISP (such as Sympatico). If Bell's connections between urban centres is congested, we need to understand this as something caused by Bell's own mismanagement and not something where we should allow them to inspect, manipulate or levy higher fees because of.

As I suggested in another submission, I believe an ideal policy fix to this problem would be to break up the phone and cable companies in the same way the previous Ontario Conservative Government broke up Ontario Hydro. Separate "distribution" which would be managed by the appropriate level of government from other services which would exist in a competitive private sector free market.

*An ideal future communications infrastructure, how do we get there, and what is stopping us!
<http://www.digital-copyright.ca/node/4593>"*



4.6 Most Rated Comment

To follow are the most rated comments for the Support for the Creation and Promotion of Canadian New Media Broadcasting consultation.

Rated by 8 participants, 2.6/4

"Supported? It does not need to be supported, it just needs to be unregulated and it will happen all by itself.

The CRTC should not involve itself except to keep private or government interests from interfering with the natural evolution of the internet.

The CBC is an unnaturally biased outlet. It should be converted into a 100% non-advertising based Canadian Public Broadcasting System receiving contributions from the government, industry and private donors. Model itself on the US PBS which has a national layer and a network of regional/state/city affiliates who contribute to content.

Fire all the very high priced "talent" at the CBC and let a new generation of Canadian television thrive.

Stop imposing."

Rated by 6 participants, 3.3/4

*"I think that if Canadian content can not flourish or compete on it's own, then it should die a natural death. If a Canadian radio or TV station isn't popular enough with Canadians to attract advertising revenue to survive - then it's gone. I'm sick and tired of a regulatory agency deciding what I can and can not view. When will the day come that I can pick and chose the station I want to see over cable and not have a bunch of idiotic useless stations bundled in with the good ones? I suspect it's because the poorly viewed or marginally attractive stations could not survive on their own. Too bad for them. Bye Bye.
Brian"*

Rated by 5 participants, 3.4/4

"Should the creation and promotion of Canadian new media broadcasting content be supported?"

No.

If there is a demand for the content it will flourish of it's own accord. The LAST thing we want or need is for "people who know better" to be telling us which messages and which ideas we should be exposed to and using our tax dollars to push their own agenda on us.

CBC ring a bell? Expensive, biased and unanswerable to anyone in the real world. They don't report public opinion they tell us what they want it to be."



4.7 Most Read Comments

To follow are the most read comments for the Support for the Creation and Promotion of Canadian New Media Broadcasting consultation.

Read 101 times, rated by 2 participant, 4/4

"Given the free nature of the internet, all that really can or should be regulated is our access to it (aka last mile). Most of the problem lies within the fact that 2 parties cannot be held accountable through competition: Local cable companies, and Bell. Bell is required to allow others to use the networks, but the current packet sniffing fiasco begs the question: Does Bell have to answer to anyone? In this case, the only logical answer is the CRTC. Internet communication is merely an evolution to radio and tv. Furthermore, could it not be the place of the CRTC to charge companies like Bell with antitrust?"

Read 65 times, rated by 8 participants, 2.6/4

"Supported? It does not need to be supported, it just needs to be unregulated and it will happen all by itself.

The CRTC should not involve itself except to keep private or government interests from interfering with the natural evolution of the internet.

The CBC is an unnaturally biased outlet. It should be converted into a 100% non-advertising based Canadian Public Broadcasting System receiving contributions from the government, industry and private donors. Model itself on the US PBS which has a national layer and a network of regional/state/city affiliates who contribute to content.

Fire all the very high priced "talent" at the CBC and let a new generation of Canadian television thrive.

Stop imposing."

Read 58 times, rated by 5 participants, 2.2/4

"The CBC is an unnaturally biased outlet. It should be converted into a 100% non-advertising based Canadian Public Broadcasting System receiving contributions from the government, industry and private donors. Model itself on the US PBS which has a national layer and a network of regional/state/city affiliates who contribute to content.

Fire all the very high priced "talent" at the CBC and let a new generation of Canadian television thrive.

Stop imposing."



5.0 BARRIERS TO ACCESSING CANADIAN NEW MEDIA BROADCASTING

This online consultation was conducted between May 15th and June 15th, 2008. The following information was presented to participants.

