



Telecom Order CRTC 2026-144

PDF version

Gatineau, 22 June 2026

File numbers: 1011-NOC2024-0318 and 4754-806

Determination of costs award with respect to the participation of the Manitoba Coalition in the proceeding initiated by Telecom Notice of Consultation 2024-318

Application

1. By letter dated 2 October 2025, the Aboriginal Council of Winnipeg, Harvest Manitoba, and the Manitoba Branch of the Consumers' Association of Canada (collectively, the Manitoba Coalition) applied for costs with respect to its participation in the proceeding initiated by Telecom Notice of Consultation 2024-318 (the proceeding). In the proceeding, the Commission sought comments on making shopping for home Internet services easier for Canadians.
2. The Commission did not receive any interventions in response to the application for costs.
3. The Manitoba Coalition 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. In particular, the Manitoba Coalition submitted that it represents the interests of consumers in Manitoba, including low-income consumers, consumers who are experiencing homelessness, and Indigenous peoples.
5. The Manitoba Coalition requested that the Commission fix its costs at \$5,626.30, consisting entirely of legal fees. The Manitoba Coalition filed a bill of costs with its application.
6. The Manitoba Coalition claimed 0.80 hours at the rate of \$206 per hour for external legal counsel to prepare for the hearing, and 33.10 hours at the rate of \$165 per hour for external legal counsel to prepare interventions and comments, prepare for the hearing, and attend the hearing.
7. The Manitoba Coalition 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). The Manitoba Coalition also submitted that it would be appropriate to allocate responsibility for costs among costs respondents based on the most recent

operating revenues and data available to the Commission, to remain consistent with the Commission's practice as set out in Telecom Regulatory Policy 2010-963.

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 Manitoba Coalition has demonstrated that it meets this requirement. The Manitoba Coalition submitted that it represents the interests of consumers in Manitoba, including low-income consumers, consumers who are experiencing homelessness, and Indigenous peoples.
10. The Manitoba Coalition has also satisfied the remaining criteria through its participation in the proceeding. In particular, the Manitoba Coalition's submissions helped the Commission develop a better understanding of the matters considered in the proceeding, having included the voices and perspectives of Manitoba consumers, especially low-income and vulnerable consumers. The Manitoba Coalition's submissions included such consumers' experiences with the persistent impacts of inadequate market competition and suggestions on how to develop measures to mitigate those impacts. The Manitoba Coalition also submitted that it participated in a cost-effective, meaningful, and responsible way, having filed concise, focused, and responsive submissions that were beneficial to the Commission and supported by independent evidence.
11. 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 the Manitoba Coalition was necessarily and reasonably incurred and should be allowed.
12. 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 throughout the proceeding: Bell Canada; Bragg Communications Inc., carrying on business as Eastlink; Cogeco Connexion Inc.; Quebecor Media Inc., on behalf of Videotron Ltd. and Freedom Mobile Inc. and their brands Fizz and VMedia; 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.

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

Company	Proportion	Amount
Rogers	41.30 %	\$ 2,323.66
TELUS	35.75 %	\$ 2,011.40
Bell Canada	22.95 %	\$ 1,291.24

Directions regarding costs

16. The Commission approves the application by the Manitoba Coalition for costs with respect to its participation in the proceeding.
17. Pursuant to subsection 56(1) of the *Telecommunications Act*, the Commission fixes the costs to be paid to the Manitoba Coalition at \$5,626.30.

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. However, the 2025 TORs are not readily available to the Commission, so the 2024 TORs were used.

18. The Commission directs that the award of costs to the Manitoba Coalition be paid forthwith by Rogers Communications Canada Inc., TELUS Communications Inc., and Bell Canada according to the proportions set out in paragraph 15.

Secretary General

Related documents

- *Making it easier for consumers to shop for Internet services*, Telecom Notice of Consultation CRTC 2024-318, 4 December 2024, as amended by Telecom Notices of Consultation CRTC 2024-318-1, 14 February 2025; 2024-318-2, 28 February 2025; 2024-318-3, 17 June 2025; and 2024-318-4, 24 July 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