



Telecom Order CRTC 2026-187

PDF version

Gatineau, 27 July 2026

File numbers: 8622-C304-202600361 and 4754-853

Determination of costs award for the Canada Anti-Monopoly Project's participation in the proceeding initiated by an application regarding the ongoing dispute between Community Fibre Company Inc. and Bell Canada

Application

1. By letter dated 6 April 2026, the Canada Anti-Monopoly Project (CAMP) applied for costs for its participation in the proceeding initiated by an application regarding the ongoing dispute between the Community Fibre Company Inc. (CFC) and Bell Canada regarding the disconnection of CFC-operated facilities (the proceeding). In the proceeding, the CFC requested that the Commission grant it expedited interim relief to ensure that Bell Canada did not disconnect, on 3 November 2025, CFC facilities installed on Bell Canada-owned support structures.
2. CAMP 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 assisted the Commission in developing a better understanding of the matters that were considered, and it participated in a responsible way.
3. With respect to the group or class of subscribers that CAMP submitted it represents, CAMP explained that it represents the interests of telecommunications consumers in rural Ottawa-area communities served by the CFC's network. More specifically, CAMP's subscriber constituency includes more than 1,300 newsletter subscribers and more than 1,900 social media followers, including consumers with a direct stake in the support structure access framework.
4. CAMP explained that it assisted the Commission in developing a better understanding of the matters that were considered by providing a distinct point of view and analysis of the issues under consideration. Specifically, CAMP explained that it addressed the following matters: (i) the alleged systemic pattern of Bell Canada support structure disputes; (ii) the gap in the Building Broadband Faster in Ontario guideline's documentation and notification requirements; and (iii) the jurisdictional question of support structures owned by provincially regulated utility companies carrying federal telecommunications facilities.
5. CAMP also submitted that it participated in the proceeding in a responsible way.

6. CAMP requested that the Commission fix its costs at \$4,201.74, consisting entirely of consultant fees. CAMP's claim included the Ontario Harmonized Sales Tax (HST) on fees less the rebate to which CAMP is entitled in connection with the HST. CAMP filed a bill of costs with its application.
7. CAMP claimed 24.5 hours for a consultant at a rate of \$165 per hour for work reviewing the file, conducting research, preparing its intervention, managing the case, and preparing its cost application (\$4,201.74 including the HST and associated rebate).
8. CAMP submitted that Bell Canada is the appropriate party to be required to pay any costs awarded by the Commission (the costs respondent) because, in CAMP's view, it had the most significant interest in the outcome of the proceeding, since it is the sole party opposing the relief requested.
9. The Commission did not receive any answers in response to the application for costs.

Commission's analysis

10. The criteria for an award of final 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.
11. In Telecom Information Bulletin 2016-188, the Commission provided guidance on how an applicant may demonstrate that it satisfies the first criterion with respect to its representation of interested subscribers. In the present case, CAMP has demonstrated that it meets this requirement. Consistent with its determinations in Telecom Orders 2025-219 and 2026-99, the Commission considers that CAMP represents a broad range of views and the subscribers who support its research and advocacy on market concentration and anti-monopoly issues.
12. CAMP has satisfied the second criterion through its participation in the proceeding. In particular, CAMP's submissions, especially regarding (i) the alleged systemic pattern of Bell Canada support structure disputes; (ii) the gap in the Building Broadband Faster in Ontario guideline's documentation and notification requirements; and (iii) the jurisdictional question of support structures owned by provincially regulated utility companies carrying federal telecommunications

facilities, assisted the Commission in developing a better understanding of the matters that were considered.

13. Finally, CAMP has satisfied the third criterion by participating in the proceeding in a responsible way. Accordingly, the Commission finds that the applicant meets the criteria for an award of costs under section 68 of the Rules of Procedure.
14. The rates claimed for 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 CAMP was necessarily and reasonably incurred and should be allowed.
15. 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.
16. 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 a proceeding and have participated actively in that proceeding. The Commission therefore considers that the following parties are the appropriate costs respondents: Bell Canada and the CFC.
17. 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
18. 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.
19. Accordingly, the Commission finds that the responsibility for payment of costs should be allocated as follows:²

Company	Proportion	Amount
Bell Canada	100%	\$4,201.74

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.

Directions regarding costs

20. The Commission approves the application by CAMP for costs for its participation in the proceeding.
21. Pursuant to subsection 56(1) of the *Telecommunications Act*, the Commission fixes the costs to be paid to CAMP at \$4,201.74.
22. The Commission directs that the award of costs to CAMP be paid forthwith by Bell Canada.

Secretary General

Related documents

- *Determination of costs award with respect to the participation of the Canadian Anti-Monopoly Project in the proceeding initiated by Telecom and Broadcasting Notice of Consultation 2025-227*, Telecom Order CRTC 2026-99, 26 May 2026
- *Determination of interim costs award with respect to the participation of the Canadian Anti-Monopoly Project in the proceeding initiated by Broadcasting and Telecom Notice of Consultation 2025-94*, Telecom Order CRTC 2025-219, 27 August 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
- *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