Many Canadians are receiving broadcasting content not just through their radios and televisions, but on their personal computers and mobile devices, as well.

Content from the Internet and mobile networks can be used on MP3 players, big-screen TVs, home stereos, game consoles and handheld devices such as PDAs and cellphones.

Given that access to broadcasting content using the Internet and mobile devices is expected to be more important in the years to come, what issues and questions should the CRTC explore in the context of the platforms that are being used by consumers? For example:

Are there any practices that affect the distribution of, and access to, Canadian new media broadcasting content online and on mobile platforms?

What do you think?

Question:

Are there any barriers to accessing Canadian New Media Broadcasting?

This section will provide an overview of the Barriers to Accessing Canadian New Media Broadcasting consultation and includes the following:

- Activity Summary
- Consultation Moderator Biography
- Dialogue Overview
- Detailed Metrics
- Highest Rated Comments
- Most Rated Comments
- Most Read Comments



5.1 Activity Summary

Site Activity Breakdown Barriers to Accessing Canadian New Media Broadcasting

Site Activity	Activity	Percentage of Total Consultation
Number of Comments Posted	70	25%
Number of Comment Readings	1,466	25%
Number of Comment Ratings	137	33%
Number of Commenters	51	37%



5.2 Consultation Moderator

Nik Nanos

Nik Nanos was the independent moderator for this topic.

Nik is one of Canada's leading research and consultation experts. He has facilitated a broad range of very complex and sensitive consultation initiatives ranging from legislative consultations through to national roundtables.

He became the consultation moderator on May 15th, 2008.



5.3 Dialogue Overview

Summary of Discussion

The vast majority of participants (48 out of 51 for this topic) believed that there were barriers to accessing Canadian new media broadcasts. Thirty-two out of 51 participants believed that there was too much control and censorship of new media in Canada by creators of traditional media and Internet Service Providers. Twenty-six participants believed that bandwidth throttling and traffic shaping creates barriers, while 25 participants believed that net neutrality must be maintained. Sixteen participants felt that large corporations created barriers to accessing new media so they can make a profit. Twelve participants believed that creating a freer market and more competition would eliminate barriers to access, while 10 participants believe that government involvement and regulation created barriers.

Dialogue Overview Tables

51 Participants posted comments on this topic.

Question:

Are there any barriers to accessing Canadian new media broadcasting?

Comments Posted on this Topic*		
Comment	Number of Individuals Who Expressed Comment	Percentage of Individuals Who Expressed Comment
Yes, there are barriers to accessing Canadian new media	48	94%
There is too much control/censorship by creators of traditional media/ISP	32	63%
Throttling/ traffic shaping creates barriers	26	51%
Net neutrality must be maintained	25	49%
Large corporations create barriers to accessing Canadian new media so they can make a profit	16	31%
A freer market and more competition would eliminate barriers	12	24%
Government involvement and regulation creates barriers	10	20%
Providers should adapt to high demand/use to allow more access	8	16%
CRTC has a role and should be more active in creating better access	7	14%
Access to the Internet is too expensive/ there are too many separate fees	6	12%
Mandatory purchase of cable company provided devices to access their network creates barriers	5	10%
The Canadian technological level is weak/ does not provide adequate access	5	10%

* Only comments that were posted more than once by more than one participant are included in the dialogue overview tables.



Comments Posted on this Topic*		
Comment	Number of Individuals Who Expressed Comment	Percentage of Individuals Who Expressed Comment
Procedures required to access Canadian new media are too costly/complex (propriety encryption)	5	10%
Canadian new media needs to be supported to eliminate barriers	3	6%
Customer service issue with Rogers	3	6%
There is limited access to the Internet in rural areas	3	6%
Access barriers need legislation/ government involvement to resolve them	2	4%
There are too many levels of protection/security that prohibit access	2	4%
Canadian content is not popular enough to access	2	4%
The Internet is too international for barriers to accessing Canadian new media	2	4%

* Only comments that were posted more than once by more than one participant are included in the dialogue overview tables.



5.4 Detailed Metrics

To follow are the metrics for the Barriers to Accessing Canadian New Media Broadcasting portion of the online consultation.

