

Rogers Communications Inc.

333 Bloor Street East
Toronto, Ontario M4W 1G9
Tel.: 416.935.3515
Fax: 416.935.2523
david.watt@rci.rogers.com

David Watt

Vice President
Regulatory Economics

August 3, 2006

Via e-pass

Ms. Diane Rhéaume
Secretary General
Canadian Radio-television and
Telecommunications Commission
Ottawa, ON K1A 0N2

Dear Ms. Rhéaume:

Re: Telecom Public Notice CRTC 2006-4 – Proceeding to establish a national do not call list framework and to review the telemarketing rules

1. Rogers is in receipt of the Public Interest Advocacy Centre's (PIAC) request for award of costs, dated August 1, 2006, in the amount of \$12,937.22, for participation by this party as counsel for the Consumers' Association of Canada (CAC) in *Proceeding to establish a national do not call list framework and to review the telemarketing rules*, Telecom Public Notice CRTC 2006-4, 20 February 2006 (Public Notice 2006-4).
2. Rogers agrees that CAC has met the criteria for an award of costs set out in subsection 44(1) of the *CRTC Telecommunications Rules of Procedure* as they represent groups of subscribers that have an interest in the outcome of the proceeding, have participated responsibly, and have contributed to a better understanding of the issues by the Commission through their participation in the proceeding.
3. Rogers notes that CAC partially agreed with TELUS's proposal, dated July 26, 2006, that the ILECs (including MTS Allstream) and cable companies (such as Rogers and Shaw) be named as cost respondents in this proceeding. However, CAC takes no position as to the apportionment of costs between these proposed cost respondents whereas TELUS proposed a 50/50 split between the ILECS and the cable companies.

4. Rogers disagrees with TELUS's proposal in its entirety. First, the scope of the parties proposed as cost respondents is too limited as all telemarketers and prospective list operators have an interest in the outcome of this proceeding and as such should all be considered as appropriate cost respondents. Second, the apportionment should be equally weighted against all cost respondents as telemarketers rather than weighted by their industry participation.
5. As Rogers pointed out in its submission dated July 24, 2006 regarding other requests for costs arising from PN 2006-4, the Commission does have legal authority to assign liability for costs to entities not regulated by the CRTC. Further, the CRTC has acted on this authority historically in instances where those entities actively participated in the proceedings and had an interest in the outcome of the proceeding.
6. Rogers maintains that it is appropriate for all participants to the proceeding representing commercial interests, which includes telemarketers and prospective list operators, be considered by the Commission as appropriate cost respondents.
7. All of which is respectfully submitted.

Yours very truly,



David Watt
Vice President
Regulatory Economics

Copy: All Interested Parties to Telecom PN CRTC 2006-4

***** END OF DOCUMENT *****