



# Changing the 2013 *Wireless Code*: Canadians' views in January 2017

Results from a survey commissioned by the  
Forum for Research and Policy in Communications (FRPC)

24 February 2017

Contact information:

Monica. L. Auer, M.A., LL.M.  
Executive Director  
[execdir@frpc.net](mailto:execdir@frpc.net)  
613.618.0224 [mobile]  
Ottawa, Ontario

## Contents

<b>Highlights</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>I Purpose of the research</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II Results from the survey</b>	<b>3</b>
A Awareness of Code	4
B Bill shock	7
C Negotiating rates	9
D Critical Information Summary for comparison shopping	11
E Account holders vs users	12
F Returning promotional items if wireless service is cancelled	15
G Data caps	16
H Unlocking fees	18
<b>III Analysis</b>	<b>19</b>
A Awareness of the Wireless Code	19
B Experience with bill shock in the previous year	20
C Negotiating better cellphone rates	21
D Views on the utility of the Critical Information Summary while comparison shopping	22
E Perspective as to whether those who pay for, or those who use, cellphones should make decisions about additional cellphone costs	23
F Response to the idea of requiring those who cancel their cellphone service to return promotional items to their wireless service providers	24
G Response to the idea that people should check their own data usage instead of maintaining the current \$50 cap	26
H Response to the idea of capping unlocking fees	27
<b>IV Survey method</b>	<b>28</b>
A Survey	28
B Survey questionnaires	28

## Tables

Table 1	Have people heard of the Code?	4
Table 2	Have people read the Code?	5
Table 3	Negotiating better cellphone rates	6
Table 4	Awareness of the Code, by cellphone rate negotiations	7
Table 5	Cellphone rate negotiations, by awareness of the Code	7
Table 6	Experience of cellphone ‘bill shock’ in the previous year?	8
Table 7	Negotiated better cellphone rate in previous four years	9
Table 8	Negotiated better cellphone rate in previous four years and the usefulness of the Critical Information Summary while shopping for a cellphone plan and before signing a cellphone contract	11
Table 9	Helpfulness of having a summary of plan’s most important features before signing contract	12
Table 10	Approval of wireless bills by users or account holders	13
Table 11	Usefulness of having the Critical Information Summary to comparison shop, compared to those who make decisions about cellphone bills	14
Table 12	Return of promotional items when contracts are cancelled	15
Table 13	Suspension of data versus tools for monitoring data usage	16
Table 14	Capping fees for unlocking cellphones	18

## Highlights

A survey of 1503 people across Canada (yielding results with a margin of error of plus or minus 3.02%, 19 times out of 20) was conducted by Access Research on behalf of the Forum for Research and Policy in Communications from 30 January to 3 February 2017, to explore Canadians' views about changes currently being proposed for the *Wireless Code*, a list of wireless rights and responsibilities established by the CRTC in mid-2013.

The Forum's survey found that

- 79.4% of Canadians did not recall ever hearing about the *Code* (see Table 1)
- Of the 20.6% of Canadians who recalled ever hearing about the *Code*, 81.2% did not recall ever reading it, so that overall, 4.4% of Canadians recalled ever reading the *Code* (see Table 2)
- More than three years after the CRTC recognized 'bill shock' as a serious problem and in response established the *Code* to explain cellphone users' rights and responsibilities, 43.2% of Canadians said they had experienced cell phone bill shock in the previous year (see Table 6)
- With respect to the idea that the *Code* would help Canadians' bargaining position with wireless service providers, 61.6% of Canadians said they had not obtained a better rate from their service provider in the previous four years through negotiations; however, 56.7% of people living in Quebec said they had (see Table 3)
- 94.2% of Canadians agreed that having a summary of a cellphone plan's most important features – a Critical Information Summary – would be very or somewhat useful to have when they were shopping for a new cellphone plan and before signing up for the plan, with 86% saying this would be "very helpful" and 8.2% saying it would be "somewhat helpful" (see Table 9)
- 84.9% of Canadians agreed, in the context of family cellphone plans, that decisions to approve additional costs for cellphone service such as data, should be made by the person who pays the cellphone bills and not the person who uses the phone (see Table 10)
- 79.7% of Canadians disagreed with the idea that people who want to cancel their cellphone contracts early should have to reimburse their wireless service providers for any promotions such as discounts, free gifts and other incentives that they received (see Table 12)
- Faced with a choice between the *Code's* current requirement for wireless service providers to suspend users' data after \$50 (unless the users decide to continue using data), and having users check their own data every few days, 75.2% of Canadians supported the *Code's* current \$50 cap (see Table 13), and
- 75.5% of Canadians agreed that the CRTC should cap unlocking fees (see Table 14).

## I Purpose of the research

The Forum for Research and Policy in Communications (FRPC) is a non-profit and non-partisan organization established to undertake research and policy analysis about communications, including broadcasting telecommunications. The Forum supports a strong Canadian communications system that serves the public interest.

This report summarizes results from a survey commissioned by the Forum in January 2017 about Canadians' views on several issues related to wireless telephones, which were raised in a public consultation launched by the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) in mid-2016.<sup>1</sup> Telecommunications Notice of Consultation CRTC 2016-293 (TNoC 2016-293) asked for people's views about the CRTC's current approach to regulating wireless telephones, embodied in a set of requirements that govern wireless service providers and which the CRTC set out in 2013.<sup>2</sup>

The 2013 *Wireless Code (Code)* generally governs the information made available to wireless subscribers in Canada, to empower them in their dealings with wireless service providers. It also sets limits on the fees that can be charged when customers want to terminate their wireless contract early. As currently described by the CRTC's website,

[e]very Canadian with a mobile plan is protected by the Wireless Code. It explains your consumer rights and the rules your provider must follow. We created the Code to make it easier for you:

- to understand your mobile plan
- to change providers
- to prevent bill shock
- to return your cellphone if you are unhappy with your service
- and more!

(CRTC, "Your Consumer Rights for Mobile Phones", online: [crtc.gc.ca, http://crtc.gc.ca/eng/phone/mobile/code.htm](http://crtc.gc.ca/eng/phone/mobile/code.htm), accessed 7 February 2017)

Previous public opinion research commissioned by the CRTC asked Canadians about issues related to the *Code*. The results from those surveys were published in 2014 (2014 survey),<sup>3</sup> 2015 (2015 survey),<sup>4</sup> Spring 2016<sup>5</sup> (2016 survey) and Fall 2016.<sup>6</sup> According to the Fall 2016 survey, its objectives were to

---

<sup>1</sup> *Review of the Wireless Code*, Telecom Notice of Consultation CRTC 2016-293 (Ottawa, 28 July 2016), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/archive/2016/2016-293.htm>.

<sup>2</sup> *The Wireless Code*, Telecom Regulatory Policy CRTC 2013-271 (Ottawa, 3 June 2013), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/archive/2013/2013-271.htm>.

<sup>3</sup> harrisdecima, *Wireless Code Public Opinion Research 2015: Quantitative Research Report Prepared for the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC)*, (15 January 2014), POR #:057-13.

<sup>4</sup> harrisdecima, *Wireless Code Public Opinion Research 2015: Quantitative Research Report Prepared for the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC)*, (31 March 2015), POR #: POR 044-14.

- Better understand some of the issues that affect Canadians the most as it relates to their wireless services to support the evaluation of the *Wireless Code*.
- Obtain data to assess whether the *Wireless Code* continues to meet its objectives, which include ensuring that consumers are empowered to make informed decisions about wireless services.
- Obtain more in-depth information on wireless complaints, data usage and bill shock.
- Allow for a more in-depth analysis of the experience of Canadians in each of the provinces in the Prairies.
- Better understand Canadians' perceptions of the CRTC and how they are changing over time.<sup>7</sup>

The survey results described in this report focus on a number of issues raised by parties in the TNoC 2016-293 proceeding:

- a. Awareness of the *Code*
- b. Bill shock
- c. *Wireless Code* users' experience in negotiating with their wireless service providers
- d. Use of the critical information summary as a tool for comparison shopping
- e. Decision-making about additional charges, and
- f. The treatment of sales incentives
- g. Data cap monitoring
- h. Unlocking fees.

**A note to readers:**

Given its focus on Canadians' views about issues related to the CRTC's 2103 review of the *Wireless Code*, the survey did not ask Canadians about their wireless service providers, the prices they pay for wireless service, problems they have or have had with their providers, whether they had complained about their wireless service providers, or about their experiences in dealing with the Commissioner of Complaints for Telecommunications Services (CCTS), a mediation body established by the CRTC and funded by wireless service providers. While some or all of those issues have been addressed by other surveys, including those undertaken by the CRTC<sup>8</sup> and the CCTS,<sup>9</sup> our focus in this survey was on Canadians' attitudes towards issues related to the CRTC's review of the *Wireless Code* (the TNoC 2016-293 proceeding).

Part II, which follows, briefly summarizes the issues and summarizes the survey results. We analyze the results in Part III, while the survey method and questionnaires are set out in Part IV.

---

<sup>5</sup> TNS Canada, *Wireless Code Public Opinion Research: 2016*, Prepared for the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (29 March 2016), POR#: 034-15.

<sup>6</sup> TNS Canada, *Wireless Code Public Opinion Research: Fall 2016*, Prepared for the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (18 November 2016) POR 027-16.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, at page 3 (1.1 Research Purpose and Objectives).

<sup>8</sup> See footnotes 3, 4, 5 and 6, above.

<sup>9</sup> Environics Research, *Commissioner for Complaints for Telecommunications Services Public Awareness Survey 2016*, (May 2016), [http://www.ccts-cprst.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Environics - CCTS Awareness Survey.pdf](http://www.ccts-cprst.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Environics_-_CCTS_Awareness_Survey.pdf); see also CCTS, *CCTS 2016 Public Awareness Survey – A Discussion*, (<https://www.ccts-cprst.ca/documents/ccts-2016-public-awareness-survey>).

## II Results from the survey

Access Research conducted an interactive-voice-response survey of 1,503 people over 18 years of age in Canada from January 30 to February 3, 2017, using an English-language and French-language questionnaire designed by the Forum. The survey's results have a margin of error of plus or minus 3.02%, 19 times out of 20. Part IV provides additional information about research methods, as well as copies of the survey questionnaires.

Access made preliminary results from the survey available to the Forum on 6 February 2017; it made the weighted data available on 17 February 2017.<sup>10</sup>

The Forum analyzed the data to understand Canadians'

- Awareness of the *Wireless Code*
- Experience with bill shock in the previous year
- Views on the utility of the Critical Information Summary while comparison shopping
- Perspective as to whether those who pay for, or those who use, cellphones should make decisions about additional cellphone costs, and
- Response to the ideas that
  - people who cancel their cellphone contracts should return promotional items from their wireless service providers
  - people should check their own data usage very few days instead of relying on the current \$50 cap on data usage, and that
  - unlocking fees should or should not be capped.