Explanation of Comment Ratings

Participants were able to rate whether they agreed, somewhat agreed, somewhat disagreed or disagreed with a statement. Each agreement/disagreement rating was given a numeric value:

- agree = 4;
- somewhat agree = 3;
- somewhat disagree = 2; and,
- disagree = 1.

Participants could also give unsure ratings. The higher the comment rating, the higher the level of agreement with that comment. The closer a comment is to 1 the greater the level of disagreement with that comment.

Number of Comment Ratings

The 70 comments in this topic received a total of 137 ratings. The mean number of ratings per comment in this topic was 2. The most ratings received by any comment was 12 ratings.

Number of Comment Readings

The 70 comments in this topic were read 1,466 times. The mean number of readings per comment was 20.9, while the most read comment had 117 readings.

Most Active Participants

51 participants posted comments in this topic, five of whom posted three or more comments. The most frequent contributor to this topic was DavidLandry, who posted four comments in total.



5.5 Highest Rated Comments

To follow are the highest rated comments for the Barriers to Accessing Canadian New Media Broadcasting consultation.

Rated by 12 participants, 4/4

"No one should have the right to be able to dictate which internet traffic is "important" and which internet traffic is not "important". Traffic that may not seem to be so important to one person or entity could be extremely important to someone else. The internet must be maintained as a level playing field for all. The CRTC must preserve net neutrality for the Canadian people by preventing the manipulation of our internet access by Internet service providers."

Rated by 7 participants, 4/4

"Tax Payers + Parliament of Canada = Bell Canada (Revenue ?\$20 billion CAD, 2007)

I'm very much hoping that the CRTC will stop Bell Canada's threat to internet neutrality by forcing them to end their disgraceful practices in traffic management, and regulate the outrageous cost of DSL service in Canada, but i have little faith.

Money from the Canadian tax payers built the millions of kilometers of telephone/DSL infrastructure throughout this country. However, tax payer's only possible link to these lines it thru "the last mile", which only Bell Canada can provide. The Government of Canada doesn't want our cities and towns saturated with landlines, which makes sense on many levels, but because of this we are forced to use this "last mile" from Bell Canada.

In other words, the government has allowed Bell Canada to make billions in revenue by controlling infrastructure that was paid for by Canadian tax payers, while the CRTC scratches their heads and thinks it would probably be best to DIALOGUE and SHARE OUR FEELINGS on the issue."

Rated by 5 participants, 4/4

"I would like to see Canadian cable companies adopting cablecards so that customers are not locked in to buying the cable company's set top box. Also, new TVs can receive High Definition signals over cable without decoder boxes if the signal is unencrypted. I think the local channels included in every package sold should be unencrypted so that every customer isn't forced to by a decoder box."

Rated by 5 participants, 4/4

"Just like they did with HDTV, additional specialty digital TV channels, and the upcoming lifting of advertising limits, the CRTC will only listen to the telephone, ISP's, cable or satellite companies as to how to proceed. This forum is a mocking example of how the people, who are supposed to be represented by the CRTC, can provide input. Here is my recommendation. The CRTC should tell providers that they cannot filter, monitor, limit, nor charge for individual services that are provided on the internet, if the person receiving them is already paying for internet access. If the services are provided to a wireless provider, those providers also cannot filter, monitor, limit, nor charge for those individual services, if the person receiving them is already paying for wireless services. It is ludicrous to me that my cell phone, or Blackberry has more functionality outside of Canada than within. Sadly, it currently does."

Rated by 5 participants, 4/4



"Net Neutrality is the Key Issue.

When I buy an internet service, I should get the full internet service I paid for, without limitation.

I should not have the ISP that I buy the service from, artificially slow down traffic from one source, while not slowing it down from another.

I should not have the ISP disrupting traffic from one source because it considers it abuse.

I should not have the ISP be allowed to change the terms of service while I am within a contract with them.

It is really very simple, I should get what I pay for, without Tampering by the ISP or anyone else."



5.6 Most Rated Comment

To follow are the most rated comments for the Barriers to Accessing Canadian New Media Broadcasting consultation.

