

Stephen Schmidt
Vice-President – Telecom Policy & Chief Regulatory Legal Counsel
Telecom Policy & Regulatory Affairs

(613) 597-8363 Telephone
(613) 597-8374 Facsimile
regulatory.affairs@telus.com

August 14, 2015

Mr. John Traversy
Secretary General
Canadian Radio-television and
Telecommunications Commission
Ottawa, ON K1A 0N2

Dear Mr. Traversy:

Re: *Review of Basic Telecommunications Services, Telecom Notice of Consultation CRTC 2015-134 (as amended) (“TNC 2015-134”) – Requests for Information from TELUS Communications Company (“TELUS”)*

1. In accordance with the proceeding schedule established by the Commission in TNC 2015-134, please find attached requests for information from TELUS addressed to the following parties:
 - The Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now, Canada (ACORN Canada); the Consumers’ Association of Canada (CAC); the Council of Senior Citizens Organizations of British Columbia (COSCO); the National Pensioners Federation (NPF); and the Public Interest Advocacy Centre (PIAC) - together the “Affordable Access Coalition” (“AAC”).
 - Axia NetMedia Corporation (“Axia”)
 - Bell Canada, on its own behalf, and on behalf of its affiliates, specifically, Bell Aliant Regional Communications, Limited Partnership (which effective 1 July 2015 was wound-up into Bell Canada, and is now operated as a division of Bell Canada), Bell Canada, Bell Mobility Inc., Câblevision du Nord du Québec inc. (“CVQ”), DMTS, KMTS, NorthernTel, Limited Partnership, Northwestel Inc., Ontera and Télébec, Société en commandite (“Bell Canada”)
 - Canadian Independent Telephone Company Joint Task Force (“CITC-JTF”)
 - Layton, Roslyn (“Layton”)
 - Klass, Benjamin and Marc Nanni (“Klass and Nanni”)
 - McKelvey, Fenwick (“McKelvey”) McNally, Michael, Dinesh Rathi, Jen Evaniew and Celine Bureau-Brennan (“McNally *et al.*”)

- Middleton, Catherine (“Middleton”)
- Province of British Columbia (“PoBC”)
- Shaw Cablesystems G.P. (“Shaw”)
- Shepherd, Tamara (“Shepherd”)
- Telesat Canada (“Telesat”)
- WIND Mobile Corp. (“WIND”)
- Winseck, Dwayne and David Ellis (“Winseck and Ellis”)

Requests for Information addressed to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now, Canada (ACORN Canada); the Consumers’ Association of Canada (CAC); the Council of Senior Citizens Organizations of British Columbia (COSCO); the National Pensioners Federation (NPF); and the Public Interest Advocacy Centre (PIAC) - together the “Affordable Access Coalition” (“AAC”).

AAC(TELUS)14Aug15-1

At Pages 10-11, Paragraph 49 of its July 14, 2015 Intervention, the Affordable Access Coalition (“AAC”) makes the following statement.

First of all, as the AAC will explain, the 5 Mbps target, may have been appropriate for 2013 but is likely is too low for 2015 and beyond. The AAC comes to this conclusion based on the legal test for “basic telecommunication service”, and the “50-80 rule” which considers a telecommunications service as “basic” for the purposes of determining required universal service if 50% of the population subscribes to a service, and 80% of those subscribers do so at given speed. For example, if 50% of Canadian households subscribed to broadband Internet service, and 80% of those subscribing households did so at 5 Mbps, then that is considered, legally, “basic” service. Indeed, in 2013, the 5 Mbps speed appears to have met that test. In 2015 however the AAC believes that “basic” broadband service is closer to 10 Mbps, and expects that “basic” broadband is likely to be 25 Mbps by 2020. (footnote omitted)

In fact, the AAC refers to the “50-80 rule” repeatedly throughout its July 14, 2015 intervention. These references appear at the following pages/paragraphs.¹

- Executive Summary, Paragraph E26.
- Executive Summary, Paragraph E35 (Key Position 6).
- Executive Summary, Paragraph E53 (Glossary and List of Abbreviations).
- Pages 10-11, paragraph 49.

¹ Both page numbers and paragraph numbers are provided for reference purposes because the paragraph numbering is not consistent throughout the AAC Intervention. For example, the order of the paragraph numbering changes on pp. 72, 85, 87, 91 and 93.

