



Understanding consumer awareness and satisfaction with the Commission for Complaints for Telecom-television Services (CCTS) 2025-2026

Final report

Prepared for Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC)

Supplier Name: Nanos Research

Contract Number: CW2415556

Contract Value: \$162,600.41 (including HST)

Award Date: 2025-08-25

Delivery Date: 2026-02-06

Registration Number: POR 016-25

For more information on this report, please contact the CRTC at: ROP-POR@crtc.gc.ca

Ce rapport est aussi disponible en français.



Canadian Radio-television and
Telecommunications Commission

Conseil de la radiodiffusion et des
télécommunications canadiennes

Understanding consumer awareness and satisfaction with the Commission for Complaints for Telecommunication Services (CCTS) 2025-2026: final report

Prepared for the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) by Nanos Research

March 2026

This publication may be reproduced for non-commercial purposes only. Prior written permission must be obtained from the CRTC. For more information on this report, please contact the CRTC at: ROP-POR@crtc.gc.ca

© His Majesty the King in Right of Canada, as represented by the Minister of Public Services and Procurement Canada, 2026.

Catalogue Number: BC92-131/2026E-PDF

International Standard Book Number (ISBN): 978-0-660-99020-0

Aussi disponible en français sous le titre : *Comprendre la notoriété et la satisfaction des consommateurs à l'égard de la Commission des plaintes relatives aux services de télécom-télévision (CPRST) 2025-2026 : rapport final.*

Numéro de catalogue : BC92-131/2026F-PDF

Numéro international normalisé du livre (ISBN) : ISBN 978-0-660-99021-7



Table of Contents

Executive summary	2
A. Background and objectives	2
B. Methodology	3
C. Contract value	3
D. Political neutrality statement and contact information	3
E. Key findings	4
About this report.....	6
Detailed findings	7
A. Subscription services	7
B. Solving telecoms complaints	9
C. Resolving complaints.....	19
D. Experience with the CCTS.....	23
E. Awareness and impressions of the CCTS.....	24
Appendix A: Methodology	27
Appendix B: Survey questionnaire	33



Executive summary

A. Background and objectives

Established in 2007 by several telecommunications service providers, the Commission for Complaints for Telecom-television Services (CCTS) is an independent telecommunications consumer agency. Its mandate and structure were approved by the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC). The mandate of the CCTS is to resolve and report on consumer complaints regarding phone, internet and TV subscription services. Telecommunications Service Providers (TSPs) and licensed Television Service Providers (TVSPs) are required by the CRTC to participate in the CCTS. The CCTS is also tasked with resolving complaints related to the CRTC consumer protection codes,¹ including tracking and reporting on any breaches of these codes.

A crucial aspect of the CCTS' effectiveness is public awareness as this increases consumers' ability to seek recourse with the CCTS and allows the CCTS the opportunity to help Canadians where it can. While the CCTS is best positioned to determine which initiatives can best improve awareness, the CRTC expects that the CCTS will measure the effectiveness of its Awareness Plan on an ongoing basis. The CRTC also requires service providers to use various communication methods to inform consumers about the CCTS and expects the CCTS to regularly assess the compliance of participants with their promotional obligations and to continue with general awareness activities, including promotion on social media and outreach to consumer groups. The initial benchmark wave of research was conducted in 2024.

The specific research objectives are as follows:

- Gauge Canadian consumers' current level of awareness about the CCTS;
- Measure satisfaction with the CCTS among consumers who have utilized its services; and,
- Understand what other consumer complaint or protection services or organizations Canadian consumers are utilizing.

¹ There are currently four consumer protection codes administered by the CCTS: the Wireless Code, the TVSP Code, the Internet Code and the Deposit and Disconnection Code (for home phone services).



B. Methodology

The survey is comprised of 3093 Canadians, 18 years of age and older, who have a subscription to at least one of the following services: wireless mobile service plans, home phone service plans, Television service plans, or Internet service plans. The survey was conducted across Canada in each province and territory.

The telephone survey sample was drawn from random recruitment by RDD dual frame (land-and cell-lines) and respondents were administered the survey by live agents.

The fieldwork was conducted between October 22nd and December 22nd, 2025. Details on the rate of participation can be found in Appendix A, and the questionnaire is provided in Appendix B.

The margin of error for a random survey of 3093 individuals with a telecommunications service subscription is plus or minus 1.7 percentage points, nineteen times out of twenty.

C. Contract value

The contract value was \$162,600.41 (including HST)

Supplier name: Nanos Research

PWGSC contract number: CW2415556

Original contract date: 2025-08-25

For more information, contact the CRTC at ROP-POR@crtc.gc.ca.

D. Political neutrality statement and contact information

This certification is to be submitted with the final report submitted to the Project Authority.

I hereby certify, as a Representative of Nanos Research, that the deliverables fully comply with the Government of Canada political neutrality requirements outlined in the Government of Canada's Policy on Communications and Federal Identity and Directive on the Management of Communications. Specifically, the deliverables do not include information on electoral voting intentions, political party preferences, party standings with the electorate, or ratings of the performance of a political party or its leaders.

Nik Nanos

Chief Data Scientist and President

Nanos Research

nik@nanos.co

(613) 234-4666 x237



E. Key findings

Complaint resolution process

When asked unprompted where they would go to try and resolve a complaint related to one of their communications service providers, a strong majority of respondents continue to say they would go to their service provider if they had a complaint (81%, marginally down from 84% in February 2025 and 2024). Consistent with findings from February 2025, some 6% of respondents said they would search online what to do, while 4% said they would contact the CRTC. Just under 1% said they would contact the CCTS.

Examining the experience for those with a recent complaint, nearly all respondents who reported having had a complaint related to their service provider in the last 12 months reported having contacted their service provider to try to resolve the complaint (91%, up from 86% in February 2025, but marginally down from 99% in 2024), while 5% report they didn't take action (marginally down from 9% in February 2025, and marginally up from under 1% in 2024). **Of note, 1% reported having contacted the CCTS**, which is consistent with February 2025 (1%).

Just over half of respondents with a complaint who contacted their service provider reported that their service provider was able to resolve their complaint (51%, consistent with 48% in February 2025; marginally down from 55% in 2024), leaving just under half unresolved by the provider (45%, 50% in February 2025; 43% in February 2024), or unsure if their provider resolved the complaint (3%).

Among those who had a complaint but did not take action, the top reasons for not doing so is that there is no resolution/too complicated (34%, up from 12% in February 2025). This was followed by that they fixed it on their own/the issue doesn't happen regularly (14%), that they complained but did not fix/bad customer service (13%) or too busy/have no time (13%).

Provider referrals to the CCTS

A very strong majority of respondents (95%, 97% in February 2025) who contacted their service provider about a complaint and whose provider did not resolve their complaint continue to report that their service provider **did not** mention the CCTS as an avenue to address their complaint. This compares to 2% who reported their provider mentioning the CCTS and 2% were unsure/did not recall. This is consistent with findings from February 2025 and 2024.

Over nine in ten respondents with a complaint not resolved by their service provider say they **did not submit** a complaint to the CCTS (97%, 95% in February 2025, 99% in February 2024), while 2% did submit and 1% were unsure or did not recall. When asked why they didn't submit a complaint, respondents often cited they were not aware/did not know about the CCTS (68%, consistent with 71% in February 2025 and 64% in February 2024), that they did not see the point in doing so (9%), that they could not be bothered to (5%) or that they were not sure how to (4%).

Awareness and impressions of the CCTS

Awareness of the CCTS remains consistent with about two in ten respondents (19%) who reported they have previously heard of the CCTS (consistent with 20% in February 2025; 18% in February 2024), while 79% had not heard of it, and 2% were unsure.



Those with reported awareness of the CCTS most often reported having become aware of it on the news (37%, consistent with 39% in February 2025 and 2024), via an Internet search (13%, same as February 2025), through television (11%, same as February 2025), social media (7%, 6% in February 2025), word of mouth (6%, 3% in February 2025), and their telecommunications service provider (4%, 5% in February 2025).

Impressions of the CCTS remain steady with about one in four Canadians aware of the CCTS who have a positive impression of it (28% score of 7-10, consistent with 26% in February 2025 and 28% in February 2024). Less than one in ten have a negative impression (8% score of 0-3, same as February 2025 and consistent with 12% in February 2024). Of note, about one third of respondents remain unsure of their impression (29%, same as February 2025 and consistent with 32% in February 2024).

In terms of impressions of the usefulness of CCTS services to them, respondents remained more likely to have positive views on the usefulness although positive impressions have marginally gone down by 3 percentage points (35% score of 7-10, marginally down from 38% in February 2025; 32% in February 2024). Less than one in five hold negative views on the usefulness of the CCTS (17% score of 0-3, consistent with 16% in February 2025, 20% in February 2024). One in four (25%) respondents were unsure how useful they thought CCTS services might be for them, consistent with February 2025 and 2024.