Rated by 12 participants, 4/4

"No one should have the right to be able to dictate which internet traffic is "important" and which internet traffic is not "important". Traffic that may not seem to be so important to one person or entity could be extremely important to someone else. The internet must be maintained as a level playing field for all. The CRTC must preserve net neutrality for the Canadian people by preventing the manipulation of our internet access by Internet service providers."

Rated by 8 participants, 3.9/4

"To me the internet has no nationality. Unless Canada wishes to join China is severely restricting what you can see, and what you can do online, I suggest that Canadian law stick to dealing with issues that actually matter. I don't give a damn if internet content is from the US or Canada or elsewhere. I DO give a damn when a Canadian company can promise one thing and arbitrarily decide it's going to deliver what it feels like afterwards though. Bell Canada might be the originator of a lot of the physical infrastructure in Canada, but if it's going to sell the usage of that physical infrastructure to private parties, whether it be a specific person like myself, or a business like Teksavvy, then it better be ready to deliver what it sold, and not later whine about it's own short comings and start making excuses. I was promised unlimited broadband, and then they arbitrarily decide that it's not going to actually be actually unlimited. If I pay for unlimited, then I expect to have virtually no limitations. I don't care if Bell can't deliver. I don't care WHY Bell can't deliver. I only care that I was sold something and then not given it. That's [EDITED BY MODERATOR]. And I don't wish to hear Bell state that it's torrents and piracy that is causing their troubles. Not my problem. They're an ISP, not a law enforcement agency. They have no right to pretend to be one. The only "regulating" I want to see happening, is to have companies that promise one thing in a product like internet service, and then them delivering another fraudulently, have severe fines enforced for having done so. Then maybe Bell (and any others) will start realizing they better start properly advertising precisely and accurately exactly what the customer is buying when they pay for it. And yes, I support net neutrality. I don't want a nation imposing on my usage, and I don't want a business imposing on my usage. When I type in a web search, I want to be accessing the entire web without any hidden biases disguised unseen."

Rated by 7 participants, 3/4

"Do not regulate other than to remove unnatural impediments to the evolution of the internet as a broadcast medium.

The only performance imposition that should be made is that networks be designed such that lower bandwidth users are not penalized by high bandwidth users when the system is congested. This does not mean "Throttling" just appropriate system design to assure that lower bandwidth users are not affected by congestion any more than high bandwidth users.



Cable companies should not be allowed to impose equipment purchases or rentals where they are not required for high definition television."

Rated by 7 participants, 4/4

"Tax Payers + Parliament of Canada = Bell Canada (Revenue ?\$20 billion CAD, 2007)I'm very much hoping that the CRTC will stop Bell Canada's threat to internet neutrality by forcing them to end their disgraceful practices in traffic management, and regulate the outrageous cost of DSL service in Canada, but i have little faith.

Money from the Canadian tax payers built the millions of kilometers of telephone/DSL infrastructure throughout this country. However, tax payer's only possible link to these lines it thru "the last mile", which only Bell Canada can provide. The Government of Canada doesn't want our cities and towns saturated with landlines, which makes sense on many levels, but because of this we are forced to use this "last mile" from Bell Canada.

In other words, the government has allowed Bell Canada to make billions in revenue by controlling infrastructure that was paid for by Canadian tax payers, while the CRTC scratches their heads and thinks it would probably be best to DIALOGUE and SHARE OUR FEELINGS on the issue."

5.7 Most Read Comments

To follow are the most read comments for the Barriers to Accessing Canadian New Media Broadcasting consultation.



Read 117 times, rated by 5 participants, 4/4

"I would like to see Canadian cable companies adopting cablecards so that customers are not locked in to buying the cable company's set top box. Also, new TVs can receive High Definition signals over cable without decoder boxes if the signal is unencrypted. I think the local channels included in every package sold should be unencrypted so that every customer isn't forced to buy a decoder box."

Read 68 times, rated by 12 participants, 4/4

"No one should have the right to be able to dictate which internet traffic is "important" and which internet traffic is not "important". Traffic that may not seem to be so important to one person or entity could be extremely important to someone else. The internet must be maintained as a level playing field for all. The CRTC must preserve net neutrality for the Canadian people by preventing the manipulation of our internet access by Internet service providers."