- Page 14, paragraph 60 (Key Position 6).
 - Page 72, paragraph 262 (Brief Answer).
 - Page 79, paragraph 178 (Rule Referenced Twice in this paragraph).
 - Page 79, paragraph 181.
 - Page 79, paragraph 182.
 - Page 81, paragraph 184.
 - Page 114, paragraph 354.
- (i) Please provide a complete list of all jurisdictions that have formally adopted the so-called “50-80 rule” as the legal standard for purposes of determining when a telecommunications service is considered “basic.”
- (ii) For all of the jurisdictions listed in (i), please provide the date on which the so-called “50-80 rule” became the legal standard for determining when a telecommunications service is considered basic.
- (iii) For all of the jurisdictions listed in (i), please provide a paper copy of the formal regulatory decision implementing the so-called “50-80 rule” or a link (URL = Uniform Resource Locator) to the formal decision.

AAC(TELUS)14Aug15-2

In paragraph 111, footnote 59, and again in paragraph 114, footnote 61 of AAC’s July 14, 2015 intervention, reference is made to a report by ComScore entitled *Canada Digital Future in Focus 2015* (27 March 2015). Reference is also made to a press release for iGR’s report *U.S. Home Broadband & WiFi Usage Forecast*, at paragraph 208, footnote 164. Please provide a copy of the reports on the public record.

Request for Information addressed to Axia NetMedia Corporation (“Axia”)

Axia(TELUS)14Aug15-1

In paragraph 4 of Section 4.2 (Next Generation Network Technical Summary) of Axia’s “Response to CRTC’s Review of Basic Telecommunications Services for all Canadians,” dated June 30, 2015, Axia states for following:

Based on increasing global standards, the upload and download speeds necessary in this digital age need to be scalable, from speeds of 25 Mbps to 1 Gbps, with no penalties for exceeding download caps.

- (i) Please provide references for the “global standards” for Internet speeds referred to in this statement with paper copies or URL links to the cited sources.
- (ii) Are these “global standards” mandated by regulators in Canada or in any other country outside of Canada? If so, please indicate in which countries this is the case and the relevant regulatory decisions mandating these standards.

Requests for Information addressed to Bell Canada, on its own behalf, and on behalf of its affiliates, specifically, Bell Aliant Regional Communications, Limited Partnership (which effective 1 July 2015 was wound-up into Bell Canada, and is now operated as a division of Bell Canada), Bell Canada, Bell Mobility Inc., Câblevision du Nord du Québec inc. (CVQ), DMTS, KMTS, NorthernTel, Limited Partnership, Northwestel Inc., Ontera and Télébec, Société en commandite (“Bell Canada”)

Bell Canada(TELUS)14Aug15-1

Reference: Bell Canada Intervention, July 14, 2015, Appendix 6 (Abridged). Please provide copies of the following documents for the public record which are referred to in Appendix 6:

- (i) The expert opinion entitled “The Appropriate Pricing Standard for Wholesale Loops,” prepared by Joseph Gillan and George Hariton, referred to in footnote 22 on page 9.
- (ii) The report entitled “Bell Aliant and Bell Canada, Statistical Analysis of Residence Primary Exchange Service Costs in Canada,” prepared by HDR Decision Economics, referred to in footnote 34 on page 15.
- (iii) The expert report entitled “Expert Report of Mr. Steven E. Turner on behalf of Bell Canada and Bell Aliant, prepared by Steven Turner, FTI Consulting, referred to in footnote 36 on page 15.

Bell Canada(TELUS)14Aug15-2

Please provide an estimate of the total financial gain to Bell Canada, on its own behalf, and on behalf of its affiliates, if its proposal to eliminate the local voice service subsidies in Bands E and F, as recommended in Recommendation 10.3 on page 26 of Appendix 6, were to have been implemented as of year-end 2014.

Bell Canada(TELUS)14Aug15-3

Please provide an estimate of the proportion of the total local voice subsidy for Bands G and H1 received by Bell Canada, on its own behalf, and on behalf of its affiliates, as of year-end 2014.

Request for Information addressed to Canadian Independent Telephone Company Joint Task Force (“CITC-JTF”)

CITC-JTF(TELUS)14Aug15-1

In its responses to the Commission’s questions in Appendix B to TNC 2015-134, the CITC-JTF states on page 17 of its Answers that assuming that adequate subsidy funds are made available, the JTF would support including broadband in the BSO and raising this

target to 10 Mbps download and 3 Mbps upload as a target to be achieved over the course of the next five years.

- (i) What level of subsidy (financial sum in dollars) does the CITC-JTF consider adequate that should be available to all eligible carriers on a yearly basis?
- (ii) What speed target does the CITC-JTF propose including in the BSO if no subsidy funding were available?