Type and source of complaint

Just under three in ten (29%) reported having had a complaint related to the service provider they were subscribed to in the last 12 months (excluding complaints about pricing), which is consistent with findings from February 2025 (31%) and 2024 (32%). Similarly to February 2025 and 2024, the complaints were most often related to their home internet service (46% of those with a complaint, 47% in February 2025), followed by mobile phone service (26%, 29% in February 2025) and television service (23%, 22% in February 2025).

In terms of the nature of the complaints, respondents most often said the complaints related to either service delivery or billing disputes, which is consistent with results from the previous waves.



About this report

This report begins with an executive summary outlining key findings and conclusions, followed by a detailed analysis of the qualitative and quantitative results. A detailed set of “banner tables” is provided under separate cover; this presents results for all survey questions by key segments such as region, age, gender, and key communities.

The quantitative results are expressed as percentages unless otherwise noted. Base size is the total sample of n=3093 unless otherwise specified.

Detailed findings are presented in the sections that follow. Overall results are presented in the main portion of the narrative and are typically supported by graphic or tabular presentation of results. Results for the proportion of respondents in the sample who either said “don’t know” or did not provide a response may not be indicated in the graphic representation of the results in all cases, particularly where they are not sizable (e.g., 10% or less). Net results cited in the text may not exactly match individual results shown in the charts due to rounding. Results may not add to 100% due to rounding or multiple responses.

The bullets under the charts also note any significant differences between sub-groups of respondents in different demographic groups.

Key demographic patterns of interest are described throughout the report, in the following order: gender, age, province/territory, income, ethnicity, and community type.

Only demographic differences that are significantly different are presented.

Details of the methodology and sample characteristics can be found in Appendix A. The final survey instrument can be found in Appendix B.



Detailed findings

A. Subscription services

Type of communications service subscription

Type of engagement	Home phone service (n=3085)	Cell phone service (n=3093)	Television service (n=3093)	Home Internet service (n=3093)	Service bundle (n=3034)
Yes	49.5%	93.4%	64.6%	94.2%	52.9%
No	49.6%	6.6%	33.8%	5.6%	43.0%
Don't know/no response	0.9%	0.1%	1.6%	0.3%	4.2%

Base: Total sample, n=3093 Canadians with a subscription to at least one telecommunication service.

- Does your household subscribe to a home phone service, also known as a landline?
- Do you have your own cell phone, smartphone or other wireless device?
- Does your household subscribe to a cable, satellite or IPTV TV service? [IF ASKED: IPTV is a different way of getting traditional TV, similar to cable or satellite TV. IPTV is different from Netflix or other streaming services. (IPTV does not include Netflix)]
- Does your household subscribe to a home Internet service?
- Does your household subscribe to a service bundle or package? For example, this could be a landline telephone service and home internet service sold as one single bundled package.

Province/territories

- Respondents in Atlantic are more likely than Canadians overall to report subscribing to a home phone service (69% vs. 49%), a television service (73% vs 65%) and a bundle package (70% vs 53%).
- Respondents from Quebec are more likely than Canadians overall to report subscribing to a television service (74% vs 65%).
- Respondents from the Prairies are less likely than Canadians overall to report subscribing to a home phone service (37% vs. 49%) and a television service (54% vs 65%).
- Respondents from the North are less likely than Canadians overall to report subscribing to a home phone service (34% vs. 49%), a cellphone service (82% vs. 93%), a television service (38% vs 65%), home internet service (71% vs. 94%) and a bundle package (34% vs 53%).

Age

- Older Canadians (48% of those 45-54, 64% of those 55 to 64, 80% of those 65 plus) are more likely to report subscribing to a home phone service than younger Canadians (29% of those 18-24, 21% of those 25-34, 32% of those 35-44).
- Older Canadians (67% of those 45-54, 81% of those 55 to 64, 86% of those 65 plus) are more likely to report subscribing to a television service than younger Canadians (42% of those 18-24, 39% of those 25-34, 53% of those 35-44).
- Older Canadians (61% of those 45-54, 62% of those 55 to 64, 72% of those 65 plus) are more likely to report subscribing to a service bundle than younger Canadians (23% of those 18-24, 30% of those 25-34, 50% of those 35-44).



Income

- Canadians with a lower income (under \$40K) are less likely than Canadians overall to report being subscribed to a mobile phone service (82% vs 93%), home internet service (84% vs 94%), and a service bundle (42% vs 53%).



B. Solving telecoms complaints

Methods to resolve complaints related to phone, television, and internet services

A strong majority of respondents with a subscription to a telecommunications service said they would go to their service provider if they had a complaint (81%, marginally down from 84% in both February 2025 and 2024). Consistent with findings from 2024, some 6% of respondents said they would search online what to do, while 4% said they would contact the CRTC. Just under 1% said they would contact the CCTS.

Just under three in ten (29%, consistent with 31% in February 2025 and 32% in February 2024) reported having had a complaint related to the service provider they were subscribed to in the last 12 months (excluding complaints about pricing). The complaints were most often related to their home internet service (46%, consistent with 47% in February 2025) and about either service delivery (51%) or billing disputes for all service types (37%).

Q1 – If you had a complaint related to one of your communications service providers that delivers mobile, home phone, television, and internet services, where would you go to try and resolve it? [OPEN]

How to resolve complaints with service providers

	Feb 2024	Feb 2025	Dec 2025
Type of engagement	Total (n=1230)	Total (n=1188)	Total (n=2949)
Contact the service provider	84.2%	84.2%	80.7%
Look up online what to do/Google	6.6%	5.9%	5.7%
CRTC	4.5%	4.4%	4.5%
Go to another provider/switch providers	1.1%	3.6%	2.9%
A family member/friend	1.3%	2.1%	2.2%
Go to the store/place I bought it	1.8%	2.2%	2.1%
Nothing/I wouldn't do anything	1.0%	1.5%	1.5%
Government agency (unspecified)	0.9%	0.4%	1.1%
Haven't had any issues/problems	0.5%	0.6%	0.7%
Office de la protection du consommateur	0.9%	0.9%	0.6%
Better Business Bureau	0.2%	0.3%	0.5%
Go to the media/social media	0.8%	0.6%	0.4%
Try to solve myself/troubleshoot problem	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%
Ombudsman	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%
Contact my local MP	-	0.3%	0.3%
CCTS	0.3%	0.6%	0.2%
Bring to IT person/repair person	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%
Other	1.5%	5.9%	5.9%
Unsure	7.3%	6.6%	8.1%

Base: All respondents, n=2949.



Province/territories

- Respondents in Ontario (84%) and the Prairies (85%) were more likely to mention they would go to their service provider than respondents in Quebec (69%).

Gender

- Women (84%) were more likely to mention they would go to their service provider than men (77%).

Recent complaints related to phone, television, and internet services

Q2 - In the last 12 months, have you had a complaint related to the service provider you were subscribed to? Please note we do not mean a complaint related to the monthly price of a service.

Recent complaint with service providers

	Feb 2024	Feb 2025	Dec 2025
Have had a complaint in last 12 months	Total (n=1301)	Total (n=1295)	Total (n=3093)
Yes	31.5%	31.3%	28.5%
No	68.1%	67.9%	70.8%
Unsure/do not recall	<1%	<1%	<1%

Base: All respondents, n=3093.

Province/territories

- Respondents in Quebec were less likely to report they have had a complaint in the last 12 months (14%) compared to respondents overall (29%).

Age

- Canadians aged 45 to 54 (33%) were more likely to report they have had a complaint in the last 12 months than Canadian aged 18 to 24 (23%).

Income

- Respondents from a higher income bracket (\$100K or more) were more likely to report having had a complaint related to their service provider (31%) compared to lower income individuals (22% of those with an income of under \$40K).



Q3 - Thinking of your most recent complaint, what service did the complaint relate to? [SELECT ALL THAT APPLY]

Service complaint related to

	Feb 2024	Feb 2025	Dec 2025
Type of service	Total (n=406)*	Total (n=417)*	Total (n=880)*
[IF SUBSCRIBES] Internet service	49.7%	46.8%	45.6%
[IF SUBSCRIBES] Mobile phone service	24.0%	28.9%	25.9%
[IF SUBSCRIBES] Television service	22.2%	22.1%	23.1%
[IF SUBSCRIBES] Bundle service	11.1%	9.5%	16.4%
[IF SUBSCRIBES] Home phone service	10.1%	5.2%	9.8%
Unsure/don't recall	3.0%	2.5%	-

Base: Respondents who have had a complaint relating to a telecommunications service they subscribe to in the last 12 months, n=880.