We analyzed these concepts in terms of demographics: language, gender, age, region (in which respondents live), education and income. Missing values (respondents answering "Don't know" or "Prefer not to answer") were excluded from the analysis.

Tests of statistical significance measure were used to measure the probability that a specific association between concepts was or was not likely to have occurred by chance.<sup>11</sup> Results were considered statistically significant when their probability of occurring by chance – using the Pearson's chi-square test<sup>12</sup> – was equal to or lower than five times out of a hundred (*i.e.*, the 5%, or .05 level). Associations between concepts that were not statistically significant may have occurred by chance, and for that reason are not generally reported. Statistically significant

---

<sup>10</sup> The data were weighted to reflect Canada's population in terms of gender, age and province of residence.

<sup>11</sup> In other words, a statistically significant result from these tests does not imply that the results are important (a significant finding), but that the results were unlikely to have occurred by chance.

<sup>12</sup> Two-sided asymptotic significance levels.

results can be generalized to the population of Canada,<sup>13</sup> whom we describe in the remainder of this report as 'Canadians'.<sup>14</sup>

## A Awareness of Code

In TNoC 2016-293 the CRTC wrote that “consumers must be aware of their rights and responsibilities under the *Code*” for it to be effective. We asked if people were aware of the *Code*, and if they had ever read it.

Awareness of the *Code* is generally low. At the end of January 2017 four out of five Canadians (79.4%) did not recall ever hearing about the *Code* (Table 1). The percentage of those who did not recall ever hearing about the *Code* was higher among younger (85%) and older people (86.2%), women (82.3%) and people with annual household incomes before taxes of less than \$20,000 (4.8%).

**Table 1** Have people heard of the Code?

<b>Q2. In 2013 the CRTC created the Wireless Code, to inform cellphone users of their rights and responsibilities. Do you recall ever hearing about the Wireless Code?</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
TOTAL	1420	20.6%	79.4%
Age (p=.006)			
18 – 24 years of age	173	15.0%	85.0%
25 – 34	229	24.9%	75.1%
35 – 44	273	24.2%	75.8%
45 – 54	285	23.5%	76.5%
55 – 64	213	19.7%	80.3%
65 years of age and over	246	13.8%	86.2%
Gender (p=.007)			
Male	671	24.1%	75.9%
Female	724	17.7%	82.3%
Other	25	12.0%	88.0%
Income (p=.001)			
Less than \$20,000	138	15.2%	84.8%
\$20,000 to \$40,000	224	17.4%	82.6%
\$40,000 to \$60,000	199	17.1%	82.9%
\$60,000 to \$80,000	168	19.6%	80.4%
\$80,000 to \$100,000	168	30.4%	69.6%
\$100,000 or more	252	26.6%	73.4%
Education (p=.033)			
Secondary school or less	232	18.5%	81.5%

<sup>13</sup> Results that are not statistically significant may have occurred by chance.

<sup>14</sup> As the survey did not ask respondents about their citizenship or nationality, non-Canadians resident in Canada with Canadian telephone numbers may also be included in the results.



<b>Q2. In 2013 the CRTC created the Wireless Code, to inform cellphone users of their rights and responsibilities. Do you recall ever hearing about the Wireless Code?</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Some college or university	329	17.3%	82.7%
Completed college or university	581	24.8%	75.2%
Post graduate studies	219	19.6%	80.4%
Negotiated better cellphone rate in previous 4 years (p=.023)			
Yes	451	24.8%	75.2%
No	742	19.3%	80.7%
Experienced cellphone shock in previous year (p=.001)			
Yes	479	17.3%	82.7%
No	631	25.8%	74.2%
Total	1110	22.2%	77.8%

Being aware of the *Code* does not necessarily mean that people are familiar with its provisions. The survey therefore asked the one in five people who recalled ever hearing about the *Code*, if they recalled ever reading it.

Most (81.2%) of those who had ever heard of the *Code*, did not recall ever reading it (Table 2). Overall, 4.4% of all Canadians recalled ever reading the *Code* (62 of the 1503 respondents).

**Table 2 Have people read the Code?**

<b>3. Do you recall ever reading the Wireless Code?</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
BASE (n=293): Ever heard of the Wireless Code			
TOTAL	330	18.8%	81.2%

Canadians were equally unlikely to have ever read the *Code*, regardless of their

- survey language (p=.670)
- gender (p=.538)
- age (p=.096)
- education (p=.531)
- annual household income (p=.084) and
- region of Canada (.669).

There was also no difference between Canadians in terms of having read the *Code* if they had

- negotiated a better cellphone rate in the previous four years (p=.547), or
- experienced cellphone bill shock in the previous year (p=.136).

Finally, bearing in mind the idea that, if they are informed, consumers are empowered to negotiate for terms that best meet their requirements, we asked Canadians with cellphones if they had ever obtained a better cellphone rate from their service provider by 'negotiating'.

In early January 2017, 38.4% of Canadians with cellphones said they had obtained a better cellphone rate by negotiating, while 61.6% said they had not obtained better cellphone rates by negotiating (Table 3). Higher levels of better, negotiated cellphones rates were reported by

- those who answered the survey in French (59.5%, vs 33% for those who answered in English)
- those who lived in Quebec (56.7%)
- those between 45 and 54 years of age (43.8%)

Lower levels of better, negotiated cellphone rates were reported by people who were

- 65 years of age and over (29.9%)
- Living in British Columbia or Northern Canada (38.5%)

**Table 3** Negotiating better cellphone rates

<b>5. Thinking about the last four years, have you obtained a better cellphone rate from your service provider by negotiating?</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>BASE (=1256): Has a cell phone</b>			
TOTAL	1256	38.4%	61.6%
Survey language (p=.000)			
English	999	33.0%	67.0%
French	257	59.5%	40.5%
Total	1256	38.5%	61.5%
Age (p=.044)			
18 – 24 years of age	156	38.5%	61.5%
25 – 34	214	43.0%	57.0%
35 – 44	260	37.7%	62.3%
45 – 54	258	43.8%	56.2%
55 – 64	177	36.2%	63.8%
65 years of age and over	194	29.9%	70.1%
Region (p=.000)			
Atlantic Canada - NS, NB, NL or PEI	90	36.7%	63.3%
Quebec	282	56.7%	43.3%
Ontario	477	35.0%	65.0%
Prairies	239	34.3%	65.7%
British Columbia and Northern Canada	168	24.4%	75.6%
Total	1256	38.5%	61.5%
Language of survey (p=.000)			
English	999	33.0%	67.0%
French	257	59.5%	40.5%
Total	1256	38.5%	61.5%

In January 2017 there were no differences between Canadians with respect to their having negotiated a better cellphone rate in the last four years, in terms of their

- gender (p=.230)
- education (p=.396), or
- annual household income before taxes (p=.736)

We also tested the idea that awareness of the *Code* might be higher among those who believed they had negotiated a better cellphone rate in the previous four years. In January 2017 a slightly higher percentage (24.8%) of those who thought they had negotiated a better cellphone rate had read the *Code*, compared to those who had not obtained a better rate through negotiations (19.3%).

**Table 4 Awareness of the Code, by cellphone rate negotiations**

Cellphone rate negotiations and awareness of the Code	Q2. In 2013 the CRTC created the Wireless Code, to inform cellphone users of their rights and responsibilities. Do you recall ever hearing about the Wireless Code?		
	Non-missing responses	Yes	No
Q5. Thinking about the last four years, have you obtained a better cellphone rate from your service provider by negotiating? (p=.024) BASE (=1256): Has a cell phone			
Yes	451	24.8%	75.2%
No	742	19.3%	80.7%
Total	1193	21.4%	78.6%

To look at the same data slightly differently (Table 5), more people who recalled ever hearing about the *Code* thought they had negotiated a better rate (43.9%), than those who did not recall ever hearing about the *Code* (36.1%).

**Table 5 Cellphone rate negotiations, by awareness of the Code**

Cellphone rate negotiations and awareness of the Code	Q2. In 2013 the CRTC created the Wireless Code, to inform cellphone users of their rights and responsibilities. Do you recall ever hearing about the Wireless Code?			
	Non-missing responses	Yes	No	Total
5. Thinking about the last four years, have you obtained a better cellphone rate from your service provider by negotiating? (p=.024) BASE (=1256): Has a cell phone				
Yes	451	43.9%	36.1%	37.8%
No	742	56.1%	63.9%	62.2%
Total	1193	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

## **B Bill shock**

In establishing the *Code* in 2013, the CRTC recognized that “bill shock is a serious problem for all consumers”.<sup>15</sup> It therefore required wireless service providers to inform consumers about their

<sup>15</sup> *The Wireless Code*, Telecom Regulatory Policy CRTC 2013-271 (Ottawa, 3 June 2013), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/archive/2013/2013-271.htm>, at paragraph 113.

voice and text allowances and roaming rates, and set caps for data overage and roaming charges.<sup>16</sup>

In 2017, more than three years after the *Code's* establishment, four in ten (43.2%) Canadians said they had experienced 'bill shock' for their cellphones in the previous year (Table 6).

The incidence of bill shock was highest for young people: just over half (54%) of those between 18 and 24 years of age had experienced bill shock, compared to just over a quarter (27.3%) of those over 65 years of age.

Linguistic and regional differences also emerged:

- 45.0% of those answering the survey in English reported bill shock in the previous year, compared to 35.5% of those answering the survey in French, and
- Higher levels of bill shock were reported by people in Atlantic Canada (51.9%) and the Prairies (50.9%); lower levels were reported in Quebec (37.8%) and Ontario (39.2%).

**Table 6 Experience of cellphone 'bill shock' in the previous year?**

<b>6. Have you experienced "Bill Shock" for your cellphone in the last year?</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>BASE: Has a cell phone</b>			
Total	1168	43.1%	56.9%
Language of survey (p=.010)			
English	940	45.0%	55.0%
French	228	35.5%	64.5%
Total	1168	43.2%	56.8%
Age (p=.000)			
18 – 24 years of age	137	54.0%	46.0%
25 – 34	209	53.1%	46.9%
35 – 44	256	41.0%	59.0%
45 – 54	237	44.3%	55.7%
55 – 64	164	39.0%	61.0%
65 years of age and over	165	27.3%	72.7%
Total	1168	53.2%	56.8%
Region (p=.005)			
Atlantic Canada – NS, NB, NL or PEI	79	51.9%	48.1%
Quebec	249	37.8%	62.2%
Ontario	451	39.2%	60.8%
Prairies	218	50.5%	49.5%
British Columbia and Northern Canada	173	48.6%	51.4%
Total	1170	43.2%	56.8%
Eastern vs Western Canada (p=.002)			
Eastern Canada	778	40.0%	60.0%
Western & Northern Canada	390	49.5%	50.5%
Total	1168	43.2%	56.8%

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, paragraphs 115-118, 130, 136-139.