Requests for Information addressed to Klass, Benjamin and Marc Nanni (“Klass and Nanni”)

Klass and Nanni(TELUS)14Aug15-1

As regards your July 13, 2015 intervention in this proceeding:

- (i) Did you receive any funding to support your intervention? If so, from whom?
- (ii) Do you have a position at a university, or elsewhere, or are you in a centre, institute, or similar organization, that supported your intervention? If so, please describe your position at the centre, institute, or similar organization and identify the source(s) of funding.
- (iii) Please describe any other entities with which you are or have been affiliated which have interests or have intervened before the CRTC or Industry Canada with respect to telecommunications policy and regulation issues.

Klass and Nanni(TELUS)14Aug15-2

Please provide current copies of your curriculum vitae for the public record.

Requests for Information addressed to Roslyn Layton (“Layton”)

Layton(TELUS)14Aug15-1

As regards your July 13, 2015 intervention in this proceeding:

- (i) Did you receive any funding to support your intervention? If so, from whom?
- (ii) Do you have a position at a university, or elsewhere, or are you in a centre, institute, or similar organization, that supported your intervention? If so, please describe your position at the centre, institute, or similar organization and identify the source(s) of funding.
- (iii) Please describe any other entities with which you are or have been affiliated which have interests or have intervened before the CRTC or Industry Canada with respect to telecommunications policy and regulation issues.

Layton(TELUS)14Aug15-2

Please provide a current copy of your curriculum vitae for the public record.

Layton(TELUS)14Aug15-3

Please provide paper copies for the public record of the following articles referred to in your July 13, 2015 intervention:

- (i) Justin (Gus) Hurwitz and Roslyn Layton, “Debatable Premises in Telecom Policy,” *CMI Working Paper No. 5* (Center for Communication, Media and Information Studies, Aalborg University, 2014 (referred to in footnote 38).
- (ii) Roslyn Layton, “Testing Telecom Assumptions,” *InterMEDIA*, March 2015, Volume 43, Issue 1 (referred to in footnote 38).
- (iii) When available, a copy of the forthcoming article that will appear in the *Journal of Information Technology & Privacy Law* (referred to in paragraph 55).

Requests for Information addressed to Fenwick McKelvey (“McKelvey”)

McKelvey(TELUS)14Aug15-1

As regards your July 14, 2015 intervention in this proceeding:

- (i) Did you receive any funding to support your intervention? If so, from whom?
- (ii) Do you have a position at a university, or elsewhere, or are you in a centre, institute, or similar organization, that supported your intervention? If so, please describe your position at the centre, institute, or similar organization and identify the source(s) of funding.
- (iii) Please describe any other entities with which you are or have been affiliated which have interests or have intervened before the CRTC or Industry Canada with respect to telecommunications policy and regulation issues.

McKelvey(TELUS)14Aug15-2

Please provide a current copy of your curriculum vitae for the public record.

Requests for Information addressed to McNally, Michael, Dinesh Rathi, Jen Evaniew and Celine Gareau-Brennan (“McNally *et al.*”)

McNally *et al.*(TELUS)14Aug15-1

As regards your July 14, 2015 intervention in this proceeding:

- (i) Did you receive any funding to support your intervention? If so, from whom?
- (ii) Do you have a position at a university, or elsewhere, or are you in a centre, institute, or similar organization, that supported your intervention? If so, please describe your position at the centre, institute, or similar organization and identify the source(s) of funding.
- (iii) Please describe any other entities with which you are or have been affiliated which have interests or have intervened before the CRTC or Industry Canada with respect to telecommunications policy and regulation issues.

McNally *et al.*(TELUS)14Aug15-2

Please provide current copies of your curriculum vitae for the public record.

Requests for Information addressed to Catherine Middleton (“Middleton”)

Middleton(TELUS)14Aug15-1

As regards your July 14, 2015 intervention in this proceeding:

- (i) Did you receive any funding to support your intervention? If so, from whom?
- (ii) Do you have a position at a university, or elsewhere, or are you in a centre, institute, or similar organization, that supported your intervention? If so, please describe your position at the centre, institute, or similar organization and identify the source(s) of funding.
- (iii) Please describe any other entities with which you are or have been affiliated which have interests or have intervened before the CRTC or Industry Canada with respect to telecommunications policy and regulation issues.

Middleton(TELUS)14Aug15-2

Please provide a current copy of your curriculum vitae for the public record.