Read 68 times, Rated by 7 participants, 3/4

"Do not regulate other than to remove unnatural impediments to the evolution of the internet as a broadcast medium. The only performance imposition that should be made is that networks be designed such that lower bandwidth users are not penalized by high bandwidth users when the system is congested. This does not mean "Throttling" just appropriate system design to assure that lower bandwidth users are not affected by congestion any more than high bandwidth users. Cable companies should not be allowed to impose equipment purchases or rentals where they are not required for high definition television."



6.0 OTHER ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

This online consultation was conducted between May 15th and June 15th, 2008. The following information was presented to participants.

The CRTC is also charged with ensuring the broadcasting system is technologically innovative, takes into account regional and linguistic needs and concerns, and provides services to all Canadians.

What other questions should the Commission explore in a public proceeding examining Canadian new media broadcasting?

Question:

What other issues should be considered?

This section will provide an overview of the Other Issues for Consideration consultation and includes the following:

- Activity Summary
- Consultation Moderator Biography
- Dialogue Overview
- Detailed Metrics
- Highest Rated Comments
- Most Rated Comments
- Most Read Comments



6.1 Activity Summary

Site Activity Breakdown Other Issues for Consideration

Site Activity	Activity	Percentage of Total Consultation
Number of Comments Posted	104	37%
Number of Comment Readings	2,478	42%
Number of Comment Ratings	167	40%
Number of Commenters	67	48%



6.2 Consultation Moderator

Nik Nanos

Nik Nanos was the independent moderator for this topic.

Nik is one of Canada's leading research and consultation experts. He has facilitated a broad range of very complex and sensitive consultation initiatives ranging from legislative consultations through to national roundtables.

He became the consultation moderator on May 15th, 2008



6.3 Dialogue Overview

Summary of Discussion

When asked what other issues should be considered, nearly half of the participants who posted comments on this topic said that net neutrality was important and needed to be maintained. Twenty-four out of 67 participants said that Internet Service Providers should not be able to throttle bandwidth. Eighteen participants said that Internet Service Providers and creators of traditional media are trying to control the Internet in order to make a profit. Sixteen participants said that the CRTC should force Internet Service Providers to adhere to their service promises. Twelve participants said that the CRTC should not be involved in the regulation of the Internet, while another 12 participants said that the lack of competition among Internet Service Providers hurts all Canadian consumers.

Dialogue Overview Tables

67 Participants posted comments on this topic.

Question:

What other issues should be considered?

Comments Posted on this Topic*		
Comment	Number of Individuals Who Expressed Comment	Percentage of Individuals Who Expressed Comment
Net neutrality must be maintained	33	49%
ISPs should not be able to throttle bandwidth	24	36%
ISPs and creators of traditional media are trying to control the Internet to make a profit	18	27%
CRTC must make ISPs adhere to their promises of service	16	24%
CRTC should not regulate the Internet	12	18%
The lack of competition among ISPs hurts Canadian consumers	12	18%
Bell customer service complaint	11	16%
Should be more ISP competition	9	13%
Regulation of new media limits free speech	6	9%
Rogers customer service complaint	5	7%
Small independent producers of new media must be protected	5	7%
Question the validity of eConsultation	4	6%
CRTC should not push Canadian content on viewers	4	6%
Government should own and control Internet communication lines	4	6%
CRTC should have stricter penalties for ISPs that are found at fault	4	6%

* Only comments that were posted more than once by more than one participant are included in the dialogue overview tables.

Comments Posted on this Topic*		
Comment	Number of Individuals Who Expressed Comment	Percentage of Individuals Who Expressed Comment
Should not have to pay additional surcharges for Internet access	3	4%
Telecommunication is over regulated in Canada	3	4%
Internet privacy use must be protected	2	3%

* Only comments that were posted more than once by more than one participant are included in the dialogue overview tables.



6.4 Detailed Metrics

To follow are the metrics for the Other Issues for Consideration portion of the online consultation.

Explanation of Comment Ratings

Participants were able to rate whether they agreed, somewhat agreed, somewhat disagreed or disagreed with a statement. Each agreement/disagreement rating was given a numeric value:

- agree = 4;
- somewhat agree = 3;
- somewhat disagree = 2; and,
- disagree = 1.

