# Telecom Order CRTC 2026-200

PDF version

Gatineau, 6 August 2026

*File numbers: 1011-NOC2025-0094 and 4754-809*

## Determination of costs award for the Manitoba Coalition's participation in the proceeding initiated by Broadcasting and Telecom Notice of Consultation 2025-94

### Application

1. By letter dated 4 November 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 for its participation in the proceeding initiated by Broadcasting and Telecom Notice of Consultation 2025-94 (the proceeding). In the proceeding, the Commission gathered views on how it can better support people, including public interest groups, to participate in its proceedings.

2. 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 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 the Manitoba Coalition has submitted it represents, the Manitoba Coalition explained that this group or class consists of Manitoba consumers, including First Nations, Inuit and Métis living in Winnipeg, and vulnerable consumers. With respect to the specific methods by which the Manitoba Coalition has submitted that it represents this group or class, the Manitoba Coalition explained that each of its member organizations directly engages with the communities it supports, by conducting primary consumer research or by advocating for and seeking to empower Winnipeg's Indigenous community. The Manitoba Coalition also indicated that its submissions were directly informed by its member organizations' expertise on the perspectives of Manitoba consumers and their experience with boards, courts, and regulators.

4. The Manitoba Coalition explained that it assisted the Commission in developing a better understanding of the matters that were considered by providing submissions that were concise, focused, and responsive to the issues and questions raised. The Manitoba Coalition further submitted that it contributed to the record, considered the submissions of other parties, and maintained consistent emphasis on the needs and interests of Manitoba consumers throughout the

proceeding. The Manitoba Coalition added that it provided the Commission with submissions grounded in its history of intervening in regulatory proceedings and a distinct point of view as the only intervener presenting a province-specific, consumer-focused perspective.

5. The Manitoba Coalition also submitted that it participated in the proceeding in a responsible way by participating thoroughly, efficiently, and in good faith at all stages.

6. The Manitoba Coalition requested that the Commission fix its costs at $9,927, consisting entirely of legal fees. The Manitoba Coalition filed a bill of costs with its application.

7. The Manitoba Coalition claimed 6 hours for external counsel at a rate of $165 per hour to review the file and prepare its intervention, comments, and reply, and 66.2 hours for another external counsel at a rate of $135 per hour to review the file, conduct research, consult with the client, and prepare its intervention, comments, and reply.

8. The Manitoba Coalition submitted that Bell Canada; Bragg Communications Inc., carrying on business as Eastlink (Eastlink); Cogeco Communications Inc., on behalf of its subsidiary Cogeco Connexion Inc. (Cogeco); Rogers Communications Canada Inc. (Rogers); and TELUS Communications Inc. (TELUS) are the appropriate parties to be required to pay any costs awarded by the Commission (the costs respondents) because, in the applicant's view, they had a significant interest and participated actively in the proceeding.

9. The Manitoba Coalition suggested that the responsibility for payment of costs should be divided among the costs respondents on the basis of their respective operating revenues.

10. The Commission did not receive any answers in response to the application for costs.

## Commission's analysis

11. 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.

12. 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, the Manitoba Coalition has demonstrated that it meets this requirement. The Manitoba Coalition’s member organizations represent a broad range of needs and interests of Manitoba consumers, including First Nations, Inuit and Métis living in Winnipeg, and vulnerable consumers. These consumers have an interest in the outcome of the proceeding because their representation in proceedings may be affected by changes to the public interest participation framework.

13. The Manitoba Coalition has satisfied the second criterion through its participation in the proceeding. In particular, the Manitoba Coalition’s submissions regarding its experience in intervening and navigating the costs processes of provincial and federal boards, courts, and tribunals assisted the Commission in developing a better understanding of the matters that were considered. These submissions included advocating for a single fund administered by the Commission, simplified procedures for frequent interveners, and direct consultation with Indigenous rights holders, as well as asking the Commission to consider holding more regional hearings to address and reduce barriers to participation.

14. Finally, the Manitoba Coalition 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.

15. The rates claimed for 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.

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 a proceeding and have participated actively in that proceeding. The Commission therefore considers that the following parties are the appropriate costs respondents: Bell Canada, Cogeco, Eastlink, Rogers, and TELUS.

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.[1]

---

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

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. The Commission acknowledges that the current framework for calculating TORs might allow certain costs respondents to choose the entity through which they intervene in a given proceeding due to their corporate structure. To maintain a consistent, simple, and predictable telecommunications costs award process, and absent compelling reasons to depart from its established practice, the Commission maintains its approach of limiting costs respondents to the specific telecommunications service providers that have a significant interest in the outcome of a proceeding and participated actively in it. The Commission also notes that the framework for calculating TORs is being examined as part of the substantive proceeding.

21. The Commission notes that, in the notice of consultation and three interim costs orders related to this proceeding, it determined that the telecommunications costs award process will be used in this proceeding.[2] This promotes simplicity and ease of access. The Commission maintains that it is not necessary to split costs between broadcasting and telecommunications for this combined proceeding because the comments made by parties related to issues relevant to both that cannot be untangled. It is therefore more administratively efficient to proceed exclusively under the telecommunications costs award process in the present case.

22. Accordingly, the Commission finds that the responsibility for payment of costs should be allocated as follows:[3]

| **Company** | **Proportion** | **Amount** |
|---|---|---|
| Rogers | 41.30% | $4,099.85 |
| TELUS | 35.75% | $3,548.90 |
| Bell Canada | 22.95% | $2,278.25 |

[2] See Broadcasting and Telecom Notice of Consultation 2025-94, paragraph 49, and Telecom Orders 2025-219, paragraph 18; 2025-198, paragraph 16; and 2025-197, paragraph 16.

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

### Directions regarding costs

23. The Commission approves the application by the Manitoba Coalition for costs for its participation in the proceeding.

24. Pursuant to subsection 56(1) of the *Telecommunications Act*, the Commission fixes the costs to be paid to the Manitoba Coalition at $9,927.

25. 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 22.

Secretary General

## Related documents

- *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

- *Determination of interim costs award with respect to the participation of the Deaf Wireless Canada Consultative Committee in the proceeding initiated by Broadcasting and Telecom Notice of Consultation 2025-94*, Telecom Order CRTC 2025-198, 7 August 2025

- *Determination of interim costs award with respect to the participation of the Public Interest Advocacy Centre in the proceeding initiated by Broadcasting and Telecom Notice of Consultation 2025-94*, Telecom Order CRTC 2025-197, 7 August 2025

- *Call for comments – A new approach to funding public interest participation in Commission proceedings*, Broadcasting and Telecom Notice of Consultation CRTC 2025-94, 12 May 2025, as amended by Broadcasting and Telecom Notice of Consultation CRTC 2025-94-1, 14 November 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