*Based on multiple mentions

Province/territories

- Residents from the Territories were more likely to report that their service complaint was for mobile phone services (42%) and home phone services (26%) compared to Canadians overall (26% and 10%, respectively).
- Canadians from Quebec (30%) were more likely to report that their service complaint was for television services (30%) than residents from the North (14%) or the Atlantic region (14%).



Q4 – [IF COMPLAINT WAS RELATED TO MOBILE SERVICE] What was/were the reason(s) for the complaint related to your mobile phone service? [Select multiple]

Q6 – [IF COMPLAINT WAS RELATED TO HOME PHONE SERVICE] What was/were the reason(s) for the complaint related to your home phone service? [Select multiple]

Q8 – [IF COMPLAINT WAS RELATED TO TELEVISION SERVICE] What was/were the reason(s) for the complaint related to your television service? [Select multiple]

Q10 – [IF COMPLAINT WAS RELATED TO HOME INTERNET SERVICE] What was/were the reason(s) for the complaint related to your internet service? [Select multiple]

Q12 – [IF COMPLAINT WAS RELATED TO SERVICE BUNDLE] What was/were the reason(s) for the complaint related to your service bundle? [Select multiple]

Cause of service complaint (December 2025)

Statement	Mobile service (n=231)	Home phone service (n=100)	Internet service (n=360)	Television service (n=237)	Service bundle (n=142)
Service delivery	50.7%	72.4%	72.0%	66.0%	48.4%
Billing disputes and/or errors (this does not include the price of the service itself)	37.3%	19.5%	17.5%	14.7%	32.1%
Compliance with contract terms and commitments	10.6%	6.3%	5.7%	9.1%	11.0%
Credit, deposit, payment management	5.8%	5.0%	3.3%	2.6%	9.6%
Costs (general)	5.8%	2.7%	-	3.4%	10.1%
Communication (respect, a lack of information, etc.)	1.9%	-	-	-	-
Issues with fraud	0.6%	-	-	-	-
Phone not working/issues with phone number being carried over	0.4%	-	-	-	-
Other (Specify)	2.0%	0.8%	-	1.6%	4.8%
Unsure/do not recall	0.2%	-	7.3%	2.1%	-
Technical Issues (Call dropping/Wi-Fi malfunction/wires crossed)	-	8.0%	-	-	-
Too many channels/channels I did not want	-	-	-	0.6%	-
Provider cut number of available channels in package	-	-	-	0.4%	-

Base: Respondents who have had a complaint relating to a telecommunications service they subscribe to in the last 12 months, n=880.



Mobile service

Statement	Feb 2024 (n=94)	Feb 2025 (n=113)	Dec 2025 (n=231)
Service delivery	41.8%	50.7%	50.7%
Billing disputes and/or errors (this does not include the price of the service itself)	45.6%	41.5%	37.3%
Compliance with contract terms and commitments	7.8%	18.4%	10.6%
Credit, deposit, payment management	6.6%	5.7%	5.8%
Costs (general)	2.1%	-	5.8%
Communication (respect, a lack of information, etc.)	1.9%	2.1%	1.9%
Issues with fraud	3.4%	-	0.6%
Phone not working/issues with phone number being carried over	1.3%	2.1%	0.4%
Unsure/do not recall	2.3%	1.4%	0.2%

Base: Respondents who have had a complaint relating to mobile service they subscribe to in the last 12 months, n=231.

Home phone service

Statement	Feb 2024 (n=45)	Feb 2025 (n=27)*	Dec 2025 (n=100)
Service delivery	73.5%	-	72.4%
Billing disputes and/or errors (this does not include the price of the service itself)	24.3%	-	19.5%
Call dropping/Wi-Fi malfunction	9.2%	-	8.0%
Compliance with contract terms and commitments	5.3%	-	6.3%
Credit, deposit, payment management	4.2%	-	5.0%
Costs (general)	-	-	2.7%
Other	-	-	0.8%
Spam calls	3.9%	-	-

Base: Respondents who have had a complaint relating to home phone service they subscribe to in the last 12 months, n=100.

*NOTE: This data has been suppressed due to a sample size of less than 30.

Internet service

Statement	Feb 2024 (n=187)	Feb 2025 (n=180)	Dec 2025 (n=360)
Service delivery	77.8%	76.4%	72.0%
Billing disputes and/or errors (this does not include the price of the service itself)	16.3%	14.4%	17.5%
Compliance with contract terms and commitments	9.3%	6.3%	5.7%
Credit, deposit, payment management	4.0%	3.7%	3.3%
Unsure/do not recall	4.3%	4.5%	7.3%

Base: Respondents who have had a complaint relating to internet service they subscribe to in the last 12 months, n=360.



Television service

Statement	Feb 2024 (n=101)	Feb 2025 (n=107)	Dec 2025 (n=237)
Service delivery	57.5%	70.2%	66.0%
Billing disputes and/or errors (this does not include the price of the service itself)	23.8%	13.5%	14.7%
Technical/hardware issues	15.4%	5.4%	14.4%
Compliance with contract terms and commitments	6.2%	7.8%	9.1%
Too expensive/fee increase	-	2.9%	3.4%
Credit, deposit, payment management	2.7%	-	2.6%
Too many channels/channels I did not want	1.6%	-	0.6%
Provider cut number of available channels in package	2.4%	4.9%	0.4%
Problems with method of payment (Online pay, no longer receiving paper bills)	2.3%	-	-
Other	-	0.5%	1.6%
Unsure/do not recall	2.2%	1.0%	2.1%

Base: Respondents who have had a complaint relating to television service they subscribe to in the last 12 months, n=237.

Service bundle

Statement	2024 (n=47)	2025 (n=45)	Dec 2025 (n=142)
Service delivery	18.0%	50.6%	48.4%
Billing disputes and/or errors (this does not include the price of the service itself)	-	35.7%	32.1%
Compliance with contract terms and commitments	75.4%	12.4%	11.0%
Price/price was increased	12.4%	3.5%	10.1%
Credit, deposit, payment management	-	8.2%	9.6%
Other	5.2%	1.9%	4.8%
Unsure/do not recall	-	2.5%	-

Base: Respondents who have had a complaint relating to service bundle they subscribe to in the last 12 months, n=142.



Q5– [IF COMPLAINT WAS RELATED TO MOBILE SERVICE] Who was your provider at the time you had the complaint?

Q7– [IF COMPLAINT WAS RELATED TO HOME PHONE SERVICE] Who was your provider at the time you had the complaint?

Q9– [IF COMPLAINT WAS RELATED TO TELEVISION SERVICE] Who was your provider at the time you had the complaint?

Q11– [IF COMPLAINT WAS RELATED TO HOME INTERNET SERVICE] Who was your provider at the time you had the complaint? [DO NOT READ]

Q13– [IF COMPLAINT WAS RELATED TO SERVICE BUNDLE] Who was your provider at the time you had the complaint?

Service provider when complaint was made (December 2025)

Providers – Top Mentions	Mobile service (n=231)	Home phone service (n=100)	Internet service (n=361)	Television service (n=237)	Service bundle (n=142)
Bell	27.0%	40.5%	22.7%	33.4%	26.9%
Rogers	20.1%	15.9%	28.4%	29.7%	32.4%
Telus	27.6%	21.9%	17.3%	11.1%	25.0%
Videotron	2.0%	-	4.5%	4.4%	1.9%
Chatr	0.9%	-	-	-	-
Fido	6.0%	-	-	-	-
Freedom Mobile	2.2%	-	-	-	-
Koodo	3.9%	1.7%	-	-	-
Lucky	0.3%	-	-	-	-
PC Mobile	1.0%	-	-	-	-
Virgin	3.0%	0.5%	1.2%	-	-
SaskTel	0.5%	-	0.8%	1.4%	1.1%
Northwestel	0.2%	1.5%	0.2%	0.8%	0.1%
Shaw	0.1%	1.0%	4.7%	4.9%	2.6%
Eastlink	-	0.7%	2.7%	1.9%	1.9%
MTS	-	0.7%	-	-	-
Xplornet	-	-	0.5%	-	-
Cogeco	-	-	2.9%	3.4%	4.1%
Access	-	-	-	0.5%	-
Citywest	-	-	-	0.5%	-
Seaside Cable	-	-	0.7%	-	-
Valley Fibre	-	-	0.5%	-	-
Other	3.0%	-	5.1%	1.6%	0.3%
Unsure/Prefer not to answer	2.3%	15.8%	7.7%	6.6%	3.6%

Base: Respondents who have had a complaint relating to a telecommunications service they subscribe to in the last 12 months, n=880.