Request for Information addressed to the Province of British Columbia (“PoBC”)

PoBC(TELUS)14Aug15-1

At paragraph 43 of its Submission, the Province of British Columbia quotes the following two paragraphs from an unspecified CRTC decision:

56. The Commission considers, however, that a bidding process would make administration more complex, and would unduly slow the implementation of basic service in certain high-cost areas. Given the small number of Canadians without access to telephone service, the Commission is of the view that establishing a new bidding mechanism to provide basic service is not warranted. In the Commission's view, incumbent local carriers, with their widespread infrastructures, will likely be the only providers of service to these areas in the foreseeable future. (underscore added)

57. Given the relatively small number of Canadians in scattered locations that do not have access to service that meets the basic service objective, the Commission finds that the most appropriate approach in high-cost areas is for incumbent local carriers to provide service over a reasonable time period. The Commission is of the view that extending service to those now unserved is generally the responsibility of the incumbent local carrier providing service in that territory.

Please provide the reference to the CRTC decision from which these paragraphs are quoted.

Requests for Information addressed to Tamara Shepherd (“Shepherd”)

Shepherd(TELUS)14Aug15-1

As regards your June 3, 2015 intervention in this proceeding:

- (i) Did you receive any funding to support your intervention? If so, from whom?
- (ii) Do you have a position at a university, or elsewhere, or are you in a centre, institute, or similar organization, that supported your intervention? If so, please describe your position at the centre, institute, or similar organization and identify the source(s) of funding.
- (iii) Please describe any other entities with which you are or have been affiliated which have interests or have intervened before the CRTC or Industry Canada with respect to telecommunications policy and regulation issues.

ShepherdTELUS)14Aug15-2

Please provide a current copy of your curriculum vitae for the public record.

Request for Information addressed to Telesat Canada (“Telesat”)

Telesat(TELUS)14Aug14-1

Please indicate whether Telesat has received funding of any kind, directly or indirectly (where another entity received funding for the provision of Internet access but where Telesat provided the underlying satellite facilities to the entity in question) for the provision of satellite services that facilitate the provision of Internet access in Canada. Please provide the total amount of funding. For the purpose of this question, funding includes but is not necessarily limited to federal, provincial or municipal government funding, subsidies provided by government departments, agencies or tribunals, or other types of grants provided by public sector organizations.

Request for Information addressed to WIND Mobile Corp. (“WIND”)

WIND(TELUS)14Aug15-1

At paragraph 9 of its July 14, 2015 Comments, WIND states:

WIND considers that access to broadband Internet access services, and in particular, mobile broadband services, is required to meaningfully participate in the digital economy.

Is WIND proposing that mobile broadband services should qualify for funding from the National Contribution Fund or be considered eligible for government funding as a basic telecommunications service, and if so, under what circumstances? For example, would WIND be subject to an obligation to serve?

Requests for Information addressed to Dwayne Winseck and David Ellis (“Winseck and Ellis”)

Winseck and Ellis(TELUS)14Aug15-1

As regards your July 14, 2015 intervention in this proceeding:

- (i) Did you receive any funding to support your intervention? If so, from whom?
- (ii) Do you have a position at a university, or elsewhere, or are you in a centre, institute, or similar organization, that supported your intervention? If so, please describe your position at the centre, institute, or similar organization and identify the source(s) of funding.
- (iii) Please describe any other entities with which you are or have been affiliated which have interests or have intervened before the CRTC or Industry Canada with respect to telecommunications policy and regulation issues.

TELUS Communications Company
August 14, 2015

Winseck and Ellis(TELUS)14Aug15-2

Please provide current copies of your curriculum vitae for the public record.

Yours truly,

{Original signed by Stephen Schmidt}

Stephen Schmidt
Vice-President - Telecom Policy & Chief Regulatory Legal Counsel
Telecom Policy & Regulatory Affairs

AH/io

cc. John Macri, CRTC, John.Macri@CRTC.gc.ca
Christine Bailey, CRTC, Christine.Bailey@CTRC.gc.ca
PIAC, lawford@piac.com
Axia NetMedia Corporation, art.price@axia.com
Bell Canada, bell.regulatory@bell.ca
Canadian Independent Telephone Company Joint Task Force,
jonathan.holmes@itpa.ca
Roselyn Layton, Roslyn@layton.dk
Fenwick McKelvey, fenwick.mckelvey@concodia.ca
Catherine Middleton, Catherine.middleton@ryerson.ca
Province of British Columbia, roman.mateko@gov.bc.ca
Dinesh Rathi, drathi@ualberta.ca
Michael McNally, mmcnally@ualberta.ca
Shaw Cablesystems, Regulatory@sjrb.ca
Tamara Shepherd, tamara.shepherd@ucalgary.ca
Telesat Canada, iscott@telesat.com
WIND, lgoetz@windmobile.ca
Dwayne Winseck, dwayne.winseck@carleton.ca
David Ellis, david@davidellis.ca
Benjamin Klass, benjikklass@hotmail.com
Interested Parties to TNC 2015-134
Alan Hamilton, TELUS, (613) 597-8364

* * * End of Document * * *