



Telecom Costs Order CRTC 2007-5

Ottawa, 14 March 2007

Application for costs by Public Interest Law Centre on behalf of the Consumers Association of Canada (Manitoba Branch), Manitoba Society of Seniors, and Manitoba Keewatinook Ininew Okimowin – Review of price cap framework, Telecom Public Notice CRTC 2006-5

Reference: 8678-C12-200605553 and 4754-282

1. By letter dated 12 December 2006, the Public Interest Law Centre (PILC) applied for costs on behalf of Consumers Association of Canada (Manitoba Branch), Manitoba Society of Seniors, and Manitoba Keewatinook Ininew Okimowin (CAC/MSOS/MKIO) with respect to their participation in the proceeding initiated by *Review of Price Cap Framework*, Telecom Public Notice CRTC 2006-5, 9 May 2006 (the PN 2006-5 proceeding).
2. By letter dated 21 December 2006, TELUS Communications Company (TCC) filed comments, and by letter dated 29 December 2006, Bragg Communications Inc. (EastLink) filed comments.
3. PILC did not file a reply to the comments submitted regarding the application.

The application

4. PILC submitted that CAC/MSOS/MKIO had met the criteria for an award of costs set out in subsection 44(1) of the *CRTC Telecommunications Rules of Procedure* (the Rules) as they represent a group of subscribers that had an interest in the outcome of the PN 2006-5 proceeding, they had participated responsibly in the PN 2006-5 proceeding, and they had contributed to a better understanding of the issues by the Commission.
5. PILC filed a bill of costs with its application, claiming a total amount of \$27,883.50 for legal and consultant fees, as well as disbursements. PILC did not name any costs respondents or take any position as to the allocation of its costs.
6. In answer to the application, TCC stated that it did not oppose PILC's entitlement to costs or the amount claimed. TCC submitted that the following parties should be named as cost respondents, on the basis of their participation in the proceeding and their significant interest in its outcome: Bell Aliant Regional Communications, Limited Partnership (Bell Aliant), Bell Canada, and Saskatchewan Telecommunications (SaskTel) (collectively, the Companies); TCC; MTS Allstream Inc. (MTS Allstream); and Quebecor Media Inc. (Quebecor), Cogeco Cable Inc. (Cogeco), Rogers Communications Inc. (Rogers), Shaw Communications Inc. (Shaw), and EastLink (collectively, the competitors). TCC submitted that any costs ordered should be allocated among the parties in proportion to their respective share of telecommunications operating revenues (TORs).

7. In answer to the application, EastLink submitted that while it did not oppose PILC's costs application, it was unable to comment on PILC's participation and the cost amount claimed because of its own limited participation in the proceeding. EastLink submitted that it was not an appropriate costs respondent due to this limited participation, which consisted entirely of responding to interrogatories posed by the Commission.

Commission's analysis and determinations

8. The Commission finds that PILC has satisfied the criteria for an award of costs set out in subsection 44(1) of the Rules. Specifically, the Commission finds that CAC/MSOS/MK10 are representative of a group or class of subscribers that has an interest in the outcome of the proceeding, have participated in a responsible way, and have contributed to a better understanding of the issues by the Commission.
9. The Commission is of the view that this is an appropriate case in which to fix the costs and dispense with taxation in accordance with the streamlined procedure set out in *New procedure for Telecom costs award*, Telecom Public Notice CRTC 2002-5, 7 November 2002.
10. The Commission notes that the rates claimed in respect of legal fees are in accordance with the rates set out in the Legal Directorate's *Guidelines for the Taxation of Costs*, revised as of 15 May 1998. The Commission also finds that the total amount claimed by PILC was necessarily and reasonably incurred and should be allowed.
11. The Commission notes that the incumbent local exchange carriers and several of their competitors were active participants in the proceeding, will be affected by the outcome, and should therefore be cost respondents.
12. The Commission agrees with EastLink's assessment of its limited participation in the proceeding, noting that it only submitted responses to interrogatory questions posed by the Commission. Accordingly, the Commission considers that EastLink is not an appropriate costs respondent in this proceeding.
13. In light of the above, the Commission determines that this cost award shall be allocated in the following proportions, based on relative TORs:

Companies	62.3%
TCC	21.4%
MTS Allstream	9.3%
Shaw	2.5%
Rogers	2.1%
Quebecor	1.8%
Cogeco	0.6%

14. Consistent with its general approach articulated in *Action Réseau Consommateur, the Consumers' Association of Canada, Fédération des associations coopératives d'économie familiale* and the *National Anti-Poverty Organization application for costs – Public Notice CRTC 2001-60*, Telecom Costs Order CRTC 2002-4, 24 April 2002, the Commission makes

Bell Canada responsible for payment on behalf of the Companies, and leaves it to the members of the Companies to determine the appropriate allocation of the costs among themselves.

Direction as to costs

15. The Commission **approves** the application by PILC, on behalf of CAC/MSOS/MKIO, for an award of costs with respect to their participation in the PN 2006-5 proceeding.
16. Pursuant to subsection 56(1) of the *Telecommunications Act*, the Commission fixes the costs to be paid to PILC at \$27,883.50.
17. The Commission directs that the award of costs to PILC be paid forthwith by the costs respondents in the proportions indicated above in paragraph 13.

Secretary General

This document is available in alternative format upon request, and may also be examined in PDF format or in HTML at the following Internet site: <http://www.crtc.gc.ca>