Mobile service

Providers – Top Mentions	Feb 2024 (n=94)	Feb 2025 (n=112)	Dec 2025 (n=231)
Telus	18.3%	24.5%	27.6%
Bell	25.7%	29.0%	27.0%
Rogers	25.3%	20.2%	20.1%
Fido	8.2%	7.0%	6.0%
Koodo	5.2%	2.4%	3.9%
Virgin	3.6%	2.6%	3.0%
Freedom Mobile/Wind	2.8%	2.0%	2.2%
Videotron	4.4%	0.7%	2.0%
PC mobile	-	-	1.0%
Chatr	-	1.7%	0.9%
SaskTel	0.4%	2.2%	0.5%
Other	-	1.7%	3.0%
Unsure/Prefer not to answer	4.7%	2.0%	2.3%

Base: Respondents who have had a complaint relating to mobile service they subscribe to in the last 12 months, n=231.

Home phone service

Providers – Top Mentions	Feb 2024 (n=46)	Feb 2025 (n=26)*	Dec 2025 (n=100)
Bell	38.0%	-	40.5%
Telus	22.4%	-	21.9%
Rogers	7.9%	-	15.9%
Koodo	-	-	1.7%
Northwestel	2.9%	-	1.5%
Shaw	3.5%	-	1.0%
Eastlink	1.9%	-	0.7%
Unsure/Prefer not to answer	7.5%	-	15.8%

Base: Respondents who have had a complaint relating to home phone service they subscribe to in the last 12 months, n=100.

*NOTE: This data has been suppressed due to a sample size of less than 30.



Internet service

Providers – Top Mentions	Feb 2024 (n=187)	Feb 2025 (n=181)	Dec 2025 (n=361)
Rogers	17.8%	24.4%	28.4%
Bell	29.2%	20.9%	22.7%
Telus	18.3%	19.6%	17.3%
Shaw	2.9%	7.7%	4.7%
Videotron	3.2%	4.7%	4.5%
Cogeco	5.4%	4.1%	2.9%
Eastlink	2.6%	2.9%	2.7%
Virgin	1.0%	3.3%	1.2%
Other	-	3.0%	5.1%
Unsure/Prefer not to answer	4.3%	4.4%	7.7%

Base: Respondents who have had a complaint relating to an internet service they subscribe to in the last 12 months, n=361.

Television service

Providers – Top Mentions	Feb 2024 (n=101)	Feb 2025 (n=107)	Dec 2025 (n=237)
Bell	30.4%	20.5%	33.4%
Rogers	29.8%	38.3%	29.7%
Telus	12.3%	10.6%	11.1%
Shaw	2.6%	9.8%	4.9%
Videotron	4.6%	5.1%	4.4%
Cogeco	7.7%	6.5%	3.4%
Eastlink	3.0%	3.5%	1.9%
SaskTel	1.8%	2.0%	1.4%
Other	-	2.0%	1.6%
Unsure/Prefer not to answer	3.5%	1.7%	6.6%

Base: Respondents who have had a complaint relating to television service they subscribe to in the last 12 months, n=237.



Service bundle

Providers – Top Mentions	Feb 2024 (n=47)	Feb 2025 (n=44)	Dec 2025 (n=142)
Rogers	27.1%	29.4%	32.4%
Bell	32.2%	25.1%	26.9%
Telus	18.6%	23.4%	25.0%
Cogeco	4.9%	-	4.1%
Shaw	2.1%	6.7%	2.6%
Eastlink	1.1%	3.8%	1.9%
Videotron	6.0%	-	1.9%
SaskTel	1.7%	2.0%	1.1%
Unsure/Prefer not to answer	4.9%	7.0%	3.6%

Base: Respondents who have had a complaint relating to a service bundle they subscribe to in the last 12 months, n=142.



C. Resolving complaints

A very strong majority of Canadians who reported having had a complaint related to the service provider they were subscribed to in the last 12 months said they contacted their service provider to try to resolve the complaint (91%, up from 86% in February 2025 but down from 99% in 2024), while 5% report they didn't take action (a marginal decrease from 9% in February 2025 but a marginal increase from less than 1% of Canadians in 2024). Top reasons for not taking action included no resolution/too complicated (34%, up from 12% in February 2025), that they fixed it on their own/the issue doesn't happen regularly (14%), that they complained but did not fix/bad customer service (13%) or too busy/have no time (13%).

Just over half of respondents reported their service provider was able to resolve their complaint (51%, consistent with 48% in February 2025 and 55% in 2024), leaving just over one in two unresolved by the provider (45%) or unsure if the provider resolved the complaint (3%).

Of note, consistent with 2025, more than nine in ten respondents (95%, 97% in February 2025, 96% in February 2024) who contacted their service provider about a complaint and whose provider did not resolve their complaint reported that their service provider **did not** refer them to the CCTS as an avenue to resolve an unresolved complaint.

In addition, more than nine in ten reported they **did not submit** a complaint to the CCTS (97%, consistent with 95% in February 2025, 99% in 2024), most often citing they were not aware/did not know about the CCTS (68%, consistent with 71% in February 2025 and 63% in February 2024).

Q14– What did you do to try to resolve the complaint? [RANDOMIZE][SELECT ALL THAT APPLY] [IF HAD A COMPLAINT IN Q2]

Action taken to resolve complaint

	Feb 2024	Feb 2025	Dec 2025
Statement	Total (n=407)	Total (n=418)	Total (n=897)
Contacted your service provider	99.1%	85.8%	90.6%
Did not do anything/didn't take action	<1%	9.1%	5.4%
Changed providers/cancelled service*	-	3.0%	2.2%
Contacted the CCTS	-	1.0%	1.2%
Contacted the CRTC	-	0.6%	1.0%
Fixed it myself (re-set router, reset phone, etc.)*	-	0.7%	0.6%
Asked family/friends for help	0.8%	<1%	<1%
Google/Internet search	<1%	<1%	<1%
Other	<1%	2.4%	1.5%
Unsure/don't recall	-	0.7%	0.6%

*New category in 2025 wave.

Base: Respondents who have had a complaint relating to a telecommunications service they subscribe to in the last 12 months, n=897.



Province/territory

- Respondents from Quebec (8%) were more likely to contact the CCTS than Canadians overall (1%) to try to resolve their complaint.

Reasons for not taking action to resolve complaint

Q15– Why did you not file a complaint? [OPEN][IF DID NOTHING IN Q14]

	Feb 2024	Feb 2025	Dec 2025
Statement	Total (n=22)*	Total (n=32)	Total (n=48)
No resolution/ Too complicated	-	11.6%	33.7%
Fixed it on my own/ Problem not happening regularly	-	14.3%	14.4%
Complained but did not fix/Bad customer service	-	10.9%	13.4%
Too busy/ No time	-	22.1%	13.1%
Did not know what to do/Lack of information	-	14.5%	11.4%
Will have it fixed	-	2.1%	8.3%
Unsure/don't recall	-	24.4%	-

*NOTE: This data has been suppressed due to a sample size of less than 30.

Base: Respondents who have had a complaint relating to a telecommunications service they subscribe to in the last 12 months but did not take action to resolve it, n=48.

Q16– Was your service provider able to resolve your complaint to your satisfaction? [IF WENT TO PROVIDER IN Q14]

Service provider able to resolve complaint

	Feb 2024	Feb 2025	Dec 2025
Service provider resolved complaint	Total (n=369)	Total (n=359)	Total (n=798)
Yes	54.9%	48.4%	51.1%
No	42.6%	49.5%	45.5%
Unsure/don't recall	2.5%	2.1%	3.4%

Base: Respondents who contacted their service provider about a complaint in the past 12 months, n=798.

Province/territory

- Respondents from the Territories (66%) were more likely to report that their service provider was able to resolve the complaint to their satisfaction than Canadians living in British Columbia (43%) or the Atlantic region (46%).



Q17– Did your service provider refer you to the Commission for Complaints for Telecom-television Services (CCTS)? [IF NO OR UNSURE IN Q16]

Provider referring complaints to the Commission for Complaints for Telecom-television Services (CCTS)

	Feb 2024	Feb 2025	Dec 2025
Statement	Total (n=166)	Total (n=176)	Total (n=372)
Yes	2.1%	1.2%	2.1%
No	96.3%	97.1%	95.4%
Unsure/don't recall	1.6%	1.7%	2.5%

Base: Respondents who contacted their service provider about a complaint in the past 12 months and whose service provider did not resolve the complaint, n=372.

Q18 – [IF NO OR UNSURE IN Q16] Did you submit a complaint through the CCTS?