Participants could also give unsure ratings. The higher the comment rating, the higher the level of agreement with that comment. The closer a comment is to 1 the greater the level of disagreement with that comment.

Number of Comment Ratings

The 108 comments in this topic received a total of 167 ratings. The mean number of ratings per comment in this topic was 1.5 . The most ratings received by any comment was 21 – two of the comments in this topic received 10 ratings or more.

Number of Comment Readings

The 108 comments in this topic were read 2,478 times. The mean number of readings per comment was 22.9, while the most read comment had 132 readings.

Most Active Participants

67 participants posted comments in this topic, sixteen of whom posted more than one comment. The most frequent contributor to this topic was Thenonconformer, who posted ten comments in total. The next most frequent contributors were GPrime and JasonN who posted five comments each.



6.5 Highest Rated Comments

To follow are the highest rated comments for the Other Issues for Consideration consultation.

Rated by 14 participants, 4/4

"The CRTC needs to step in, and prevent ISPs from continuing their practice of traffic shaping.

The internet needs to preserve it's neutrality - allowing ISPs to decide what traffic is important, or allowing them to decide what is right and wrong for their subscribers, should not be allowed!

They cannot do it correctly either - the common example of a mis-managed piece of technology being BitTorrent. They are throttling it because they claim that people using it are doing so for illegal purposes - but as the CBC proved, as well as many Linux distributions have done and continue to do so, this is simply not the case. The people it is hurting are the people who are using this service legally - those people using it illegally can, and do, find ways around these limits.

In the end, _private companies_ should not be the ones to make the decision - that is why the CRTC exists! A body responsible for "regulating Canada's broadcasting and telecommunications systems" and making certain that the rights of Canadians using those systems are preserved.

Net neutrality is defined as a network that is "free of restrictions on the kinds of equipment that may be attached, on the modes of communication allowed, which does not restrict content, sites or platforms, and where communication is not unreasonably degraded by other communication streams." This is one of the most important things we can have.

The internet is a wonderful tool - but only if it is allowed to remain open, and free of any restrictions imposed by a company, or government, acting in between the web and the user trying to use it."

Rated by 8 participants, 4/4

"New media is often an extension of old media. Companies that control media in a specific market, such as Canwest Global in Vancouver, can use their position to create and maintain their dominance over that market including newer forms of media. This can lead to abuses.

The CRTC needs to create and maintain regulations that regulate and limit the amount of media services any one individual or corporation can provide in any single market, thereby allowing for a greater variety of opinions and opportunities. This could be accomplished under a regulation blanketing all types of media, including those that haven't been created or even imagined."

Rated by 7 participants, 4/4

"I completely agree. It is naive to think that Internet Service Providers will not discriminate against legal services that compete with the services that they are selling. In Saskatchewan, SaskTel sells IP based television packages. If I subscribe, I can watch CBC broadcasts of NHL hockey games on my television through my internet connection. But the CBC streams hockey games for free over the net. If Canada does not enforce 'net neutrality', then there's no way that SaskTel is going to give those CBC streams equal priority over their network when it competes with their own product.

It's not for the ISPs to decide how the networks that they sell access to are used. If you allow the ISPs to do that, they will turn back the clock on the 'internet age' and make it just another way of delivering cable TV, moderated discussion groups, and telephone services."



6.6 Most Rated Comment

To follow are the most rated comments for the Other Issues for Consideration consultation.

Rated by 21 participants, 3.9/4

"No one should have the right to be able to dictate which internet traffic is "important" and which internet traffic is not "important". Traffic that may not seem to be so important to one person or entity could be extremely important to someone else. The internet must be maintained as a level playing field for all.

The CRTC must preserve net neutrality for the Canadian people by preventing the manipulation of our internet access by Internet service providers."

Rated by 14 participants, 4/4

"The CRTC needs to step in, and prevent ISPs from continuing their practice of traffic shaping.

The internet needs to preserve it's neutrality - allowing ISPs to decide what traffic is important, or allowing them to decide what is right and wrong for their subscribers, should not be allowed!