### **c Negotiating rates**

In 2012 many Canadians complained that while their wireless devices rapidly “degrade” after two years, they felt locked into three-year contracts.<sup>17</sup> The CRTC decided to limit contracts to a maximum of two years, to enable consumers “to switch WSPs, upgrade devices, and take advantage of competitive offers at least every two years, in order to contribute to a more dynamic wireless marketplace and to enable consumers to take advantage of technological changes.”<sup>18</sup>

In an interview in 2013 when the CRTC enacted the *Code*, the CRTC’s Chairperson noted that the change would enable Canadians to bargain with their wireless service providers. He said that, “[a]s part of a more dynamic marketplace, Canadians will be able to choose a new carrier or re-bargain with their existing one.”<sup>19</sup>

The Forum’s survey asked Canadians if they had negotiated a better rate with their wireless service provider since the *Code*’s creation – in the previous four years. Six out of ten Canadians (61.6%) said they had not obtained a better cellphone rate through negotiations (Table 7). In contrast with people living the rest of Canada, however, 56.7% of people living in Quebec said they had obtained a better cellphone rate from their service provider by negotiating.

**Table 7 Negotiated better cellphone rate in previous four years**

<b>Q5. Thinking about the last four years, have you obtained a better cellphone rate from your service provider by negotiating?</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
TOTAL	1256	38.4%	61.6%
Language of survey (p=.000)			
English	999	33.0%	67.0%
French	257	59.5%	40.5%
Total	1256	38.5%	61.5%
Age (p=.044)			
18 – 24 years of age	156	38.5%	61.5%
25 – 34	214	43.0%	57.0%
35 – 44	260	37.7%	62.3%
45 – 54	258	43.8%	56.2%
55 – 64	177	36.2%	63.8%
65 years of age and over	194	29.9%	70.1%
Region (p=.000)			

<sup>17</sup> 2013-271, paragraph 202.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, paragraph 216.

<sup>19</sup> Christine Dobby, “Canadians can cancel phone contracts without penalty after two years under new wireless code” *Financial Post* (3 June 2013, 9:25 AM ET), [http://business.financialpost.com/fp-tech-desk/crtc-wireless-code-canada?\\_lsa=5482-0be3](http://business.financialpost.com/fp-tech-desk/crtc-wireless-code-canada?_lsa=5482-0be3).

<b>Q5. Thinking about the last four years, have you obtained a better cellphone rate from your service provider by negotiating?</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Atlantic Canada – NS, NB, NL or PEI	90	36.7%	63.3%
Quebec	282	56.7%	43.3%
Ontario	477	35.0%	40.1%
Prairies	239	34.3%	65.7%
British Columbia and Northern Canada	168	24.4%	75.6%
Total	1256	38,5%	61.5%
Income (p=.000)			
Less than \$20,000	96	33.3%	66.7%
\$20,000 to \$40,000	192	34.4%	65.6%
\$40,000 to \$60,000	174	39.7%	60.3%
\$60,000 to \$80,000	160	40.0%	60.0%
\$80,000 to \$100,000	157	38.9%	61.1%
\$100,000 or more	242	39.7%	60.3%
Total	1021	38.0%	62.0%
Helpful to have Critical Information Summary while comparison shopping and before signing contract? (.046)			
Very helpful	1103	39.7%	60.3%
Somewhat helpful	97	35.1%	64.9%
Neither helpful nor unhelpful	26	19.2%	80.8%
Not very helpful	9	33.3%	66.7%
Not helpful at all	7	0.0%	100.0%
Total	1242	38.6%	61.4%

In considering people's views about the usefulness of the Critical Information Summary while shopping and before signing an agreement in Table 7, above, we noted that more than half of those who thought this would be very or somewhat helpful said they had not negotiated a better cellphone rate in the previous four years.

We looked at these data slightly differently, to understand what people who had negotiated, or who had not negotiated better cellphone rates, thought of the idea of having the Critical Information Summary while shopping. More than 90% of both groups – those who had, and those who had not, negotiated better rates – thought having the Critical Information Summary while shopping and before signing a contract would be very or somewhat helpful (Table 8).

**Table 8** Negotiated better cellphone rate in previous four years and the usefulness of the Critical Information Summary while shopping for a cellphone plan and before signing a cellphone contract

Q5. Thinking about the last four years, have you obtained a better cellphone rate from your service provider by negotiating?	TOTAL	Yes	No
Helpful to have Critical Information Summary while comparison shopping and before signing contract? (.046)			
Very helpful	1103	91.3%	87.3%
Somewhat helpful	97	7.1%	8.3%
Neither helpful nor unhelpful	26	1.0%	2.8%
Not very helpful	9	0.65	0.8%
Not helpful at all	7	0.0%	0.9%
Total	1242	100.0%	100.0%

There was no relationship between Canadians' negotiation for a better cellphone rate in the previous four years, with their gender ( $p=.230$ ), their annual household pre-tax income ( $p=.736$ ), or their experience of bill shock in the previous years ( $p=.389$ ).

### **D** Critical Information Summary for comparison shopping

In considering the content of the *Code* in 2012 the CRTC heard that many people thought the contracts they had signed with wireless service providers were complex: the documents were often long and detailed, and used unfamiliar terminology. The result was that consumers did not always understand what they were agreeing to when they signed their contracts (contrary to the basic principle of contract law in Canada – that all parties to a contract understand the agreement they are making).

Several parties involved in the 2012 proceeding that led to the *Code* therefore asked the CRTC to require wireless service providers “to provide a one- or two-page summary of the most important contract terms and conditions for the consumer”.<sup>20</sup> They also recommended that “consumers should be able to request the contract summary at the time of offer so that consumers could compare WSPs’ key contract terms and conditions when shopping for wireless services.”<sup>21</sup>

When it introduced the *Code* in 2013, the CRTC required wireless service providers to provide their customers with a “Critical Information Summary” after they signed a contract for postpaid wireless services (*i.e.*, services for which customers pay after using them) – but did not require this summary to be provided before the contract is signed, to enable comparative shopping. It said this proposal “would involve a significant burden, from both a financial and a resource perspective, and the Commission considers that it is not necessary to require this.”<sup>22</sup>

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, paragraph 62.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, paragraph 64.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, paragraph 71.

In 2017, 94.2% Canadians agreed that a summary of a plan's most important features would be either very or somewhat useful to have when they were shopping and before they signed a contract (Table 9). Agreement was a bit higher (98.4%) among those who said they had negotiated a better cellphone rate in the previous four years, than those who had not (95.6%)

**Table 9 Helpfulness of having a summary of plan's most important features before signing contract**

7. Do you think it would help people who are thinking about buying a new cellphone plan to comparison shop, by having a summary of the plan's most important features before signing up for the plan?	TOTAL	Yes, a summary would be very helpful when shopping	Yes, a summary would be somewhat helpful when shopping	Having a summary would be neither helpful nor unhelpful when shopping	No, having a summary would not be very helpful when shopping	No, having a summary would not be helpful at all when shopping
Total	1476	86.0%	8.2%	2.6%	0.9%	0.6%
Gender (p=.000)						
Male	704	84.8%	10.5%	3.3%	0.9%	0.6%
Female	748	90.9%	6.3%	1.7%	0.8%	0.3%
Other	24	66.7%	8.3%	12.5%	4.2%	8.3%
Total	1476	87.6%	8.3%	2.6%	0.9%	0.5%
Education (p=.001)						
Secondary school or less	242	78.9%	13.6%	4.5%	2.5%	0.4%
Some college or university	351	88.9%	8.8%	1.1%	0.6%	0.6%
Completed college or university	601	90.2%	6.3%	2.7%	0.3%	0.5%
Post graduate studies	228	87.7%	7.9%	2.6%	0.4%	1.3%
Total	1422	87.6%	8.4%	2.6%	0.8%	0.6%
Negotiated better cellphone rate in last 4 years (p=.046)						
Yes	480	91.3%	7.1%	1.0%	0.6%	0.0%
No	762	87.3%	8.3%	2.8%	0.8%	0.9%
Total	1242	88.8%	7.8%	2.1%	0.7%	0.6%

### **E Account holders vs users**

Since 2013 the popularity of family or shared wireless plans has grown, with the result that several users may be covered by a plan for which one of the users, or another person altogether, bears financial responsibility.

The *Code* now requires 'users' to be notified when they have reached certain limits, and allows the users to continue beyond the limits, as long as they agree to pay the additional charges. As the *Code* does not require the person who accepted responsibility for the bills to approve the charges, bill shock can result.

In early 2017, 84.9% Canadians agreed that decisions to approve additional wireless costs should be made by the person who pays for it – not the person(s) using individual devices on the plan (Table 10), with agreement growing to 90% among those between 18 and 24 years of age,



and to 93% among those answering the survey in English. Agreement decreased to less than 70% for those with annual incomes below \$40,000, and to 57% for those living in Quebec.

