



Telecom Order CRTC 2026-102

PDF version

Gatineau, 26 May 2026

File numbers: 1011-NOC2025-0227 and 4754-836

Determination of costs award with respect to the participation of the Public Interest Advocacy Centre in the proceeding initiated by Telecom and Broadcasting Notice of Consultation 2025-227

Application

1. By letter dated 28 January 2026, the Public Interest Advocacy Centre (PIAC) 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. PIAC 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 PIAC has submitted it represents, PIAC explained that this group or class consists of all consumers across Canada with a particular focus on low-income and vulnerable consumers. PIAC submitted that this group or class has an interest in the outcome of the proceeding because their access to daily and emergency services may be limited by their ability to afford various telecommunications services. PIAC also submitted that it is held accountable for its representation of the public interest through a volunteer board of directors drawn from across Canada.
5. PIAC requested that the Commission fix its costs at \$3,595, consisting entirely of legal fees. PIAC filed a bill of costs with its application.
6. PIAC claimed 3.25 days at a rate of \$600 per day for in-house counsel for work reviewing the file, legal research, and preparing the intervention and reply comments (\$1,950). PIAC also

claimed 7 days at a rate of \$235 per day for an articling student for work reviewing the file and preparing the intervention and reply comments (\$1,645).

7. PIAC 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).
8. PIAC suggested that the responsibility for payment of costs should be divided among the costs respondents on the basis of the most recent data provided to the Commission.

Commission's analysis

9. 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.
10. 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, PIAC has demonstrated that it meets this requirement. PIAC represents the interests of all consumers across Canada with a particular focus on low-income consumers. These consumers have an interest in the outcome of the proceeding because they could be affected by it. PIAC is also held accountable for its representation of the public interest through a volunteer board of directors drawn from across Canada.
11. PIAC has also satisfied the remaining criteria through its participation in the proceeding. In particular, PIAC's submissions, especially those in which it advocated for mandatory uniform consumer protections in the event of a service outage or disruption, were not duplicative of those of other parties and assisted the Commission in developing a better understanding of the matters that were considered. PIAC also participated in a responsible way.
12. The rates claimed in respect of legal 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 PIAC was necessarily and reasonably incurred and should be allowed.

13. 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.
14. 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.
15. 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.¹
16. 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.
17. Accordingly, the Commission finds that the responsibility for payment of costs should be allocated as follows:²

Company	Proportion	Amount
Rogers	53.61%	\$1,927.28
TELUS	46.39%	\$1,667.72

Directions regarding costs

18. The Commission approves the application by PIAC for costs with respect to its participation in the proceeding.

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

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

19. Pursuant to subsection 56(1) of the *Telecommunications Act*, the Commission fixes the costs to be paid to PIAC at \$3,595.
20. The Commission directs that the award of costs to PIAC be paid forthwith by Rogers Communications Canada Inc. and TELUS Communications Inc. according to the proportions set out in paragraph 17.

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