



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

Executive Summary

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

Supplier Name: Nanos Research

Contract Number: CW2336462

Contract Value: \$112,943.50 (including HST)

Award Date: 2023-11-03

Delivery Date: 2024-03-08

Registration Number: POR 080-23

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

Ce rapport est aussi disponible en français.



Understanding consumer awareness and satisfaction with the Commission for Complaints for Telecommunication Services (CCTS)

Executive Summary

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

April 2024

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, 2024.

Catalogue Number: BC92-131/2024E-PDF

International Standard Book Number (ISBN): 978-0-660-70863-8

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)*.

Numéro de catalogue : BC92-131/2024F-PDF

Numéro international normalisé du livre (ISBN) : 978-0-660-70864-5



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 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 1,301 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 online by live agents.

The fieldwork was conducted between January 31st and February 19th, 2024. 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 1,301 individuals with a telecommunications service subscription is plus or minus 2.7 percentage points, nineteen times out of twenty.

C. Contract value

The contract value was \$112,943.50 (including HST)

Supplier name: Nanos Research

PWGSC contract number: CW2336462

Original contract date: 2023-11-03

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 said they would go to their service provider if they had a complaint (84%). Some 7% of respondents said they would search online what to do, while 5% said they would contact the CRTC. Of note, less than 1% mentioned unprompted that they would go to 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 (99%), while 1% reported having asked their family and friends for help, and less than 1% each reported having searched online or taking no action. **No respondents reported having contacted the CCTS.**

Just over half of respondents with a complaint who contacted their service provider reported that their service provider was able to resolve their complaint (55%), leaving more than four in ten unresolved by the provider (43%), or unsure if their provider resolved the complaint (3%).

Provider referrals to the CCTS

More than nine in ten respondents (96%) who contacted their service provider about a complaint and whose provider did not resolve their complaint reported their service provider **did not** mention the CCTS as an avenue to address their complaint, while 2% each reported their provider mentioning the CCTS or being unsure/did not recall.

In addition, over nine in ten respondents with a complaint not resolved by their service provider reported they **did not submit** a complaint to the CCTS, (99%; 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 (64%), that they did not see the point in doing so (11%), that they were not sure how to (7%), or that they could not be bothered to (6%).

Awareness and impressions of the CCTS

Just under two in ten respondents (18%) reported they have previously heard of the CCTS, while 80% 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 (39%), via an Internet search (10%), through word of mouth (8%), television (8%), social media (5%) or the radio (5%).

Respondents aware of the CCTS are twice as likely to have a positive impression of it (28%; score of 7-10) than a negative one (12%; score of 0-3), but, of note, about one third of respondents were unsure of their impression (32%).

In terms of impressions of the usefulness of CCTS services to them, respondents remained more likely to have positive views on the usefulness (32%; score of 7-10) than negative views (20%; score of 0-3), but views were more mixed. One in four (25%) respondents were unsure how useful they thought CCTS services might be for them.



Type and source of complaint

Just under one in three (32%) 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 (50% of those with a complaint), followed by mobile phone service (24%) and television service (22%).

In terms of the nature of the complaints, respondents most often said the complaints related to either service delivery or billing disputes.