**Table 10 Approval of wireless bills by users or accountholders**

<b>10. Many families have plans for wireless telephone service where several family members use different cellphones, although there is just one bill. If a cellphone user's data use is suspended, they can keep using data as long as they agree to pay additional charges. Some say that the person who pays the cellphone bills should have to approve additional charges. Do you agree or disagree that the person who pays for a cell phone, should have to approve additional costs for that phone?</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Yes, decisions to approve additional cellphone costs should be made by the person who pays for it</b>	<b>No, decisions to approve additional cellphone costs should be made by the person who uses it</b>
Total	1389	84.9%	15.1%
Language of survey (p=.000)			
English	1037	93.5%	6.5%
French	280	50.7%	49.3%
Total	1389	84.9%	15.1%
Age (p=.007)			
18 – 24 years of age	165	90.3%	9.7%
25 – 34	231	87.0%	13.0%
35 – 44	273	85.7%	14.3%
45 – 54	288	87.2%	12.8%
55 – 64	208	79.3%	20.7%
65 years of age and over	225	79.6%	20.4%
Total	1390	84.8%	15.2%
Regions of Canada (p=.000)			
Atlantic Canada - NS, NB, NL or PEI	93	91.4%	8.6%
Quebec	308	57.1%	42.9%
Ontario	530	93.0%	7.0%
Prairies	266	92.5%	7.5%
British Columbia and Northern Canada	193	93.3%	6.7%
Total	1390	84.9%	15.1%
Eastern or Western Canada (p=.000)			
Eastern Canada	930	81.0%	19.0%
Western Canada and Northern Canada	460	92.6%	7.4%
Total	1390	84.8%	15.2%
Income (p=.000)			
Less than \$20,000	125	76.0%	24.0%
\$20,000 to \$40,000	214	76.6%	23.4%
\$40,000 to \$60,000	195	84.6%	15.4%
\$60,000 to \$80,000	167	83.8%	16.2%
\$80,000 to \$100,000	174	87.9%	12.1%
\$100,000 or more	254	90.9%	9.1%
Total	1129	84.0%	16.0%

<b>10. Many families have plans for wireless telephone service where several family members use different cellphones, although there is just one bill. If a cellphone user's data use is suspended, they can keep using data as long as they agree to pay additional charges. Some say that the person who pays the cellphone bills should have to approve additional charges. Do you agree or disagree that the person who pays for a cell phone, should have to approve additional costs for that phone?</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Yes, decisions to approve additional cellphone costs should be made by the person who pays for it</b>	<b>No, decisions to approve additional cellphone costs should be made by the person who uses it</b>
Education (p=.002)			
Secondary school or less	226	77.4%	22.6%
Some college or university	321	82.9%	17.1%
Completed college or university	576	88.0%	12.0%
Post graduate studies	214	86.0%	14.0%
Total	1337	84.7%	15.3%

In terms of decision-making about cellphone costs, 89.3% of people who believed that those who pay for cellphones should make decisions about their additional costs, thought the Critical Information Summary would be “very helpful” for comparison shopping, compared to 84% of those who believe that users should make decisions about their additional costs (Table 11).

**Table 11 Usefulness of having the Critical Information Summary to comparison shop, compared to those who make decisions about cellphone bills**

<b>10. Many families have plans for wireless telephone service where several family members use different cellphones, although there is just one bill. If a cellphone user's data use is suspended, they can keep using data as long as they agree to pay additional charges. Some say that the person who pays the cellphone bills should have to approve additional charges. Do you agree or disagree that the person who pays for a cell phone, should have to approve additional costs for that phone? (p=.039)</b>	<b>7. Do you think it would help people who are thinking about buying a new cellphone plan to comparison shop, by having a summary of the plan's most important features before signing up for the plan?</b>					
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Yes, a summary would be very helpful when shopping</b>	<b>Yes, a summary would be somewhat helpful when shopping</b>	<b>Having a summary would be neither helpful nor unhelpful when shopping</b>	<b>No, having a summary would not be very helpful when shopping</b>	<b>No, having a summary would not be helpful at all when shopping</b>
Those who pay the bills	1168	89.3%	7.6%	2.1%	0.7%	0.3%
Those who use the phones	206	84.0%	10.2%	3.9%	0.5%	1.5%
Total	1374	88.5%	8.0%	2.4%	0.7%	0.4%

**F Returning promotional items if wireless service is cancelled**

When the CRTC established the *Code* in 2013 it concluded that “early cancellation fees must be significantly limited to empower consumers to take advantage of competitive offers and technological advances at least every two years.”<sup>23</sup> It limited early cancellation fees to amounts owing on wireless devices if provided as part of a wireless contract, and to the lower of \$50 or 10% of the minimum monthly charges in the remaining months of contracts that did not include a device.<sup>24</sup> It said this would ensure that “[i]n all cases, after two years, customers will be able to decide whether or not to continue the relationship with their current WSP or to choose a competitor’s service without any early cancellation fees or other burden.”<sup>25</sup>

During the CRTC’s 2017 review of the *Code*, some wireless service providers argued that subscribers who want to cancel their contracts should be required to return any promotional items provided to them when they signed the contracts. One effect of this requirement might be to introduce another ‘burden’, using the CRTC’s 2013 language, for wireless service users who want to end their contract early.

Eight out of ten Canadians (79.7%) opposed the idea of having to return sales promotions if they cancelled their contracts, and this idea was consistent across all demographics (Table 12). That said, men were somewhat more supportive of the idea of returning sales promotions if contracts were cancelled (23.9%) compared to women (17.1%); those from Western Canada (24%) were more supportive compared to Eastern Canada (18.6%), and older people (25% for those between 55 and 64 years of age) were more supportive compared to younger people (12% for those between 18 and 24 years of age).

**Table 12 Return of promotional items when contracts are cancelled**

<b>8. Some cellphone companies offer sales promotions, such as discounts, free gifts and other incentives, to customers who subscribe to their services. Should subscribers who want to cancel their contracts early have to reimburse their providers for the sales promotions they received?</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Yes, subscribers should have to reimburse their providers for sales promotions</b>	<b>No, subscribers should not have to reimburse their providers for sales promotions</b>
Total	1370	20.3%	79.7%
Gender (p=.006)			
Male	669	23.9%	76.1%
Female	680	17.1%	82.9%
Other	22	13.6%	86.4%
Total	1371	20.4%	79.6%
Eastern or Western Canada (p=.023)			
Eastern Canada	944	18.6%	81.4%
Western Canada and Northern Canada	425	24.0%	76.0%
Total	1369	20.3%	79.7%
Age (p=.026)			

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, paragraph 218.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, paragraphs 233-238.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, paragraph 221.

<b>8. Some cellphone companies offer sales promotions, such as discounts, free gifts and other incentives, to customers who subscribe to their services. Should subscribers who want to cancel their contracts early have to reimburse their providers for the sales promotions they received?</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Yes, subscribers should have to reimburse their providers for sales promotions</b>	<b>No, subscribers should not have to reimburse their providers for sales promotions</b>
18 – 24 years of age	166	12.0%	88.0%
25 – 34	229	17.9%	82.1%
35 – 44	268	22.0%	78.0%
45 – 54	281	23.1%	68.9%
55 – 64	200	25.0%	75.0%
65 years of age and over	224	18.8%	81.3%
Total	1369	20.2%	79.8%

## **G** *Data caps*

In 2013 the CRTC used data caps to reduce the likelihood of a wireless user experiencing 'bill shock' because of unexpected data charges. The *Code* requires wireless service providers to suspend data usage once their customers use \$50 worth of data in a month. Users can then decide whether to accept additional charges, if they wish to continue using data.

At the beginning of 2017 three out of four of Canadians (75.2%) agreed that is better to suspend users' data when they have used \$50 worth of data (Table 13); one in four (24.8%) agreed that it is better for users to check their own data usage every few days. Fewer than 20% of Canadians with annual incomes above \$40,000 supported do-it-yourself data usage monitoring; 29% or more of Canadians with annual incomes below \$40,000 supported the use of data-monitoring tools.

**Table 13** Suspension of data versus tools for monitoring data usage

<b>9. Cellphone companies are supposed to suspend users' data usage once they use \$50 worth of data in a month, so they are not shocked by high cellphone bills. Users can then decide whether to continue using data. Some say companies should not have to suspend data usage because users can check how much data they have used every few days. Do you think it is better for cellphone users if their data usage is suspended after \$50, or better that they check their own data usage every few days?</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>It is better to suspend users' data once when they have used \$50 worth of data</b>	<b>It is better that cellphone users check their own data usage every few days</b>
Total	1347	75.2%	24.8%
Language of survey (p=.000)			
English	1068	77.4%	22.6%
French	279	66.7%	33.3%
Total	1347	75.2%	24.8%
Age (p=.000)			
18 – 24 years of age	174	78.2%	21.8%

<b>9. Cellphone companies are supposed to suspend users' data usage once they use \$50 worth of data in a month, so they are not shocked by high cellphone bills. Users can then decide whether to continue using data. Some say companies should not have to suspend data usage because users can check how much data they have used every few days. Do you think it is better for cellphone users if their data usage is suspended after \$50, or better that they check their own data usage every few days?</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>It is better to suspend users' data once when they have used \$50 worth of data</b>	<b>It is better that cellphone users check their own data usage every few days</b>
25 – 34	233	82.8%	17.2%
35 – 44	256	82.0%	18.0%
45 – 54	283	74.6%	25.4%
55 – 64	195	68.2%	31.8%
65 years of age and over	206	62.6%	37.4%
Total	1012	75.1%	24.9%
Education (p=.000)			
Secondary school or less	216	67.1%	32.9%
Some college or university	315	71.1%	28.9%
Completed college or university	557	81.0%	19.0%
Post graduate studies	213	75.6%	24.4%
Total	1301	75.4%	24.6%
Income (p=.000)			
Less than \$20,000	120	65.0%	35.0%
\$20,000 to \$40,000	211	64.5%	35.5%
\$40,000 to \$60,000	194	77.3%	22.7%
\$60,000 to \$80,000	166	80.7%	19.3%
\$80,000 to \$100,000	167	80.2%	19.8%
\$100,000 or more	242	79.3%	20.7%
Total	1100	74.9%	25.1%
Region (p=.001)			
Atlantic Canada - NS, NB, NL or PEI	88	83.0%	17.0%
Quebec	309	67.6%	32.4%
Ontario	511	74.0%	26.0%
Prairies	255	80.4%	19.6%
British Columbia and Northern Canada	183	80.3%	19.7%
Total	1346	75.2%	24.8%
Eastern or Western Canada (p=.003)			
Eastern Canada	908	72.7%	27.3%
Western Canada and Northern Canada	440	80.2%	19.8%
Total	1348	75.1%	24.9%
Experienced bill shock in last year (p=.000)			
Yes (experienced bill shock)	473	82.5%	17.5%
No (did not experience bill shock)	605	71.9%	28.1%
Total	1078	76.5%	23.5%

## H Unlocking fees

People who acquire a wireless device as part of their wireless contracts pay for the device over the term of their contract, and therefore own the device.

The 2013 *Code* requires wireless service providers to unlock devices that they provide to their users, or to give them the means to unlock the device, within 90 days of the date the contract begins, but it is silent about the amounts that wireless service providers may impose for this service.

Three quarters (75.5%) of Canadians agreed that the CRTC should cap unlocking fees (Table 14).

