



Telecom Order CRTC 2026-99

PDF version

Gatineau, 26 May 2026

File numbers: 1101-NOC2025-227 and 4754-834

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

Application

1. By letter dated 14 January 2026, the Canadian Anti-Monopoly Project (CAMP) 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. Rogers Communications Canada Inc. (Rogers) filed an answer, dated 22 January 2026, in response to CAMP's application. On 27 January 2026, CAMP replied to Rogers' answer.
3. On 11 March 2026, CAMP filed an amendment to its costs application to correct paragraph references and its business number.
4. 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 had assisted the Commission in developing a better understanding of the matters that were considered, and it had participated in a responsible way.
5. With respect to the group or class of subscribers that CAMP has submitted it represents, CAMP explained that this group or class includes more than 1,200 Canadians who subscribe to its newsletter and more than 1,600 Canadians who follow its analysis on LinkedIn. CAMP explained that these individuals are sufficiently concerned with competition policy that they have sought out expert examination and commentary on the issue. CAMP submitted that it therefore represents a broad public interest in ensuring that Canadian telecommunications markets are fair, competitive, and consumer-protective.

6. CAMP requested that the Commission fix its costs at \$19,379.43, consisting entirely of consultant fees. CAMP's claim included the Ontario Harmonized Sales Tax (HST) on fees, minus the rebate to which CAMP is entitled in connection with the HST. CAMP filed a bill of costs with its application.
7. CAMP claimed 113 hours at a rate of \$165 per hour for a consultant for work reviewing the file, conducting research, managing the case, and preparing its interventions, reply comments, and costs application (\$19,379.43 with the HST and associated rebate).
8. CAMP 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).
9. CAMP suggested that the responsibility for payment of costs should be divided among the costs respondents on the basis of their gross revenues.

Answer

10. Rogers submitted that CAMP failed to meet the subscriber representation requirement¹ as set out in subparagraph 66(1)(a)(i) of the Rules of Procedure. Rogers explained that CAMP operates as a policy advocacy organization representing broad ideological interests rather than a specific group or class of subscribers. Rogers submitted that a person's decision to follow an organization's commentary does not constitute membership in a class for the purpose of being represented in Commission proceedings. Rogers explained that legitimate subscriber representation must be grounded in tangible, shared characteristics, not abstract ideological preferences that bear no connection to regulatory outcomes. However, Rogers added that it has no concern with CAMP's participation, nor does it dispute that its participation may have provided a unique perspective to the Commission.

Reply

11. CAMP noted that Rogers made similar eligibility arguments in response to an application for costs made by CAMP in a separate proceeding. The Commission did not accept those arguments in Telecom Order 2025-219, where the Commission found that CAMP represents a broad range of views and the subscribers who support its research and advocacy. CAMP acknowledged that Rogers distinguished between the current application for costs and the one that was the subject of Telecom Order 2025-219, which was an application for interim costs. However, CAMP submitted that the eligibility criterion is the same for both interim and final costs, so the distinction is without merit. CAMP further noted that in paragraph 15 of Telecom Information

¹ The requirement in question is that the applicant must demonstrate that they have, or represent a group or a class of subscribers that has, an interest in the outcome of the proceeding.

Bulletin 2016-188, the Commission explicitly contemplates representation through social media and other forms of digital communications, which is how CAMP engages with its represented group.

Commission's analysis

12. 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.
13. 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, CAMP has demonstrated that it meets this requirement. Consistent with its determinations in Telecom Order 2025-219, the Commission considers that CAMP represents a broad range of views and the subscribers who support its research and advocacy in market concentration and anti-monopoly issues.
14. CAMP has also satisfied the remaining criteria through its participation in the proceeding. In particular, CAMP's submissions, especially its substantive analysis on several key issues, including international precedents, wholesale market information asymmetries, vertical integration concerns, and vulnerable populations, assisted the Commission in developing a better understanding of the matters that were considered. CAMP further assisted the Commission by making recommendations for enhanced protections for seniors, persons with disabilities, and residents of remote communities, who face disproportionate harm during outages. CAMP also participated in a responsible way.
15. 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 CAMP was necessarily and reasonably incurred and should be allowed.
16. 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.

17. 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. (Quebecor); 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.
18. 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.²
19. 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.
20. Accordingly, the Commission finds that the responsibility for payment of costs should be allocated as follows:³

Company	Proportion	Amount
Rogers	36.38%	\$7,050.24
TELUS	31.49%	\$6,102.58
Bell Canada	20.22%	\$3,918.52
Quebecor	11.91%	\$2,308.09

Directions regarding costs

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

² TORs consist of Canadian telecommunications revenues from local and access, long distance, data, private line, Internet, and wireless services.

³ In this order, the Commission has used the TORs of the costs respondents based on their most recent audited financial statements.

22. Pursuant to subsection 56(1) of the *Telecommunications Act*, the Commission fixes the costs to be paid to CAMP at \$19,379.43.
23. The Commission directs that the award of costs to CAMP be paid forthwith by Rogers Communications Canada Inc., TELUS Communications Inc., Bell Canada, and Quebecor Media Inc. according to the proportions set out in paragraph 20.

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
- *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
- *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