



Telecom Order CRTC 2023-372

PDF version

Ottawa, 17 November 2023

File numbers: 1011-NOC2022-0065 and 4754-697

Determination of costs award with respect to the participation of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Coalition in the proceeding initiated by Telecom Notice of Consultation 2022-65

Application

1. By letter dated 3 August 2022, the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Coalition (the DHH Coalition), which is composed of the Deafness Advocacy Association Nova Scotia (DAANS), the Newfoundland and Labrador Association of the Deaf (NLAD), and the Ontario Association of the Deaf (OAD), applied for costs with respect to its participation in the proceeding initiated by Telecom Notice of Consultation 2022-65 (the proceeding). In the proceeding, the Commission sought to address disparities in the cost of next-generation 9-1-1 (NG9-1-1) services across Canada in order to prevent certain customers, including vulnerable and rural residents, from facing significantly higher access costs to NG9-1-1 services. Specifically, the Commission asked for input from parties on whether NG9-1-1 services should be funded, at least in part, through the National Contribution Fund.
2. The Commission did not receive any interventions in response to the application for costs.
3. The DHH 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 DHH Coalition submitted that each of its member organizations represents the interests of Deaf Canadians. Specifically, (i) DAANS works with the public, private, and non-profit sectors to remove barriers faced by Deaf, hard-of-hearing, deaf-blind, and late-deafened Nova Scotians; (ii) NLAD protects and promotes the rights of people who are Deaf or who communicate in American Sign Language in Newfoundland and Labrador; and (iii) OAD protects and promotes the rights of Deaf Ontarians while providing resources and support to the Deaf community of Ontario.

5. The DHH Coalition requested that the Commission fix its costs at \$6,868.10 consisting of \$6,825 for consulting fees and \$43.10 for disbursements. The DHH Coalition filed a bill of costs with its application.
6. The DHH Coalition claimed 53.5 hours for an external consultant at a rate of \$110 per hour for reviewing the file, researching, and preparing the intervention; one day for an in-house consultant at a rate of \$470 per day for reviewing the file, researching and preparing the reply; and one day for an in-house consultant at a rate of \$470 per day for reviewing the file and preparing the intervention and the reply.
7. The DHH Coalition submitted that the communications service providers who participated in the proceeding are the appropriate parties to be required to pay any costs awarded by the Commission (the costs respondents).

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 DHH Coalition has demonstrated that it meets this requirement because all of its members represent Deaf and Hard of Hearing sign-language users to whom accessible NG9-1-1 services are integral, and the collective expertise of the DHH Coalition's members provides a unique and important point of view for the Commission to consider.
10. The DHH Coalition's contributions were focused, structured and adhered to relevant deadlines in the proceeding.
11. The rates claimed in respect of consultant fees are in accordance with the rates established in the *Guidelines for the Assessment of Costs* (the Guidelines), as set out in Telecom Regulatory Policy 2010-963. The Commission finds that the total amount

claimed by the DHH Coalition was necessarily and reasonably incurred and should be allowed.

12. 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.
13. 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: 9315-1884 Québec inc.; Bell Canada; Brooke Telecom Co-operative Ltd.; Bruce Telecom Ontario Inc.; City West Cable & Telephone Corp.; Cochrane Telecom Services; CoopTel coop de télécommunication; Execulink Telecom Inc.; Gosfield North Communications Co-operative Limited; Hay Communications Co-operative Limited; Huron Telecommunications Co-operative Limited; Lansdowne Rural Telephone Company Ltd.; Mornington Communications Co-operative Limited; Nexicom Inc.; North Frontenac Telephone Corporation Ltd.; North Renfrew Telephone Company Limited; Quadro Communications Co-operative Inc.; Quebecor Media Inc.; Rogers Communications Canada Inc. (RCCI); Saskatchewan Telecommunications; Shaw Communications Inc. (Shaw)¹; Sogetel inc.; SSI Canada; TELUS Communications Inc. (TCI); TBayTel; Tuckersmith Communications Co-operative Limited; Wightman Telecom Ltd.; WTC Communications; and Xplornet Communications Inc.
14. 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.
15. 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.
16. Accordingly, the Commission finds that the responsibility for payment of costs should be allocated as follows:²

¹ The Commission is aware of the recent transaction between RCCI and Shaw. Due to the complexity involved in determining the new telecommunications operating revenue (TOR) amounts contrasted with the relatively small costs amount in question, the Commission maintained separate TORs for Shaw for the calculation in this application. (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 2021 audited financial statements.

Company	Proportion	Amount
RCCI	38.18%	\$2,622.22
TCI	35.97%	\$2,470.30
Bell Canada	25.85%	\$1,775.58

Directions regarding costs

17. The Commission **approves** the application by the DHH Coalition for costs with respect to its participation in the proceeding.
18. Pursuant to subsection 56(1) of the *Telecommunications Act*, the Commission fixes the costs to be paid to the DHH Coalition at \$6,868.10.
19. The Commission **directs** that the award of costs to the DHH Coalition be paid forthwith by RCCI, TCI and Bell Canada according to the proportions set out in paragraph 16.

Secretary General

Related documents

- *Call for comments – Funding next-generation 9-1-1 access services through the National Contribution Fund*, Telecom Notice of Consultation CRTC 2022-65, 8 March 2022; as amended by Telecom Notice of Consultation CRTC 2022-65-1, 24 March 2022
- *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