**Table 14 Capping fees for unlocking cellphones**

<b>11. The cellphones that many people get from their cellphone providers must be unlocked, a process that can take up to fifteen minutes. Should service providers be able to charge whatever they want for this unlocking service, or should unlocking fees be capped?</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Yes, unlocking fees should be capped</b>	<b>No, unlocking fees should not be capped</b>
Total	1387	75.5%	24.5%
Language of survey (p=.012)			
English	1094	77.1%	22.9%
French	293	70.0%	30.0%
Total	1387	75.6%	24.4%
Regions of Canada (p=.006)			
Atlantic Canada - NS, NB, NL or PEI	87	80.5%	19.5%
Quebec	322	67.7%	32.3%
Ontario	530	77.4%	22.6%
Prairies	259	78.8%	21.2%
British Columbia and Northern Canada	190	76.8%	23.2%
Total	1388	75.5%	24.5%
Income (p=.001)			
Less than \$20,000	125	61.6%	38.4%
\$20,000 to \$40,000	213	68.5%	31.5%
\$40,000 to \$60,000	195	77.9%	22.1%
\$60,000 to \$80,000	172	75.0%	25.0%
\$80,000 to \$100,000	170	80.0%	20.0%
\$100,000 or more	249	77.9%	22.1%
Total	1124	74.2%	25.8%
Education (p=.000)			
Secondary school or less	215	67.4%	32.6%
Some college or university	318	68.9%	31.1%
Completed college or university	577	80.1%	19.9%
Post graduate studies	225	80.0%	20.0%
Total	1335	75.4%	24.6%

### III Analysis

#### A Awareness of the Wireless Code

When it established the *Wireless Code* in 2013, the CRTC emphasized the importance of public awareness about the *Code*:

381. The Commission considers that the *Wireless Code* must be accompanied by a promotion and awareness campaign to ensure that the rights and requirements set out in the *Code* are well understood by consumers and WSPs. The Commission notes that because consumers' dealings with wireless services occur through WSPs, consumers need to have access to knowledgeable staff or resources in order to ensure that consumers obtain the information they need. As such, the Commission considers it important for WSPs to ensure that their staff and agents are knowledgeable of and promote the *Code*.<sup>26</sup>

Surveys undertaken on behalf of the CRTC in 2014, 2015 and 2016<sup>27</sup> found that roughly half of Canadians recalled hearing or seeing something about the *Wireless Code*. At the mid-February 2017 CRTC public hearing to review the *Code*, Bell Canada Enterprises (BCE) told the CRTC that the 2016 survey evidence "confirms that existing measures promoting *Code* awareness are working well."<sup>28</sup>

CRTC surveys: % of those who clearly or vaguely recalled hearing or seeing anything about the <i>Wireless Code</i>	
2014	53%
2015	50%
2016	45%

Some public interest organizations did not share this view. The Union des consommateurs said it was utopian to think that consumers should know about the *Wireless Code*.<sup>29</sup> The Forum pointed out that the CRTC's surveys showed that unawareness of the *Code* might have grown since 2014.<sup>30</sup> The Public Interest Advocacy Centre<sup>31</sup> argued that the declining level of awareness of the *Code* in the CRTC's surveys signalled that "greater efforts need to be undertaken to maintain, and hopefully increase public awareness of the *Wireless Code*."<sup>32</sup> The Consumers Council of Canada similarly recommended a new public-awareness campaign at the retail level.<sup>33</sup>

The Forum's January 2017 survey found that just one in five Canadians (20.6%) recalled every hearing anything about the *Code*; and that four out of five (79.4%) did not recall ever hearing

<sup>26</sup> *The Wireless Code*, Telecom Regulatory Policy CRTC 2013-271 (Ottawa, 3 June 2013), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/archive/2013/2013-271.htm>.

<sup>27</sup> See footnotes 3 to 6, above.

<sup>28</sup> CRTC, *Transcript* (Gatineau, 7 February 2017), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/transcripts/2017/tt0207.htm>, paragraph 1564.

<sup>29</sup> L'union des consommateurs, *Observations initiales*, (3 octobre 2016), at paragraph 93.

<sup>30</sup> The Forum for Research and Policy in Communications, *From one-by-one remedies, to systemic compliance: Ensuring that the Wireless Code is fair for all*, Comments (3 October 2016), at paragraph 179.

<sup>31</sup> On behalf of itself, the Consumers' Association of Canada, the Council of Senior Citizens Organizations of British Columbia, and the National Pensioners Federation (the Coalition).

<sup>32</sup> The Coalition, *Intervention*, TNoC 2016-293 (3 October 2016), at paragraph 399.

<sup>33</sup> Consumers Council of Canada, *Intervention*, TNoC 2016-293 (26 September 2016), at paragraph 35.

anything about it. Low recall levels such as these raise concerns about the degree to which consumers are, in fact, aware of their rights and responsibilities under the *Code*.

The Forum's survey also indicates some support for the idea that general awareness of the *Code's* existence may be useful to Canadians, when they negotiate their cellphone rates. In January 2017, 43.9% of those who recalled every hearing about the *Code* thought they had obtained a better cellphone rate by negotiating with their cellphone providers, compared to the 36.1% who thought they had negotiated a better cellphone rate but did not read the *Code*.

The Forum's survey went on to ask if people had ever read the *Code*. Interestingly, of the 20.6% of those who had heard of the *Code*, most (81.2%) had not: among all Canadians, in other words (those who had heard of the *Code*, and those who had not), just 4.4% recalled ever reading the *Code*. This finding was consistent across all demographic groups (*i.e.*, age, gender, language of survey, education levels, annual income before taxes, and region of Canada), and for those who had experienced bill shock in the previous year.

## **B Experience with bill shock in the previous year**

In 2013 the CRTC recognized "that bill shock is a serious problem for all consumers. When a consumer receives a bill that is unexpectedly many times greater than their normal monthly bill, it can be a source of considerable concern."<sup>34</sup> The CRTC therefore required wireless service providers to help customers manage their voice and text usage by clearly describing limits on that usage.<sup>35</sup> It also required wireless service providers to notify consumers about charges for data overages and international roaming,<sup>36</sup> and to suspend data usage at \$50 and national and international data roaming charges \$100.<sup>37</sup>

Surveys undertaken on behalf of the CRTC in 2014, 2015 and 2016 found that just under a third of Canadians had experienced bill shock in the preceding year. The Consumers Council of Canada noted that the incidence of bill shock was being reduced,

"improvements are still required to the way in which device and account holders authorize overages."<sup>38</sup> PIAC recommended that the *Wireless Code* "have built-in protections from data bill shock which benefit the consumer first."<sup>39</sup>

CRTC surveys - percentage of those who experienced bill shock, meaning a surprisingly high bill, in the previous year	
2014	28%
2015	29%
2016	24%

---

<sup>34</sup> *The Wireless Code*, Telecom Regulatory Policy CRTC 2013-271 (Ottawa, 3 June 2013), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/archive/2013/2013-271.htm>, at paragraph 113.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, at paragraph 115.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, at paragraph 116.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, at paragraphs 136-137.

<sup>38</sup> CRTC, *Transcript* (Gatineau, 7 February 2017), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/transcripts/2017/tt0207.htm>, paragraph 1831 (Consumers Council of Canada).

<sup>39</sup> CRTC, *Transcript* (Gatineau, 6 February 2017), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/transcripts/2017/tt0206.htm>, paragraph 71.



Some wireless service providers told the CRTC that the incidence of bill shock had decreased steadily.<sup>40</sup> Along with meeting the CRTC's usage limits, some wireless service providers redesigned their invoices to help "customers better understand the wireless invoices, and the costs associated with using their devices."<sup>41</sup>

In January 2017 43.1% of Canadians said they had experienced 'bill shock' in the previous year, with younger people reporting higher levels (of 54% and 53.1%, for 18-24 and 25-34 year olds, respectively) (see Table 6, above).

These results establish that cellphone bill shock remains a problem for Canadians, indicating that the CRTC may need to revise the *Wireless Code* to increase Canadians' certainty about their wireless bills.

### **c** *Negotiating better cellphone rates*

During the CRTC's public hearing to review of the *Wireless Code* some wireless service providers acknowledged that lower barriers to switching wireless service providers had affected their approach to acquiring and retaining customers. When asked if customers were now empowered to negotiate with their wireless service providers,<sup>42</sup> BCE noted that "it's much more economic for you to keep your existing customers."<sup>43</sup> Sasktel commented that it was sometimes prepared to waive certain charges, rather than negotiate.<sup>44</sup> Quebecor said that it listened to its clients, and was also prepared to reduce certain charges.<sup>45</sup>

The Public Interest Advocacy Centre (PIAC)<sup>46</sup> noted, however, that negotiation is not a strong cultural norm in Canada.<sup>47</sup>

Results from the Forum's survey tends to confirm the idea that while the *Code* now permits Canadians to change wireless service providers every two years instead of three, the majority (61.6%) of Canadians either have not been able to, or did not attempt to, negotiate better rates with their wireless service providers.

---

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, paragraph 1675 (Bell Mobility).

<sup>41</sup> CRTC, *Transcript* (Gatineau, 7 February 2017), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/transcripts/2017/tt0207.htm>, at paragraph 2573 (Rogers).

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, at paragraph 1623.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, at paragraph 1628 (BCE).

<sup>44</sup> CRTC, *Transcript* (Gatineau, 8 February 2017), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/transcripts/2017/tt0208.htm>, paragraph 4079 (Sasktel, FS 25 May/16, ¶).

<sup>45</sup> CRTC, *Transcript* (Gatineau, 7 February 2017), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/transcripts/2017/tt0207.htm>, (Quebecor):

2271 LE PRÉSIDENT: Donc, tout est négociable.

2272 M. HÉBERT: C'est pas une question de négociation, puis c'est vraiment une question qu'on est à l'écoute de nos clients. Et chaque client a une bonne raison de peut-être demander d'être crédité et si la raison nous apparaît juste, on n'a pas besoin de passer à travers un processus fastidieux pour nous donner l'agilité nécessaire pour répondre aux besoins de nos clients.

<sup>46</sup> Representing itself, the Consumers' Association of Canada, the Council of Senior Citizens' Organizations of British Columbia and the National Pensioners Federation in the proceeding.

<sup>47</sup> CRTC, *Transcript* (Gatineau, 6 February 2017), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/transcripts/2017/tt0206.htm>, paragraph 260.

At the beginning of 2017, three and a half years after the *Code's* establishment, six out of ten Canadians (61.6%) said they had not obtained a better cellphone rate through negotiations. In contrast with other Canadians, however, 56.7% of people living in Quebec said they *had* obtained a better cellphone rate from their service provider by negotiating.

#### **D Views on the utility of the Critical Information Summary while comparison shopping**

When it established the *Code* in 2013 the CRTC required wireless service providers to provide their customers with a summary of key aspects of their contracts – a 'Critical Information Summary'. At the time, a number of public interest organizations argued that the Critical Information Summary should be provided to customers before signing wireless contracts; the CRTC disagreed.