Submitting a complaint through the CCTS

	Feb 2024	Feb 2025	Dec 2025
Submitted a complaint	Total (n=167)	Total (n=177)	Total (n=380)
No	98.9%	95.0%	96.6%
Yes	-	2.4%	2.0%
Unsure/don't recall	1.1%	2.7%	1.3%

Base: Respondents who contacted their service provider about a complaint in the past 12 months and whose service provider did not resolve the complaint, n=380.



Q19 - Why did you not submit a complaint to the CCTS? [RANDOMIZE][IF NO TO Q18]

Reason for not submitting a complaint through the CCTS

	2024	Feb 2025	Dec 2025
Reason	Total (n=164)	Total (n=171)	Total (n=369)
Was not aware/did not know about the CCTS	63.3%	71.2%	68.2%
I didn't see the point	11.0%	8.7%	8.6%
I couldn't be bothered	5.9%	6.7%	5.4%
My complaint was resolved/didn't need to	4.3%	1.4%	4.1%
I wasn't sure how to	6.6%	5.0%	3.8%
I thought my provider could solve the issue/provider is working on it	2.2%	0.5%	3.0%
Never thought about it	1.0%	-	1.8%
I changed providers instead	1.7%	0.6%	0.5%
They have not helped before/I have tried in the past*	-	0.6%	0.3%
Other	0.5%	1.5%	0.7%
Unsure	3.6%	3.8%	3.5%

*New category in 2025 wave.

Base: Respondents who contacted their service provider about a complaint in the past 12 months and whose service provider did not resolve the complaint and who did not submit a complaint to the CCTS, n=369.

Province/territory

- Respondents from the Territories (28%) were more likely to say the reason they did not submit a complaint through the CCTS was because they weren't sure how to than Canadians overall (4%).



D. Experience with the CCTS

Method of submitting a complaint through the CCTS

Q20 - How did you submit the complaint to the CCTS? [IF SELECTED CCTS IN Q14 OR YES TO Q18]

NOTE: This data has been suppressed due to a sample size of less than 30.

Resolution of complaint through the CCTS

Q21 - Was your complaint resolved? [IF SELECTED CCTS IN Q14 OR YES TO Q18]

NOTE: This data has been suppressed due to a sample size of less than 30.

Satisfaction with CCTS experience

Q22 - On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is not at all satisfied and 10 is very satisfied, how satisfied were you with your experience with the CCTS? [IF SELECTED CCTS IN Q14 OR YES TO Q18]

NOTE: This data has been suppressed due to a sample size of less than 30.

Reason for satisfaction rating with CCTS experience

Q23 - Why do you have that opinion? [OPEN] [IF SELECTED CCTS IN Q14 OR YES TO Q18]

NOTE: This data has been suppressed due to a sample size of less than 30.



E. Awareness and impressions of the CCTS

Nearly two in ten respondents (19%) report they have previously heard of the CCTS, which is consistent with the previous waves (20% in February 2025, 18% in February 2024). Those who report being aware of the CCTS most often say they have heard of it on the news (37%, 39% in February 2025 and February 2024), via an Internet search (13%, 13% in February 2025, 10% in February 2024), or television (11%, 11% in February 2025, 8% in February 2024), all consistent with results from the two previous waves.

Respondents aware of the CCTS have very similar views compared to 2025 and 2024, with a majority having at least a neutral or positive impression of the CCTS (63%, 63% in February 2025, 56% in February 2024). Impressions of the usefulness of the CCTS are slightly below the previous wave but higher than February 2024 with a mean score of 5.7 (5.9 in February 2025, 5.3 in February 2024) although respondents continue to have diverse views on the perceived usefulness of CCTS services for them personally (35% give this a score of 7-10 out of 10; marginally down from 38% in February 2025, 32% in February 2024).

Q24 - Prior to today, had you heard or not heard of the Commission for Complaints for Telecom-television Services (CCTS)? [ASK UNLESS "YES" TO Q18]

Awareness of the CCTS

	Feb 2024	Feb 2025	Dec 2025
Awareness	Total (n=1301)	Total (n=1292)	Total (n=3086)
Heard	18.3%	20.1%	19.0%
Not heard	80.2%	78.6%	79.2%
Unsure	1.5%	1.3%	1.8%

Base: All respondents, n=3086.



Q25 - Where did you hear about the CCTS? [ASK IF HEARD IN Q24 OR YES TO Q18 OR SELECTED CCTS IN Q14]

Where they heard about the CCTS

	Feb 2024	Feb 2025	Dec 2025
How became aware of CCTS	Total (n=268)	Total (n=278)	Total (n=637)
The news	39.1%	38.5%	36.7%
Internet search	9.6%	13.4%	13.3%
Television in general (e.g., ads, etc.)	7.9%	10.7%	10.8%
Social media	5.3%	5.9%	6.6%
Word of mouth	7.9%	2.5%	5.8%
Your telecommunications service provider	2.2%	4.8%	3.6%
Education/School/Training	1.6%	3.4%	3.1%
The CRTC	2.1%	1.3%	2.8%
Radio	5.2%	4.1%	2.7%
Newspaper	0.6%	0.2%	1.5%
Have contacted them in past	-	-	0.3%
Other	2.2%	1.4%	1.4%
Unsure/do not recall	14.8%	12.9%	11.5%

Base: Respondents who have heard of the CCTS, n=637.

Region

- Residents of Quebec (13%) were marginally less likely than residents of the Atlantic region (25%) to report having previously heard of the CCTS.

Age

- Older respondents (65 plus: 25%; 55-64: 25%) reported higher awareness than younger respondents (18-24: 7%; 25-34: 12%).



Q26 - On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is a very negative impression and 10 is a very positive impression, what is your overall impression of the CCTS? [ASK IF HEARD IN Q24 OR YES TO Q18 OR SELECTED CCTS IN Q14]

Overall impression of the CCTS

	Feb 2024	Feb 2025	Dec 2025
Impression (score of 0-10)	Total (n=268)	Total (n=283)	Total (n=637)
Mean	5.6	5.7	5.8
Negative (0-3)	11.6%	7.5%	7.8%
Neutral (4-6)	28.4%	36.8%	35.4%
Positive (7-10)	28.1%	26.4%	27.8%
Unsure/do not recall	31.9%	29.3%	29.0%

Base: Respondents who have heard of the CCTS, n=637.

Q27 - On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is not at all useful and 10 is very useful, how useful do you think the services that the CCTS provides would be to you?

Overall impression of the usefulness of CCTS

	Feb 2024	Feb 2025	Dec 2025
Usefulness of CCTS (score of 0-10)	Total (n=1301)	Total (n=1295)	Total (n=3093)
Mean	5.3	5.9	5.7
Not useful (0-3)	20.1%	15.9%	16.5%
Neutral (4-6)	22.8%	21.7%	23.8%
Useful (7-10)	32.1%	37.8%	34.5%
Unsure/do not recall	25.0%	24.5%	25.2%

Base: All respondents, n=3093

Province/territories

- Respondents in Ontario and the North were slightly more likely to think the services the CCTS provides would be useful to them (mean of 6.0 out of 10 each) than respondents in the Prairies (mean score of 5.3).

Income

- Mid-income respondents (household income of \$40K to under \$100K) were more likely to think the services offered by the CCTS would be useful (mean score of 6.1 out of 10) than high income respondents (\$100K or more) (mean of 5.5).



Appendix A: Methodology

Nanos conducted a RDD dual frame (land- and cell-lines) random telephone survey of 3093 Canadians, 18 years of age or older, with a subscription to at least one of the following plans between October 22nd and December 22nd, 2025: wireless mobile service plans, home phone service plans, television service plans, internet service plans or service bundle. Participants were randomly recruited by telephone and administered a survey via live agent. The results were statistically checked and weighted by age and gender using the latest Census information and the sample was geographically stratified to be representative of Canada.

This research project is compliant with the terms of the Standards for the Conduct of Government of Canada Public Opinion Research. All research conducted complies with the Standards for the Conduct of Government of Canada Public Opinion Research – Telephone Surveys.

All Nanos surveys are registered in the CRIC Research Verification Service and contain a Research Verification Service (RVS) number. This registration number can be used to check the legitimacy of the research and provide feedback on the research.

Nanos Research monitors ten percent of all fieldwork for quality control and assurance in accordance with the standards of CRIC, European Society for Opinion and Marketing Research and American Association for Public Opinion Research.

Sample Characteristics

The following table outlines the weighted and unweighted sample composition for the survey.