They cannot do it correctly either - the common example of a mis-managed piece of technology being BitTorrent. They are throttling it because they claim that people using it are doing so for illegal purposes - but as the CBC proved, as well as many Linux distributions have done and continue to do so, this is simply not the case. The people it is hurting are the people who are using this service legally - those people using it illegally can, and do, find ways around these limits.

In the end, _private companies_ should not be the ones to make the decision - that is why the CRTC exists! A body responsible for "regulating Canada's broadcasting and telecommunications systems" and making certain that the rights of Canadians using those systems are preserved.

Net neutrality is defined as a network that is "free of restrictions on the kinds of equipment that may be attached, on the modes of communication allowed, which does not restrict content, sites or platforms, and where communication is not unreasonably degraded by other communication streams." This is one of the most important things we can have.

The internet is a wonderful tool - but only if it is allowed to remain open, and free of any restrictions imposed by a company, or government, acting in between the web and the user trying to use it."

Rated by 8 participants, 4/4

"New media is often an extension of old media. Companies that control media in a specific market, such as Canwest Global in Vancouver, can use their position to create and maintain their dominance over that market including newer forms of media. This can lead to abuses.

The CRTC needs to create and maintain regulations that regulate and limit the amount of media services any one individual or corporation can provide in any single market, thereby allowing for a greater variety of opinions and opportunities. This could be accomplished under a regulation blanketing all types of media, including those that haven't been created or even imagined."



Rated by 8 participants, 4/4

"I completely agree. It is naive to think that Internet Service Providers will not discriminate against legal services that compete with the services that they are selling. In Saskatchewan, SaskTel sells IP based television packages. If I subscribe, I can watch CBC broadcasts of NHL hockey games on my television through my internet connection. But the CBC streams hockey games for free over the net. If Canada does not enforce 'net neutrality', then there's no way that SaskTel is going to give those CBC streams equal priority over their network when it competes with their own product.

It's not for the ISPs to decide how the networks that they sell access to are used. If you allow the ISPs to do that, they will turn back the clock on the 'internet age' and make it just another way of delivering cable TV, moderated discussion groups, and telephone services."



6.7 Most Read Comments

To follow are the most read comments for the Other Issues for Consideration consultation.

Read 132 times, rated by 21 participants, 3.9/4

"No one should have the right to be able to dictate which internet traffic is "important" and which internet traffic is not "important". Traffic that may not seem to be so important to one person or entity could be extremely important to someone else. The internet must be maintained as a level playing field for all.

The CRTC must preserve net neutrality for the Canadian people by preventing the manipulation of our internet access by Internet service providers."

Read 94 times, rated by 14 participants, 4/4

"The CRTC needs to step in, and prevent ISPs from continuing their practice of traffic shaping.

The internet needs to preserve it's neutrality - allowing ISPs to decide what traffic is important, or allowing them to decide what is right and wrong for their subscribers, should not be allowed!

They cannot do it correctly either - the common example of a mis-managed piece of technology being BitTorrent. They are throttling it because they claim that people using it are doing so for illegal purposes - but as the CBC proved, as well as many Linux distributions have done and continue to do so, this is simply not the case. The people it is hurting are the people who are using this service legally - those people using it illegally can, and do, find ways around these limits.

In the end, _private companies_ should not be the ones to make the decision - that is why the CRTC exists! A body responsible for "regulating Canada's broadcasting and telecommunications systems" and making certain that the rights of Canadians using those systems are preserved.

Net neutrality is defined as a network that is "free of restrictions on the kinds of equipment that may be attached, on the modes of communication allowed, which does not restrict content, sites or platforms, and where communication is not unreasonably degraded by other communication streams." This is one of the most important things we can have.

The internet is a wonderful tool - but only if it is allowed to remain open, and free of any restrictions imposed by a company, or government, acting in between the web and the user trying to use it."

Read 77 times, rated by 8 participants, 4/4

"New media is often an extension of old media. Companies that control media in a specific market, such as Canwest Global in Vancouver, can use their position to create and maintain their dominance over that market including newer forms of media. This can lead to abuses.

The CRTC needs to create and maintain regulations that regulate and limit the amount of media services any one individual or corporation can provide in any single market, thereby allowing for a greater variety of opinions and opportunities. This could be accomplished under a regulation blanketing all types of media, including those that haven't been created or even imagined."