The CRTC's surveys about the *Wireless Code* have not asked Canadians about the use of the Critical Information Summary as a shopping tool, but in February 2017 several public interest organizations, including the Forum, advocated that the Critical Information Summary be made available to customers for the purposes of comparison shopping. The Union des consommateurs said it believed that it would be useful for consumers to have the Summary before concluding a contract with wireless service providers, as it would assist them in shopping and in thinking about the contract they might later sign.<sup>48</sup> Having the Summary would be useful. PIAC suggested that the *Wireless Code* be amended to require wireless service providers to provide the Critical Information Summary to Canadians upon request.<sup>49</sup>

Some wireless service providers disagreed: they said it was unnecessary to make the Critical Information Summary a requirement because consumers could obtain up-to-date and printable information online, the limited information in the Summary might lead customers to make "ill-informed purchase decisions", having to provide the Critical Information Summary would be "burdensome" to wireless service providers;<sup>50</sup> that it was impractical;<sup>51</sup> and that in light of promotional offers, the Critical Information Summary was a poor tool for comparative shopping.<sup>52</sup>

In January 2017, however, Canadians disagreed with wireless service providers, expressing instead a very clear preference for having a Critical Information Summary while they were shopping: 94.2% agreed that having a summary of the plan's most important features would be very or somewhat useful to have when shopping and before signing a contract (see Table 9, above). Canadians do not appear to view wireless service providers' online information as being as useful as a standardized summary of critical elements about wireless plans.

---

<sup>48</sup> L'union des consommateurs, *Observations initiales*, (3 octobre 2016), at paragraph 49.

<sup>49</sup> CRTC, *Transcript* (Gatineau, 6 February 2017), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/transcripts/2017/tt0206.htm>, paragraph 264 (PIAC).

<sup>50</sup> Bell Canada Enterprises, CRTC, *Transcript* (Gatineau, 7 February 2017), paragraphs 1567-1569.

<sup>51</sup> Rogers, CRTC, *Transcript* (Gatineau, 7 February 2017), paragraph 2754,

<sup>52</sup> Telus; CRTC, *Transcript* (Gatineau, 6 February 2017), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/transcripts/2017/tt0206.htm>, paragraph 845.

**E Perspective as to whether those who pay for, or those who use, cellphones should make decisions about additional cellphone costs**

In 2013 the CRTC introduced limits on the charges that wireless service providers could levy for customers' use of data and roaming services. Once these limits were reached, customers could then decide whether to agree to pay additional charges to exceed the limits.

Since the *Code's* establishment, however, Canadians began to rely more heavily on 'family' plans for wireless service, than on individual wireless plans. Surveys undertaken for the CRTC found that from 2015 to 2016 the percentage of Canadians subscribing to family plans increased from 25%, to 30%.

The challenge for those using family plans is that the current *Code* requires "customers" to be notified, and also allows them to authorize additional charges that would otherwise be capped – even if an individual 'customer' in a family plan is not the person who pays for the plan. The *Code* currently defines 'customers' as "Individuals or small businesses subscribing to retail mobile wireless services", but does not otherwise define 'subscribing'.

In its annotated guide to the *Wireless Code*, the CCTS described the implications of the *Code's* current wording with respect to customers, notifications and authorizations:

We have seen many complaints in which WSPs have been sending data cap notifications as a text message to the individual wireless devices. Some individuals or small businesses may have an account with multiple devices and/or shared services (e.g. a family "share" data plan). When the data limit is reached, the WSP is sending a notification to the device that is using the data at the time the threshold is reached. And, in some circumstances, the WSPs are interpreting the Code as permitting them to allow the \$50/\$100 overage on each device on the plan. So a customer who has multiple lines on an account will be charged more than the \$50 / \$100 spending cap because the WSP multiplies the cap by the number of lines on the account.<sup>53</sup>

At the CRTC's February 2017 public hearing to review the *Wireless Code*, PIAC advocated that family wireless plans designate a single account holder.<sup>54</sup> The Consumers Council of Canada agreed that an account holder ought to control the overall account and be able to authorize other parties in the plan to accept overages.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> CCTS, *Annotated Guide to the Wireless Code* (Ottawa; updated 22 September 2016), Version 2.0, <https://www.ccts-cprst.ca/wp-content/uploads/pdfs/AWC/en/Annotated-Guide-to-the-Wireless-Code.pdf>, at page 32.

<sup>54</sup> CRTC, *Transcript* (Gatineau, 6 February 2017), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/transcripts/2017/tt0206.htm>, paragraphs 295-297 (PIAC).

<sup>55</sup> CRTC, *Transcript* (Gatineau, 7 February 2017), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/transcripts/2017/tt0207.htm>, paragraphs 1928 and 1948 (Consumers Council of Canada).

In February 2017 Telus explained to the CRTC that by default, its plans allow any user in a five-member family plan to consent to additional fees.<sup>56</sup> At the same hearing Sasktel explained that if users do not specify a person to authorize such fees, “then it is the primary cellular unit on that account, so the first unit that was activated”,<sup>57</sup> even if this person is not the account holder.<sup>58</sup> Eastlink, on the other hand, explained that “only the account holder can authorize additional use above the cap they have established”, ensuring “that account holders receive the bill they expect to receive ....”,<sup>59</sup> while Rogers pointed to its ‘Data Manager’ tool as giving parents the ability to track and block cellphone lines.<sup>60</sup>

In January 2017, however, most Canadians (84.9%) said that the person who pays the bills – the cellphone account holder – should be the one to approve additional charges.

### **F Response to the idea of requiring those who cancel their cellphone service to return promotional items to their wireless service providers**

One of the “most significant concerns” raised by consumers when the CRTC was thinking about creating the *Wireless Code* involved the early cancellation fees that some had to pay if they wanted to cancel their contract before it ended.<sup>61</sup> They told the CRTC that high early cancellation fees locked them into their contracts and limited their ability to change wireless service providers;<sup>62</sup> they also said there “should be no hidden fees” for canceling their wireless contracts early.

The CRTC decided that the *Wireless Code* should minimize switching barriers, and enable customers to take advantage of competitive wireless offers more than every three years.<sup>63</sup> It therefore limited early cancellation fees, based on the value of any wireless devices provided as part of a contract, or if no devices were provided, on the lower of a percentage of the monthly charges remaining in the contract or \$50.<sup>64</sup>

CRTC surveys: percentage of those who said it was difficult to end their contract early, and who identified the cost of early cancellation as the reason for the difficulty	
2014	52%
2015	45%
2016	55%

<sup>56</sup> CRTC, *Transcript* (Gatineau, 6 February 2017), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/transcripts/2017/tt0206.htm>, paragraph 864.

<sup>57</sup> CRTC, *Transcript* (Gatineau, 8 February 2017), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/transcripts/2017/tt0208.htm>, paragraph 3944.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, paragraph 3946.

<sup>59</sup> CRTC, *Transcript* (Gatineau, 6 February 2017), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/transcripts/2017/tt0206.htm>, paragraph 528.

<sup>60</sup> CRTC, *Transcript* (Gatineau, 7 February 2017), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/transcripts/2017/tt0207.htm>, paragraph at paragraph 2773 (Rogers).

<sup>61</sup> *The Wireless Code*, Telecom Regulatory Policy CRTC 2013-271 (Ottawa, 3 June 2013), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/archive/2013/2013-271.htm>, at paragraph 201.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, at paragraph 205.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, at paragraph 217.

<sup>64</sup> The specific requirements are somewhat more complicated:  
234. If a customer cancels a contract before the end of the commitment period, a [wireless service provider or] WSP must not charge the customer any fee or penalty other than the early cancellation fee, which must be calculated in the manner set out below:

Surveys commissioned by the CRTC found that from 2014 to 2016, roughly half of Canadians found it difficult to change wireless service providers because of the cost of ending their contracts early.

During the CRTC's February 2017 hearing to review the *Code* some wireless service providers suggested that customers who want to cancel their wireless service contracts early should be required to return any sales incentives or promotions that they received from their service provider.

Rogers explained that such promotions include "phone accessories and attachments, gift cards, and port-in credits, [which] all provide added benefits to the customer when they sign an agreement," and asked the Commission to allow wireless service providers to recover these incentives from customers.<sup>65</sup> Rogers said this change would "remove the risk for operators of introducing more lucrative, economic inducements over and above the device subsidy than we do today",<sup>66</sup> and increase their "appetite to make some of these offers".<sup>67</sup> Such inducements include "... VR headsets, ... Bluetooth headphones, and smartwatches, ... as well as things like gift cards that just provide a straight dollar reduction off of in-store purchases of accessories or off the price of the device at the till."<sup>68</sup>

In January 2017 a majority (79.7%) of Canadians rejected the suggestion that they should return sales promotions if they cancelled their contracts (see Table 12, above).

- 
- (i) When a subsidized device is provided as part of the contract
    - a) for fixed-term contracts: The early cancellation fee must not exceed the value of the device subsidy. The early cancellation fee must be reduced by an equal amount each month, for the *lesser* of 24 months or the total number of months in the contract term, such that the early cancellation fee is reduced to \$0 by the end of the period.
    - b) for indeterminate contracts: The early cancellation fee must not exceed the value of the device subsidy. The early cancellation fee must be reduced by an equal amount each month, over a maximum of 24 months, such that the early cancellation fee is reduced to \$0 by the end of the period.
  - (ii) When the contract does not include a subsidized device
    - a) for fixed-term contracts: The early cancellation fee must not exceed the *lesser* of \$50 or 10 percent of the minimum monthly charge for the remaining months of the contract, up to a maximum of 24 months. The early cancellation fee must be reduced to \$0 by the end of that period.
    - b) for indeterminate contracts: A WSP must not charge an early cancellation fee.

<sup>65</sup> CRTC, *Transcript* (Gatineau, 7 February 2017), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/transcripts/2017/tt0207.htm>, paragraphs 2607-2608.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, at paragraph 2828.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, at paragraph 2841.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, at paragraph 2829.

## **G Response to the idea that people should check their own data usage instead of maintaining the current \$50 cap**

In 2013 the CRTC accepted users' evidence that "excess usage of data services, which can result in data overage charges or data roaming charges, are the most significant source of bill shock for consumers".<sup>69</sup>

The CRTC decided to require wireless service providers to cap data charges, while offering consumers the option of expressly consenting to pay additional charges to use more data.<sup>70</sup> It considered "that a monthly \$50 cap on data overage charges will enable consumers to use a moderate amount of data over and above what they are subscribed to, while empowering them to prevent significant unintentional charges",<sup>71</sup> and also stipulated a monthly \$100 cap on data roaming rates.<sup>72</sup> The Commission added that it would not require wireless service providers to provide usage monitoring tools, but that it expected providers to offer customers such tools.

