



# Telecom Order CRTC 2026-101

PDF version

Gatineau, 26 May 2026

*File numbers: 1011-NOC2025-0227 and 4754-835*

## **Determination of costs award with respect to the participation of the Canada Deaf Grassroots Movement in the proceeding initiated by Telecom and Broadcasting Notice of Consultation 2025-227**

### **Application**

1. By letter dated 16 January 2026, the Canada Deaf Grassroots Movement (CDGM) applied for costs with respect to its participation in the proceeding initiated by Telecom and Broadcasting Notice of Consultation 2025-227 (the proceeding). In the proceeding, the Commission sought to help make it easier for Canadians to know what to expect from their Internet, cellphone, telephone, or television service providers in the event of a service outage or disruption. The Commission looked to consider additional consumer protections, including clearer communications from service providers during outages and refunds for lost services.
2. The Commission did not receive any interventions in response to the application for costs.
3. The CDGM submitted that it had met the criteria for an award of costs set out in section 68 of the *Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission Rules of Practice and Procedure* (the Rules of Procedure) because it represented a group or class of subscribers that had an interest in the outcome of the proceeding, it had assisted the Commission in developing a better understanding of the matters that were considered, and it had participated in a responsible way.
4. With respect to the group or class of subscribers that the CDGM has submitted it represents, the CDGM explained that this group or class consists of an estimated 370,000 Deaf, Deaf Indigenous, Hard of Hearing, and Deaf-Blind (DDIHHDB) individuals across Canada. The CDGM explained that these individuals are directly affected by service outages and disruptions, particularly where inaccessible notification systems, lack of real-time updates, or reliance on voice-only communication results in exclusion, risk, or unequal consumer protection. With respect to the specific methods by which the CDGM has submitted that it represents this group or class, the CDGM explained that it works with public, private and non-profit sectors across multiple domains, including communication access, education, employment, health, legal services, and civic participation.
5. The CDGM requested that the Commission fix its costs at \$6,435, consisting entirely of consultant fees. The CDGM filed a bill of costs with its application.

6. The CDGM claimed 50 hours at a rate of \$110 per hour and 8.5 hours at a rate of \$110 per hour for external consultants for work reviewing the file and preparing its intervention, reply comments, and costs application (\$5,500 and \$935, respectively).
7. The CDGM submitted that the telecommunications service providers that participated in the proceeding are the appropriate parties to be required to pay any costs awarded by the Commission (the costs respondents).

### **Commission's analysis**

8. The criteria for an award of costs are set out in section 68 of the Rules of Procedure, which reads as follows:

68. The Commission must determine whether to award final costs and the maximum percentage of costs that is to be awarded on the basis of the following criteria:

- (a) whether the applicant had, or was the representative of a group or a class of subscribers that had, an interest in the outcome of the proceeding;
- (b) the extent to which the applicant assisted the Commission in developing a better understanding of the matters that were considered; and
- (c) whether the applicant participated in the proceeding in a responsible way.

9. In Telecom Information Bulletin 2016-188, the Commission provided guidance regarding how an applicant may demonstrate that it satisfies the first criterion with respect to its representation of interested subscribers. In the present case, the CDGM has demonstrated that it meets this requirement. The CDGM represents the interests of DDIHHDB individuals across Canada, who have an interest in the outcome of the proceeding because they are directly affected by service outages and disruptions.
10. The CDGM has also satisfied the remaining criteria through its participation in the proceeding. The CDGM's submissions provided an accessibility-based perspective on outage-related consumer protections, were not duplicative of that of other parties, and assisted the Commission in developing a better understanding of the matters that were considered. The CDGM also participated in a responsible way.
11. The rates claimed in respect of consultant fees are in accordance with the rates established in the *Guidelines for the Assessment of Costs*, as set out in Telecom Regulatory Policy 2010-963. The Commission finds that the total amount claimed by the CDGM was necessarily and reasonably incurred and should be allowed.
12. This is an appropriate case in which to fix the costs and dispense with taxation, in accordance with the streamlined procedure set out in Telecom Public Notice 2002-5.

13. The Commission has generally determined that the appropriate costs respondents to an award of costs are the parties that have a significant interest in the outcome of the proceeding in question and have participated actively in that proceeding. The Commission considers that the following parties had a significant interest in the outcome of the proceeding and participated actively in the proceeding: Bell Canada; Bragg Communications Inc., carrying on business as Eastlink; Cogeco Communications Inc.; Iristel Inc.; Quebecor Media Inc., on behalf of its affiliates Freedom Mobile Inc. and Videotron Ltd.; Rogers Communications Canada Inc., including Groupe Shaw Group and Shaw Telecom G.P. (Rogers); Saskatchewan Telecommunications; TekSavvy Solutions Inc.; TELUS Communications Inc. (TELUS); and Xplore Inc.
14. The Commission considers that, consistent with its practice, it is appropriate to allocate the responsibility for payment of costs among costs respondents based on their telecommunications operating revenues (TORs) as an indicator of the relative size and interest of the parties involved in the proceeding.<sup>1</sup>
15. However, as set out in Telecom Order 2015-160, the Commission considers \$1,000 to be the minimum amount that a costs respondent should be required to pay, due to the administrative burden that small costs awards impose on both the applicant and costs respondents.
16. Accordingly, the Commission finds that the responsibility for payment of costs should be allocated as follows:<sup>2</sup>

Company	Proportion	Amount
Rogers	41.30%	\$2,657.66
TELUS	35.75%	\$2,300.51
Bell Canada	22.95%	\$1,476.83

### Directions regarding costs

17. The Commission approves the application by the CDGM for costs with respect to its participation in the proceeding.
18. Pursuant to subsection 56(1) of the *Telecommunications Act*, the Commission fixes the costs to be paid to the CDGM at \$6,435.

---

<sup>1</sup> TORs consist of Canadian telecommunications revenues from local and access, long distance, data, private line, Internet, and wireless services.

<sup>2</sup> In this order, the Commission has used the TORs of the costs respondents based on their most recent audited financial statements.

19. The Commission directs that the award of costs to the CDGM be paid forthwith by Rogers Communications Canada Inc., TELUS Communications Inc., and Bell Canada according to the proportions set out in paragraph 16.

Secretary General

### **Related documents**

- *Call for comments – Consumer protections in the event of a service outage or disruption*, Telecom and Broadcasting Notice of Consultation CRTC 2025-227, 4 September 2025, as amended by Telecom and Broadcasting Notice of Consultation CRTC 2025-227-1, 3 October 2025
- *Guidance for costs award applicants regarding representation of a group or a class of subscribers*, Telecom Information Bulletin CRTC 2016-188, 17 May 2016
- *Determination of costs award with respect to the participation of the Ontario Video Relay Service Committee in the proceeding initiated by Telecom Notice of Consultation 2014-188*, Telecom Order CRTC 2015-160, 23 April 2015
- *Revision of CRTC costs award practices and procedures*, Telecom Regulatory Policy CRTC 2010-963, 23 December 2010
- *New procedure for Telecom costs awards*, Telecom Public Notice CRTC 2002-5, 7 November 2002