Demographic	Unweighted	Weighted
Age	n=3093	n=3034
18-24	203	305
25-34	286	501
35-44	410	499
45-54	446	475
55-64	531	533
65 plus	1217	721
Gender	n=3093	n=3034
Male	1677	1463
Female	1382	1537
Prefer not to answer	34	34
Education	n=3093	n=3034
High School diploma, equivalent or less	618	539
Registered Apprenticeship or other trades certificate or diploma/College, CEGEP or other non-university certificate or diploma	1015	994
University certificate or diploma/Bachelor's degree or post-graduate degree below Bachelor's level	1400	1448



Demographic	Unweighted	Weighted
Prefer not to answer	60	54
Total household income	n=3093	n=3034
Low income (under \$40,000)	414	369
Mid-income (\$40,000 to \$80,000)	1047	973
High income (\$80,000 or more)	1051	1070
Prefer not to answer	581	622
Region	n=3093	n=3034
British Columbia	383	419
Prairies	552	533
Ontario	975	1161
Quebec	632	702
Atlantic	247	201
Territories	304	18

Screening

Once invited, participants were administered a set of screening questions to filter out anyone who was not eligible to participate in the study. For the purposes of this study the following screening criteria were applied:

- The first set of screening criteria that were applied are industry standard screening criteria. This involves several components, the first of which is age – in this case, all respondents confirmed they are 18 years of age or older at the time they are taking the survey. Any respondent who indicated they are under 18 years of age or refused to answer the question was not allowed to proceed through the survey.
- Respondents were also screened on their employment situation and the employment situation of their immediate family members/household members. The industry standards required that any respondents who indicated they are employed, or have family members employed, in the market research, advertising and/or media sectors were not allowed to proceed through the survey.
- In addition, respondents were screened on their subscriptions to telecommunications services, which were required to qualify for the survey. Respondents needed to have a subscription to at least one of the following services: cell phone service, home landline service, home internet service, television service or a service bundle.

As noted, respondents who fell into any of the above categories or who reported not having any telecommunications service subscriptions were immediately terminated from the research/prevented from proceeding any further and they were no longer eligible to participate in the study.

Fieldwork Dates

Fieldwork was conducted between October 22nd and December 22nd, 2025.

Margin of error

The margin of error for the random sample of 3093 Canadians, 18 years of age and older, is 1.7 percentage points plus or minus, nineteen times out of twenty.



Questionnaire design

The questionnaire used was the same as the second wave conducted in 2025 and the benchmark wave conducted in 2024. Initially, the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission provided Nanos with desired topic areas for the questionnaire. Nanos Research then designed a questionnaire and advised on best practices in question design. Upon approval of the English questionnaire, Nanos Research translated the questionnaire into French which was then reviewed by the CRTC.

Nanos programmed the questionnaire into our CATI system, then thoroughly tested the programming in English and French to ensure accuracy ahead of the pre-test and rollout. This procedure ensured that the survey logic accurately reflected the questionnaire and data was collected properly. The final survey questionnaire is included in Appendix B.

Interview Duration

Interview length averaged 8 minutes and ranged from 5 to 24 minutes.

Weighting Procedures

Our sampling methodology stratified the population along three key variables which allowed triangulation of the weighting approach and yielded robust, geographic and demographic representation across the country.

The sample was stratified along three axes – by region/province, by sex and by age. Fixed completion quotas were assigned to each province, which were anchored by their population distribution relative to the national total.

In order to ensure balanced representation within each province/region, the sample was further stratified by sub-regions. This prevented over/under-sampling of geographies (ex. City of Toronto), within the provincial total.

Within each province soft gender/sex quotas were then set which approximate that area's sex distribution. The data collection allowed for a variance of +/- 5% for sex within each region, again preventing over representation by either men or women. The third stratification axis was by age category. The age categories were used to group respondents and for weighting purposes.

Each of the age categories were weighted, within their sex and their province/region, the outcome of which yielded a dataset which accurately reflects the demographic composition of the population at large.

Quality Controls

Prior to launching the survey, a pre-test was conducted with 20 individuals (10 English, 10 French). The purpose of the pre-test was to ensure that the content of the questionnaire was understandable, that the duration of the interview fit the target, to ensure comparability between the French and the English, and to ensure that the logic of the survey flowed smoothly. The pre-test was completed from October 22nd to October 26th, 2025.

Upon completion of the pre-test, Nanos and the CRTC reviewed the findings and determined no modifications were needed and the survey was deployed to the full sample.

Between 10 to 15% of all the interviews conducted by Nanos are live monitored by a Nanos field supervisor on staff and present at the call centre. The following are the supervisory procedures Nanos follows to ensure the quality of all fieldwork.

Pre-field Procedures – Telephone

- Projects are staffed with employees best suited for the nature and subject matter of the project.
- The Survey Field Manager:



- analyzes the general project summary, questionnaires, sample requirements, quota requirements and any special instruction;
 - contacts the client to clarify any grey areas;
 - meticulously programs the questionnaire into CATI according to the questionnaire logic, and project requirements;
 - extensively tests the programming to ensure that all possible scenarios are properly programmed;
 - invites clients to test the CATI questionnaire on their own computer through a secure web-link;
 - if needed, forwards the structure of the data file to the client for approval prior to commencement of the fieldwork;
 - briefs the Supervisors on project specs.
- Field Supervisors analyze the questionnaires, quotas and instructions to familiarize themselves and to find points that need clarifying from the field perspective.
 - If required, a pre-test is conducted to evaluate the flow of the questionnaire in terms of question order, script and logic.

Field Procedures – Telephone

- Interviewers receive an in-depth project briefing that includes the general objectives of the project, coverage of the questionnaire, logic, and any special instructions that they may require.
- Interviewers role-play to become familiar with all aspects of the questionnaire before starting live interviewing.
- After the initial hours of interviewing, a debriefing is held to cover any issues that monitoring has discovered and to answer any questions interviewers may have.
- Full-time field supervision is provided on each project; typically, the Interviewer to Field Supervisor ratio is 10-15:1.
- Extensive monitoring of interviews is carried out during the first few days in the field. Thereafter, a minimum of 10% of all calls and interviews are monitored.
- Monitoring reports are prepared for each monitored interview, and immediate feedback is given to the interviewer.
- Audio monitoring is conducted in conjunction with video monitoring – the Field Supervisor views a remote screen that displays exactly what the interviewer is entering as they proceed with the interview.
- Continuous monitoring, feedback and ongoing training ensure that the highest performance quality is maintained
- Call validations are made in addition to call monitoring. This checks the accuracy of the data captured, but also the professionalism of the interviewers. Nanos validates a minimum of 10% of the completions by re-contacting a random selection of respondents.
- To eliminate non-response error, Nanos makes a minimum of 5 call attempts per sample on consumer surveys.
- Quota and sample management is controlled automatically by the CATI system.
- When approximately 10% of the total interviews are completed, the CATI questionnaire logic is checked by using the actual survey results to ensure that programming is correct.
- Field Supervisors verify verbatim daily to ensure the quality and accuracy of the respondents' comments.



- Assistant Field Supervisors provide additional help on projects with respect to monitoring, call validation, and verbatim quality checks.

Call Dispositions

The following table outlines the call disposition for the fieldwork.

Telephone Survey Call Disposition	
	Total
Total Numbers Attempted	332388
Out of scope - invalid	238850
NIS, Business, etc.	238850
Unresolved (U)	58314
No answer/machine/etc.	57840
Busy	474
In-score Non-responding (IS)	31996
Language barrier	347
Incapable of completing	0
Callback	1101
Refusal	30548
Termination	0
In scope responding (R)	3228
Complete	3093
Partials	135
Response Rate	3.5%

Response Rate

The response rate for this survey was 3.5%. This was calculated using the Canadian Research Insights Council (CRIC) formula, which has been approved by the Government of Canada (Response Rate/Participation Rate = $R/(U + IS + R)$).

Non-Response Bias

First, there is potential non-response bias based on the profile of the responding sample. Based on our experience, using the RDD dual frame land and cell-line sample represents the optimal and most reliable form of research that requires the least amount of post fieldwork statistical weighting. From a research perspective, the less weighting the better since the data remains random and in its raw form as shared with Nanos.

There was potential for under-coverage among individuals who may not even have access to a land or cell-line to be included in the sample. Nanos managed the non-response bias by statistically checking the demographics of the participating sample group with the Canadian population. Where a valid variance occurred, the dataset was weighted to be consistent with the profile of Canadians 18 years and older, including those, for example, of a lower socio-economic status. The estimated proportion of Canadians without access to a cellphone or landline to complete the survey is 1%².



Second, there is the potential non-response bias based on the answers themselves. Although the demographic profile of the sample reflects the Canadian population, hypothetically, the non-responding participants may have different opinions. Although this is a hypothetical possibility, the Nanos track record with respect to both economic and political sentiment which very accurately captures opinion and closely correlates to a number of external measures intended to be examined, suggests that there is little non-response bias in the Nanos methodology.