Surveys commissioned by the CRTC since establishing the *Code* found that a majority Canadians now view data as essential.

CRTC's surveys - % of those who said data was essential to them	
2014	[Question not asked]
2015	40%
2016	55%

In the CRTC's February 2017 public hearing to review the *Wireless Code* some argued that the current data-related caps should be increased, because wireless service providers send their subscribers alerts before they exceed the data caps, and because they offer tools to set limits and alerts for multi-user accounts.<sup>73</sup> Rogers also noted that

Canadian wireless users are among the heaviest data consumers in the world. According to CISCO, Canada ranks 4th internationally in mobile data use and Canadian mobile data traffic is expected to grow at a compound annual growth rate of 42 percent between now and 2020. Already 70 percent of Canadian wireless subscribers have plans that provide at least 1 gigabyte of data usage per month.<sup>74</sup>

When asked in January 2017 if they preferred the existing data-caps system to one in which users check their own usage from time to time, three-quarters (75.2%) of Canadians preferred the existing data-caps approach.

---

<sup>69</sup> *The Wireless Code*, Telecom Regulatory Policy CRTC 2013-271 (Ottawa, 3 June 2013), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/archive/2013/2013-271.htm>, at paragraph 128.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, at paragraph 129.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, at paragraph 132.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.* at paragraph 133.

<sup>73</sup> See e.g. Rogers, in CRTC, *Transcript* (Gatineau, 7 February 2017), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/transcripts/2017/tt0207.htm>, paragraphs 2650-2652.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, at paragraph 2568.

## H Response to the idea of capping unlocking fees

In 2013 the CRTC concluded that locked mobile devices constituted a barrier to competition, by preventing customers from switching to another carrier domestically, and from using a foreign wireless service provider while travelling internationally.

The Commission accepted wireless service providers' argument that locked devices were required for an initial period to establish customer relationships and limit fraud,<sup>75</sup> but required the providers to "make an unlocking service available to customers who [received a device through their provider and who] have been subscribed to their services for 90 days, at a rate specified in the contract and Critical Information Summary."<sup>76</sup>

The CRTC decided not to set a specific rate for unlocking services, but required wireless service providers to state their unlocking rates clearly in their contract with subscribers, and in the Critical Information Summary.<sup>77</sup>

In the February 2017 CRTC public hearing to review the *Code*, some public-interest groups recommended that unlocking fees be capped, or eliminated, pointing out that consumers who were paying for wireless devices in their monthly fees to their wireless service providers, owned those devices. PIAC and the Consumers Council of Canada supported the idea of eliminating unlocking fees.<sup>78</sup>

Freedom Mobile (whose unlocking fees increased from \$10 in 2013, to \$50 in 2016) suggested that the Commission eliminate unlocking fees,<sup>79</sup> while Rogers confirmed that while a three-month waiting period before a wireless device could be unlocked reduced the risk of fraud, a \$50 unlocking fee would not end fraud.<sup>80</sup>

In January 2017 75.5% of Canadians agreed that unlocking fees should be capped.

---

<sup>75</sup> *The Wireless Code*, Telecom Regulatory Policy CRTC 2013-271 (Ottawa, 3 June 2013), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/archive/2013/2013-271.htm>, at paragraphs 162-163.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, at paragraph 164.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, at paragraph 168.

<sup>78</sup> CRTC, *Transcript* (Gatineau, 6 February 2017), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/transcripts/2017/tt0206.htm>, paragraph 409 (PIAC); Consumers Council of Canada, *Intervention*, TNoC 2016-293 (26 September 2016), at page 21.

<sup>79</sup> CRTC, *Transcript* (Gatineau, 8 February 2017), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/transcripts/2017/tt0208.htm>, paragraph 3452.

<sup>80</sup> CRTC, *Transcript* (Gatineau, 7 February 2017), <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/transcripts/2017/tt0207.htm>, paragraphs 2886-2887.

## IV Survey method

### A Survey

Access Research conducted an interactive-voice-response telephone survey in English and in French on behalf of the Forum, from January 30 to February 3, 2017. It surveyed 1,503 people in Canada aged 18 years and older (and excluding those employed by telecommunications companies), based on a probability sample, and asking questions developed by the Forum.

The data were subsequently weighted to reflect gender, age and province (of residence). Twelve hundred responses were completed using the English-language questionnaire, and 303 using the French-language questionnaire. Just over half (56.4%) of respondents answered using their cellphones; the remaining respondents (56.4%) answered using a landline.

The survey's results have a margin of error of plus or minus 3.02%, 19 times out of 20 (*i.e.*, the 95% confidence interval).

### B Survey questionnaires

#### FRPC SURVEY CELLPHONES AND THE WIRELESS CODE

FRP1

24 January 2017

N= 1,500  
(Canada)

---

Hello, this is Access Research calling on behalf of Forum Research and Policy in Communications. We're doing a national survey about telephones in Canada, including cellphones and landlines, and we'd like your opinion. If you have any questions about this call, you can reach our firm, Access Research, at 1-855-561-3603 or at [inquiry@access-research.com](mailto:inquiry@access-research.com)

Just use the touchpad on your phone to select the correct answer when prompted.

Would you like to continue in English or in French? Press 1 to continue in English; appuyer sur le 2 pour continuer en français.

---

S.1 First of all, are you 18 years of age or older?

Press 1 for Yes  
Press 2 for No

→ GO TO Q1  
→ THANK AND TERMINATE AT T.1

T.1 Thank you, that's all the questions I have. Have a great day.

---

1. Are you or is any member of your household or immediate family employed by a



Press 1 for Yes  
Press 2 for No

→ **THANK AND TERMINATE**  
→ **CONTINUE**

2. In 2013 the CRTC created the *Wireless Code*, to inform cellphone users of their rights and responsibilities. Do you recall ever hearing about the *Wireless Code*?

Press 1 for Yes  
Press 2 for No  
Press 3 for Don't Know

→ **CONTINUE**  
→ **SKIP TO Q4**  
→ **CONTINUE**

3. Do you recall ever reading the *Wireless Code*?

Press 1 for Yes  
Press 2 for No  
Press 3 for Don't Know

4. Do you have a cell phone?

Press 1 for Yes  
Press 2 for No  
Press 3 for Don't Know

→ **CONTINUE**  
→ **SKIP TO Q7**  
→ **SKIP TO Q7**

5. Thinking about the last four years, have you obtained a better cellphone rate from your service provider by negotiating?

Press 1 for Yes  
Press 2 for No  
Press 3 for Don't Know

6. Have you experienced "Bill Shock" for your cellphone in the last year?

Press 1 for Yes  
Press 2 for No  
Press 3 for Don't Know

7. Do you think it would help people who are thinking about buying a new cellphone plan to comparison shop, by having a summary of the plan's most important features before signing up for the plan?

Press 1 for Yes, a summary would be very helpful when shopping  
Press 2 for Yes, a summary would be somewhat helpful when shopping  
Press 3 for Having a summary would be neither helpful nor unhelpful when shopping  
Press 4 for No, having a summary would not be very helpful when shopping  
Press 5 for No, having a summary would not be helpful at all when shopping  
Press 6 for Don't know

8. Some cellphone companies offer sales promotions, such as discounts, free gifts and other incentives, to customers who subscribe to their services. Should subscribers who want to cancel their contracts early have to reimburse their providers for the sales promotions they received?

Press 1 for Yes, subscribers should have to reimburse their providers for sales promotions  
Press 2 for No, subscribers should not have to reimburse their providers for sales promotions  
Press 3 for Don't know

9. Cellphone companies are supposed to suspend users' data usage once they use \$50 worth of data in a month, so they are not shocked by high cellphone bills. Users can then decide whether to continue using data. Some say companies should not have to suspend data usage because users can check how much data they have used every few days. Do you think it is better for cellphone users if their data usage is suspended after \$50, or better that they check their own data usage every few days?

Press 1 for It is better to suspend users' data once when they have used \$50 worth of data  
Press 2 for It is better that cellphone users check their own data usage every few days  
Press 3 for Don't know

10. Many families have plans for wireless telephone service where several family members use different cellphones, although there is just one bill. If a cellphone user's data use is suspended, they can keep using data as long as they agree to pay additional charges. Some say that the person who pays the cellphone bills should have to approve additional charges. Do you agree or disagree that the person who pays for a cell phone, should have to approve additional costs for that phone?

Press 1 for Yes, decisions to approve additional cellphone costs should be made by the person who pays for it  
Press 2 for No, decisions to approve additional cellphone costs should be made by the person who uses it  
Press 3 for Don't know

11. The cellphones that many people get from their cellphone providers must be unlocked, a process that can take up to fifteen minutes. Should service providers be able to charge whatever they want for this unlocking service, or should unlocking fees be capped?

Press 1 for Yes, unlocking fees should be capped  
Press 2 for No, unlocking fees should not be capped  
Press 3 for Don't know

- D1. Finally, just a couple of question to help us group the data. What is your gender?

Press 1 for Male  
Press 2 for Female

- D2. How old are you?

Press 1 for Under 25 years  
Press 2 for 25 to 34  
Press 3 for 35 to 44  
Press 4 for 45 to 54  
Press 5 for 55 to 64  
Press 6 for 65 and over

- D3. What is the highest level of education you completed?

Canadians' views in January 2017

- Press 1 for Secondary school or less
- Press 2 for Some college or university
- Press 3 for Completed college or university
- Press 4 for Completed post graduate studies
- Press 5 for Prefer not to respond

D4. Have I reached you on a land line or on a cell phone?

- Press 1 for Landline
- Press 2 for Cell phone

→ SKIP TO QD6  
→ CONTINUE

D5. In addition to a cell phone, do you also have a landline in your household?

- Press 1 for Yes, you also have a landline
- Press 2 for No, you do not have a landline
- Press 3 for Don't know

D6. In which Province or Territory do you live?

- Press 1 for Nova Scotia, Newfoundland and Labrador or Prince Edward Island
- Press 2 for Quebec
- Press 3 for Ontario
- Press 4 for Manitoba or Saskatchewan
- Press 5 for Alberta
- Press 6 for British Columbia
- Press 7 for Northwest Territories, Yukon or Nunavut
- Press 9 to hear these answers again

D7. And finally, what is your annual household income before taxes?

- Press 1 for Less than \$20,000
- Press 2 for \$ 20,000 to \$40,000
- Press 3 for \$ 40,000 to \$60,000
- Press 4 for \$ 60,000 to \$80,000
- Press 5 for \$ 80,000 to \$100,000
- Press 6 for \$100,000 to \$250,000
- Press 7 for more than \$250,000
- Press 8 if you'd prefer not to answer
- Press 9 to repeat these answers

**Those are all our questions. If you have any questions about this call, you can reach our firm, Access Research, at 1-855-561-3603 or at [inquiry@access-research.com](mailto:inquiry@access-research.com). Thank you for your time. Good bye.**

**FRPC SURVEY**  
**LES TÉLÉPHONES CELLULAIRES ET LE CODE SUR LES SERVICES SANS FIL**

FRP1

Le 24 janvier 2017

N=1,500  
(Canada)

---

Bonjour. Ici est *Access Research*, et nous vous appelons au nom du Forum de la Recherche et de la Politique en Communications. Nous réalisons un sondage qui porte sur les téléphones au Canada, incluant les téléphones sans fil ou cellulaires, et les lignes terrestres. Si vous avez des questions par rapport à cet appel, vous pouvez nous rejoindre au 1-855-561-3603 ou à [inquiry@access-research.com](mailto:inquiry@access-research.com).

Vous pouvez utiliser le pavé tactile sur votre téléphone pour répondre aux questions.

Préférez-vous continuer en français ou en anglais? Appuyez sur le 2 pour continuer en français; press 1 to continue in English.

---

S.1 Premièrement, avez-vous 18 ans ou plus ?

Appuyez sur 1 pour Oui  
Appuyez sur 2 pour Non

**→GO TO Q1**  
**→REMERCIEZ ET TERMINER A T.1**

T.1 Merci, celles sont toutes mes questions. Bonne journée.

---

12. Êtes-vous ou est-ce qu'un membre de votre ménage ou de votre famille immédiate est employé par une compagnie de télécommunications ?

Appuyez sur 1 pour Oui  
Appuyez sur 2 pour Non

**→REMERCIEZ ET TERMINER**  
**→CONTINUEZ**

13. Le CRTC a créé *le code sur les services sans fil* en 2013 pour expliquer aux usagers des téléphones sans fil leurs droits et leurs obligations. Est-ce que vous vous rappelez avoir entendu parler du *code sur les services sans fil* ?

Appuyez sur 1 pour Oui  
Appuyez sur 2 pour Non  
Appuyez sur 3 pour Ne sais pas

**→CONTINUEZ**  
**→PASSEZ À Q4**  
**→CONTINUEZ**

14. Est-ce que vous vous rappelez avoir lu *le code sur les services sans fil* ?

Appuyez sur 1 pour Oui  
Appuyez sur 2 pour Non  
Appuyez sur 3 pour Ne sais pas

15. Avez-vous un téléphone cellulaire ?

Appuyez sur 1 pour Oui

**→CONTINUEZ**

Appuyez sur 2 pour Non  
Appuyez sur 3 pour Ne sais pas

→PASSEZ À Q7  
→PASSEZ À Q7

16. En pensant aux quatre dernières années avez-vous négocié avec votre fournisseur de services sans fil pour un meilleur tarif pour des services sans fil ?

Appuyez sur 1 pour Oui  
Appuyez sur 2 pour Non  
Appuyez sur 3 pour Ne sais pas

17. En pensant à votre service sans fil, avez-vous ressenti un 'choc de facture' l'année dernière ?

Appuyez sur 1 pour Oui  
Appuyez sur 2 pour Non  
Appuyez sur 3 pour Ne sais pas

18. Pensez-vous qu'il serait utile pour les gens qui font des comparaisons en magasinant un nouveau plan de service sans fil, d'avoir un résumé des éléments les plus importants du contrat de ce plan avant de l'acheter ?

Appuyez sur 1 pour Oui, avoir un résumé en magasinant serait très utile  
Appuyez sur 2 pour Oui, avoir un résumé en magasinant serait utile  
Appuyez sur 3 pour Avoir un résumé en magasinant ne serait ni utile ni inutile  
Appuyez sur 4 pour Non, avoir un résumé en magasinant ne serait pas très utile  
Appuyez sur 5 pour Non, avoir un résumé en magasinant ne serait pas du tout utile  
Appuyez sur 6 pour Ne sais pas

19. Quelques fournisseurs de services sans fil offrent des promotions aux clients, par exemple des rabais, des cadeaux et autres récompenses, si les clients signent des contrats de service. Si des clients résilient leurs contrats avant la fin de la période d'engagement, est-ce que les clients devraient être dans l'obligation de rembourser leurs fournisseurs de services sans fil pour les promotions de ventes qu'ils ont reçues ?

Appuyez sur 1 pour Oui, les clients devraient rembourser leurs fournisseurs de services sans fil pour les promotions de ventes  
Appuyez sur 2 pour Non, les clients ne devraient pas rembourser leurs fournisseurs de services sans fil pour les promotions de ventes  
Appuyez sur 3 pour Ne sais pas

20. Les fournisseurs de service sans fil sont censés suspendre l'accès des usagers aux données lorsqu'ils atteignent 50 \$ au cours d'un mois, de sorte qu'ils évitent un choc de facture. Les usagers peuvent alors décider s'ils veulent continuer d'utiliser les données. Quelques entreprises sont d'avis qu'on ne devrait pas obliger les fournisseurs de service sans fil de suspendre l'utilisation des données parce que les usagers peuvent toujours vérifier leur utilisation de données des derniers jours. Pensez-vous qu'il est mieux de suspendre l'accès aux données lorsque les usagers atteignent 50 \$, ou plutôt que les usagers vérifient eux-mêmes leur utilisation fréquemment ?

Appuyez sur 1 pour Il est mieux que l'utilisation des données soit suspendue quand les usagers atteignent 50 \$  
Appuyez sur 2 pour Il est mieux que les usagers des services sans fil vérifient leur utilisation des données fréquemment  
Appuyez sur 3 pour Ne sais pas

21. Beaucoup de familles ont des plans de services sans fil ou il n'y a qu'une facture, bien que plusieurs membres de la famille utilisent des téléphones cellulaires différents. Si l'accès aux données est suspendu pour un usager, il ou elle peut avoir accès aux données en acceptant de

payer des frais supplémentaires. Quelques parties proposent que ceux qui paient les factures doivent accepter de payer des frais supplémentaires. Êtes-vous d'accord ou non, que la personne qui paie pour un téléphone cellulaire devrait accepter de payer les frais supplémentaires pour ce téléphone ?

Appuyez sur 1 pour Oui, la personne qui paie pour un service sans fil devrait décider s'il accepte de payer des frais supplémentaires pour ce service  
Appuyez sur 2 pour Non, la personne qui utilise un service sans fil devrait décider d'accepter de payer des frais supplémentaires pour ce service  
Appuyez sur 3 pour Ne sais pas

22. Les téléphones sans fil que plusieurs personnes obtiennent de leurs fournisseurs de service sans fil doivent être déverrouillés, ce qui peut prendre jusqu'à quinze minutes. Est-ce que les fournisseurs de service sans fil devraient facturer les frais qu'ils veulent pour ce service, ou devrait-on imposer une limite sur les frais de déverrouillage ?

Appuyez sur 1 pour Oui, on devrait imposer une limite sur les frais pour le déverrouillage  
Appuyez sur 2 pour Non, on ne devrait pas imposer une limite sur les frais pour le déverrouillage  
Appuyez sur 3 pour Ne sais pas

- D1. Enfin, voici quelques questions simplement pour nous aider à regrouper les données. Quel est votre sexe ?

Appuyez sur 1 pour masculin  
Appuyez sur 2 pour féminin

- D2. Quel âge avez-vous ?

Appuyez sur 1 pour moins de 25 ans  
Appuyez sur 2 pour 25 à 34  
Appuyez sur 3 pour 35 à 44  
Appuyez sur 4 pour 45 à 54  
Appuyez sur 5 pour 55 à 64  
Appuyez sur 6 pour 65 ou plus

- D3. Quel niveau de scolarité le plus élevé avez-vous atteint ?

Appuyez sur 1 pour école secondaire ou moins  
Appuyez sur 2 pour une partie d'un programme collégial ou universitaire  
Appuyez sur 3 pour études collégiales ou universitaires complétées  
Appuyez sur 4 pour études supérieures complétées  
Appuyez sur 5 pour Préfère ne pas répondre

- D4. Est-ce que je vous ai rejoint par téléphone à ligne terrestre ou par téléphone cellulaire ?

Appuyez sur 1 pour téléphone à ligne terrestre  
Appuyez sur 2 for téléphone cellulaire

**→PASSEZ À QD6**  
**→CONTINUEZ**

- D5. En plus d'un téléphone cellulaire, avez-vous un téléphone à ligne terrestre chez vous ?

Appuyez sur 1 pour Oui, vous avez aussi une ligne terrestre  
Appuyez sur 2 pour Non, vous n'avez pas une ligne terrestre  
Appuyez sur 3 pour Ne sais pas

Canadians' views in January 2017

D6. Dans quelle province ou quel territoire habitez-vous ?

Appuyez sur 1 pour Nouvelle-Écosse, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador ou Île-du-Prince-Édouard

Appuyez sur 2 pour Québec

Appuyez sur 3 pour Ontario

Appuyez sur 4 pour Manitoba ou Saskatchewan

Appuyez sur 5 pour Alberta

Appuyez sur 6 pour Colombie-Britannique

Appuyez sur 7 pour Territoires du Nord-Ouest, Yukon ou Nunavut

Appuyez sur 9 pour entendre ces options de nouveau

D7. Et finalement, quel est le revenu total de votre ménage, avant les impôts ?

Appuyez sur 1 pour moins de 20 000 \$

Appuyez sur 2 pour 20 000 à 40 000 \$

Appuyez sur 3 pour 40 000 à 60 000 \$

Appuyez sur 4 pour 60 000 à 80 000 \$

Appuyez sur 5 pour 80 000 à 100 000 \$

Appuyez sur 6 pour 100 000 à 250 000 \$

Appuyez sur 7 pour plus de 250 000 \$

Appuyez sur 8 si vous préférez ne pas répondre

Appuyez sur 9 pour répéter ces options

**Il s'agit de toutes nos questions. Merci du temps que vous nous avez accordé. Si vous avez des questions envers cet appel, vous pouvez contacter Access Research à 1-855-561-3603 ou à [inquiry@access-research.com](mailto:inquiry@access-research.com). Je vous remercie de votre collaboration et du temps que vous nous avez accordé. Bonne journée!**