There is also the possible issue of call response bias, which is the potential bias in terms of the profile of the individual who wants to answer the phone within a household. This issue specifically relates to land-line sample where the line is within a household with multiple eligible adult respondents. This is a methodological convention which is a carryover from in-person surveys done in neighborhoods where there would be a bias of a male answering the door. The solution was to ask to interview the individual present in the household who had the next birthday. This solution helps with representativeness and bias against the profile of those who answer the phone.

Also, of note, the positive reputation of Nanos as Canada's most trusted research organization has a material impact on both response rates and, in our opinion, non-response bias.

In order to minimize non-response, the following were key:

- Having a clear and interesting survey introduction which thoroughly explained the purpose of the research, identifies the CRTC as the sponsoring agency and piques the respondent to participate in the survey.
- Our toll-free number was used on the outbound number so that respondents can call back at a later date for more information.
- Interviewers were comprehensively trained prior to going live and were required to always compose themselves in a friendly, courteous and professional manner at all times as a vehicle to engage the respondent on the line and maximize the likelihood of their participation.
- Information on the company, contact information for the Senior Fieldwork Managers as well as the project registration number was provided to respondents who wish to validate the authenticity of the research.
- Call schedules were varied throughout the appropriate calling day to increase the likelihood of reaching potential respondents who are shift workers or otherwise employed on evenings and weekends.
- Brevity – the survey was kept at a reasonable duration and did not exceed the 8-minute average survey mark.
- The questionnaire instrument was clear and concise. Overly wordy or complex questions were avoided as they can promote frustration and drop off from the survey.



Appendix B: Survey questionnaire

Hello/Bonjour, my name is XXXX. I'm calling on behalf of Nanos, a public opinion research firm. We're doing a survey for the Government of Canada to explore issues of interest to Canadians.

This survey should take up to 8 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary and completely confidential. Your answers will remain anonymous and will be protected according to the requirements of the *Privacy Act, Access to Information Act* and any other related legislation.

This survey is registered with the Canadian Research Insights Council's survey validation system.

[ACCESSIBILITY NOTE: If an alternative method of taking part in the survey is needed offer this to respondents.]

I was wondering if you could share your opinions and participate in our survey.

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

- Yes
- No (IF LANDLINE - ask if there is anyone else over 18 years if age at home, if yes – ASK TO SPEAK TO THAT PERSON; REPEAT INTRODUCTION AS NEEDED. IF CELL-LINE – Thank and terminate)

B. Do you or does anyone in your household or immediate family, work in any of the following occupations?

- Market Research [THANK/TERMINATE]
- Public or media relations or advertising [THANK/TERMINATE]
- Any media company such as print, radio, TV [THANK/TERMINATE]
- Media monitoring [THANK/TERMINATE]
- Any telecommunications company [THANK/TERMINATE]
- None of these [CONTINUE]
- [DO NOT READ] Don't know/no response [THANK/TERMINATE]

C. Have I reached you on your cell phone?

- Yes
- No

D. Are you in a place where you can safely talk on the phone and answer my questions and is this a good time to answer this survey?

- Yes [SKIP TO F]
- No [GO TO E]

INTERVIEWER NOTE: If you think respondents' setting may endanger them (e.g., driving a vehicle), hinder their participation (e.g., background distractions), or hamper their ability to respond openly (e.g., lack of privacy), suggest rescheduling the interview.

E. When would be a good time for me to call back?

- Schedule call-back if possible (time/day):
- No/refused [THANK/TERMINATE]

F. Does your household subscribe to a home phone service, also known as a landline?

- Yes [DUAL USE]..... 1
- No [CODE AS CPO]..... 2



Don't know/no response.....77

- G. Do you have your own cell phone, smartphone or other wireless device?
 - Yes1
 - No2
 - [DO NOT READ] Don't know/no response77

- H. Does your household subscribe to a cable, satellite or IPTV TV service?
 - Yes1
 - No2
 - [DO NOT READ] Don't know/no response77

[IF ASKED: IPTV is a different way of getting traditional TV, similar to cable or satellite TV. IPTV is different from Netflix or other streaming services. (IPTV does not include Netflix)]

- I. Does your household subscribe to a home Internet service?
 - Yes1
 - No2
 - [DO NOT READ] Don't know/no response77

- J. Does your household subscribe to a service bundle or package? For example, this could be a landline telephone service and home internet service sold as one single bundled package.
 - Yes1
 - No2
 - [DO NOT READ] Don't know/no response77

[NOTE – IF DOES NOT SUBSCRIBE TO ANY SERVICES IN F-J, THANK AND TERMINATE]

TERMINATION MESSAGE: Thank you for your willingness to take part in this survey. Unfortunately, you do not meet the eligibility requirements of this study.

- K. In what year were you born?
 - Record year – THEN SKIP TO M:
 - [DO NOT READ] Prefer not to answer99 [GO TO L]

- L. [IF PREFER NOT TO ANSWER IN K] Would you be willing to tell me in which of the following age categories you belong? [READ; STOP WHEN A SELECTION IS MADE]
 - 18 to 241
 - 25 to 342
 - 35 to 443
 - 45 to 544
 - 55 to 645
 - 65 or older6
 - [DO NOT READ] Prefer not to answer99

- M. How do you identify your gender? [DO NOT READ][OPEN – CODE WITH LIST]
 - Woman.....1
 - Man2
 - Another response [INTERVIEWER RECORD].....3
 - [DO NOT READ] Prefer not to answer77

- N. In which province or territory do you live? [DO NOT READ]i
 - Newfoundland and Labrador1
 - Prince Edward Island2



Nova Scotia.....3
 New Brunswick.....4
 Quebec5
 Ontario6
 Manitoba7
 Saskatchewan.....8
 Alberta.....9
 British Columbia10
 Yukon.....11
 Northwest Territories.....12
 Nunavut.....13
 [DO NOT READ] Prefer not to answer99

Our study today is about your experience related to telecommunications services.

1. If you had a complaint related to one of your communications service providers that delivers mobile, home phone, television, and internet services, where would you go to try and resolve it? [OPEN]

Mention 1:
Mention 2:

2. In the last 12 months, have you had a complaint related to the service provider you were subscribed to? Please note we do not mean a complaint related to the monthly price of a service.

- Yes1 [GO TO Q3]
- No2 [SKIP TO Q24]
- Unsure/don't recall77 [UNPROMPTED] [SKIP TO Q24]

3. [IF YES TO Q2] Thinking of your most recent complaint, what service did the complaint relate to? [SELECT ALL THAT APPLY]

- [IF SUBSCRIBES] Mobile phone service1
- [IF SUBSCRIBES] Home phone service2
- [IF SUBSCRIBES] Television service.....3
- [IF SUBSCRIBES] Internet service.....4
- [IF SUBSCRIBES] Bundle service.....5
- Unsure/don't recall [SKIP TO Q14]6

4. [IF COMPLAINT WAS RELATED TO MOBILE SERVICE IN Q3] What was/were the reason(s) for the complaint related to your mobile phone service? [Select multiple]

- Compliance with contract terms and commitments.....1
- Billing disputes and/or errors (this does not include the price of the service itself)2
- Service delivery3
- Credit, deposit, payment management4
- Other (Specify)20
- Unsure/do not recall77 [UNPROMPTED]

5. [IF COMPLAINT WAS RELATED TO MOBILE SERVICE IN Q3] Who was your provider at the time you had the complaint? [DO NOT READ]

- Bell.....1
- Eastlink2
- Rogers.....3
- Telus4
- Videotron5
- Chatr.....6
- Fido.....7



Fizz..... 8
 Freedom Mobile..... 9
 Koodo 10
 Lucky..... 11
 PC Mobile 12
 Virgin 13
 Other (Record) 20
 Unsure/Prefer not to answer 99

6. [IF COMPLAINT WAS RELATED TO HOME PHONE SERVICE IN Q3] What was/were the reason(s) for the complaint related to your home phone service? [Select multiple]

Compliance with contract terms and commitments..... 1
 Billing disputes and/or errors (this does not include the price of the service itself) 2
 Service delivery 3
 Credit, deposit, payment management 4
 Other (Specify) 20
 Unsure/do not recall 77 [UNPROMPTED]

7. [IF COMPLAINT WAS RELATED TO HOME PHONE SERVICE IN Q3] Who was your provider at the time you had the complaint? [DO NOT READ]

Bell..... 1
 Cogeco..... 2
 Eastlink 3
 Rogers..... 4
 Telus 5
 Videotron 6
 Fido..... 7
 Virgin 8
 Other (Record) 20
 Unsure/Prefer not to answer 99

8. [IF COMPLAINT WAS RELATED TO TELEVISION SERVICE IN Q3] What was/were the reason(s) for the complaint related to your television service? [Select multiple]

Compliance with contract terms and commitments..... 1
 Billing disputes and/or errors (this does not include the price of the service itself) 2
 Service delivery 3
 Credit, deposit, payment management 4
 Other (Specify) 20
 Unsure/do not recall 77 [UNPROMPTED]

9. [IF COMPLAINT WAS RELATED TO TELEVISION SERVICE IN Q3] Who was your provider at the time you had the complaint? [DO NOT READ]

Bell..... 1
 Cogeco..... 2
 Eastlink 3
 Rogers..... 4
 Telus 5
 Videotron 6
 Fido..... 7
 Virgin 8
 Other (Record) 20
 Unsure/Prefer not to answer 99



10. [IF COMPLAINT WAS RELATED TO INTERNET SERVICE IN Q3] What was/were the reason(s) for the complaint related to your internet service? [Select multiple]

- Compliance with contract terms and commitments.....1
Billing disputes and/or errors (this does not include the price of the service itself)2
Service delivery3
Credit, deposit, payment management4
Unsure/do not recall77 [UNPROMPTED]

11. [IF COMPLAINT WAS RELATED TO HOME INTERNET SERVICE IN Q3] Who was your provider at the time you had the complaint? [DO NOT READ]

- Bell..... 1
Cogeco 2
Eastlink 3
Rogers..... 4
Telus 5
Videotron 6
Fido..... 7
Fizz..... 8
Freedom Mobile..... 9
Virgin 10
Other (Record) 20
Unsure/Prefer not to answer 99

12. [IF COMPLAINT WAS RELATED TO SERVICE BUNDLE IN Q3] What was/were the reason(s) for the complaint related to your service bundle? [Select multiple]

- Compliance with contract terms and commitments.....1
Billing disputes and/or errors (this does not include the price of the service itself)2
Service delivery3
Credit, deposit, payment management4
Other (Specify)20
Unsure/do not recall77 [UNPROMPTED]

13. [IF COMPLAINT WAS RELATED TO SERVICE BUNDLE IN Q3] Who was your provider at the time you had the complaint? [DO NOT READ]

- Bell..... 1
Cogeco 2
Eastlink 3
Rogers..... 4
Telus 5
Videotron 6
Fido..... 7
Fizz..... 8
Freedom Mobile..... 9
Virgin 10
Other (Record) 20
Unsure/Prefer not to answer 99

14. [IF HAD A COMPLAINT IN Q2] What did you do to try to resolve the complaint? [RANDOMIZE][SELECT ALL THAT APPLY]

- Contacted your service provider 1 [SKIP TO Q16]
Contacted the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) 2 [IF ONLY SELECTS THIS, SKIP TO Q24]
Contacted the Commission for Complaints for Telecom-television Services.... 3 [IF ONLY SELECTS THIS, SKIP TO Q18]
Other (Specify) 4 [IF ONLY SELECTS THIS, SKIP TO Q24]



Did not do anything/didn't take action 5 [EXCLUSIVE][GO TO Q15, THEN SKIP TO Q24]
Unsure/don't recall 77 [UNPROMPTED][EXCLUSIVE][SKIP TO Q24]

[IF DID NOTHING OR DID NOT SELECT SERVICE PROVIDER OR CCTS– SKIP TO Q24]

15. [IF DID NOTHING IN Q14] Why did you not file a complaint? [OPEN]

16. [IF WENT TO PROVIDER IN Q14] Was your service provider able to resolve your complaint to your satisfaction?
Yes 1 [SKIP TO Q24]
No 2 [GO TO Q17]
Unsure/don't recall 77 [GO TO Q17]

17. [IF NO OR UNSURE IN Q16] Did your service provider refer you to the Commission for Complaints for Telecommunication Services (CCTS)?
Yes 1
No 2
Unsure/don't recall 77

[ONLY READ THIS IF ASKED]: the Commission for Complaints for Telecom-television Services (CCTS) is an independent organization that handles complaints about most telecommunications services provided to individuals and small businesses, including home phone, wireless, Internet, and Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) services. The CCTS also addresses complaints about television services provided to individuals, including cable, Internet Protocol television and satellite television providers.

18. Did you submit a complaint through the CCTS?
Yes 1 [SKIP TO Q20, ASK Q20-23, THEN SKIP TO Q25]
No 2 [GO TO Q19, THEN SKIP TO Q24]
Unsure/don't recall 77 [SKIP TO Q24]

19. [IF NO TO Q18] Why did you not submit a complaint to the CCTS? [RANDOMIZE]
I wasn't sure how to 1
I didn't see the point 2
I couldn't be bothered 3
My complaint was resolved/didn't need to 4
Was not aware/did not know about the CCTS 5
Other (Specify) 20
Unsure 77

20. [IF SELECTED CCTS IN Q14 OR YES TO Q18] How did you submit the complaint to the CCTS?
Online complaint submission form 1
Telephone 2
Email 3
Mail 4
Fax 5
TTY 6
Other (Specify) 20
Unsure/don't recall 77

21. [IF SELECTED CCTS IN Q14 OR YES TO Q18] Was your complaint resolved?
Yes, complaint was resolved 1
No, complaint process is still in progress 2



- No, complaint was not resolved.....3
- No, the CCTS would not accept the complaint.....4
- Unsure/don't recall77

22. [IF SELECTED CCTS IN Q14 OR YES TO Q18] On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is not at all satisfied and 10 is very satisfied, how satisfied were you with your experience with the CCTS? _____

23. [IF SELECTED CCTS IN Q14 OR YES TO Q18] Why do you have that opinion? [OPEN]

[DO NOT READ IF READ THE EXPLANATION EARLIER IN SURVEY] As you may know, the Commission for Complaints for Telecom-television Services also known as the CCTS is an independent organization dedicated to working with consumers and service providers to resolve complaints about telephone and internet services. The CCTS handles complaints about most telecommunications services provided to individuals and small businesses, including home phone, wireless, Internet, and Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) services. The CCTS also addresses complaints about television services provided to individuals, including cable, Internet Protocol television and satellite television providers.

24. [ASK UNLESS SUBMITTED REPORT TO CCTS IN Q18] Prior to today, had you heard or not heard of the Commission for Complaints for Telecom-television Services (CCTS)?

- Heard.....1 [GO TO Q25]
- Not heard2 [SKIP TO Q27]
- Unsure.....77 [SKIP TO Q27]

25. [ASK IF HEARD IN Q24 OR YES TO Q18 OR SELECTED CCTS IN Q14] Where did you hear about the CCTS?

- Internet search1
- The news2
- Social media3
- Word of mouth.....4
- Your telecommunications service provider5
- The CRTC6
- Other (Specify)20
- Unsure/do not recall77

26. [ASK IF HEARD IN Q24 OR YES TO Q18 OR SELECTED CCTS IN Q14] On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is a very negative impression and 10 is a very positive impression, what is your overall impression of the CCTS? _____

27. On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is not at all useful and 10 is very useful, how useful do you think the services that the CCTS provides would be to you?

Our last few questions will help us group your responses.

28. What source(s) do you typically go to for news? (Please select all that apply) [RANDOMIZE]

- Social media 1
- TV 2
- Newspaper 3
- Radio 4
- Word of mouth 5
- Other (Please specify _____)6
- None..... 7

29. Please rank the top three social media channels you use the most frequently (maximum three) [RANDOMIZE]

- Rank
- Facebook _____



- Twitter/X _____
- YouTube _____
- WhatsApp _____
- Reddit _____
- Instagram _____
- Snapchat _____
- LinkedIn _____
- Telegram _____
- TikTok _____
- Another social media application _____
- None, do not use social media _____

30. Which of the following categories best describes your household income, that is, the income from all people living at your residence? [READ; STOP WHEN A SELECTION IS MADE]

- Under \$20,000..... 1
- \$20,000 to just under \$40,000 2
- \$40,000 to just under \$60,000 3
- \$60,000 to just under \$80,000 4
- \$80,000 to just under \$100,000 5
- \$100,000 to just under \$120,000 6
- \$120,000 to just under \$150,000 7
- \$150,000 and above 8
- Prefer not to answer 99 [Unprompted]

31. Which of the following is the highest level of education you have achieved? [READ; STOP WHEN A SELECTION IS MADE]

- Some high school 1
- Completed high school..... 2
- Some college or university 3
- Completed college..... 4
- Completed university 5
- Completed graduate studies 6
- Refuse/No Answer 99 [Unprompted]

32. For verification purposes only, please tell me the first three digits of your postal code: _____

33. [By observation only, do not ask] Language of Interview: _____