



Broadcasting Decision CRTC 2025-271

PDF version

Reference: Part 1 application posted on 7 March 2024

Gatineau, 16 October 2025

David Lepofsky

Toronto, Ontario

Public record: 2024-0069-6

Complaint against Bell Canada and Bell Media Inc. – Barriers to accessibility when accessing programming via set-top boxes and other devices

Summary

When the *Online Streaming Act* came into force, it amended the *Broadcasting Act* to include a policy objective for programs broadcasted in Canada to be accessible without barriers to persons with disabilities. The Commission is working on concrete ways to identify, prevent and eliminate barriers to accessibility as part of its work to modernize the broadcasting framework.

The Commission approves, in part, an application by David Lepofsky, who argued that barriers to accessibility are preventing persons who are blind or partially sighted from accessing certain broadcasting services provided by Bell Canada and Bell Media Inc. (collectively, Bell). In particular, he argued that individuals who use screen readers¹ should have access to set-top boxes,² websites and mobile applications that allow them to access programming independently.

To address certain issues raised in David Lepofsky's complaint, while making the broadcasting system more accessible, furthering the policy objectives of the *Broadcasting Act*, and supporting the *Accessible Canada Act*, the Commission is launching a public consultation (Broadcasting Notice of Consultation 2025-272) on adding accessibility requirements for broadcasting undertakings, including:

- amending the accessibility requirements set out in section 7.3 of the *Broadcasting Distribution Regulations*; and

¹ A screen reader reads aloud on-screen text and provides auditory descriptions. This allows users to identify and select programming content and menu options.

² Commonly understood to be a device that connects to a television and enables customers to select channels and programming offered by their service provider. It may also include features such as allowing customers to record programs.

- imposing comparable, new requirements on certain online undertakings and certain exempt terrestrial broadcasting distribution undertakings.

Background

1. On 28 February 2024, the Commission received an application by David Lepofsky regarding certain broadcasting services provided by Bell Canada and Bell Media Inc. (collectively, Bell) that, in his view, present barriers to accessibility.
2. David Lepofsky, who is blind, argued that Bell was engaging in discrimination and had not reasonably accommodated him. He further argued that he had previously attempted to resolve his concerns by engaging with Bell directly and by filing a complaint with the Canadian Human Rights Commission (CHRC).³
3. In his application, David Lepofsky asked the Commission to require Bell to:⁴
 - ensure that viewers using screen readers⁵ can access programming offered through its set-top boxes,⁶ websites and mobile applications;
 - ensure that any programming with described video that it offers on one of its platforms is also offered on its other platforms;
 - remove its 60-day retention limit for cloud-based recordings of programs;
 - adjust how it approaches accessibility (including by engaging in specific forms of consultation and reporting, providing training, and making changes related to employment matters and governance structures); and
 - compensate him for services he could not fully use or make a charitable donation at his direction.
4. David Lepofsky also requested additional procedures modelled after proceedings before the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal, which hears complaints about discrimination that it is sent by the CHRC. The Commission denied that request because its own well-established rules and procedures allowed it, and the parties, to receive the information they needed regarding the application.⁷

³ David Lepofsky filed a complaint with the CHRC in 2021 that the CHRC declined to address in 2023 as, in its view, that complaint could more appropriately be dealt with by the Commission. That decision led to the filing of this application. See pages 276 to 292 of the application for a copy of that complaint (and paragraph 37 for the remedies requested). See pages 481 to 490 for a copy of the CHRC's decision.

⁴ See paragraph 25 on pages 6 and 7 of the application.

⁵ A screen reader reads aloud on-screen text and provides auditory descriptions. This allows users to identify and select programming content and menu options.

⁶ Commonly understood to be a device that connects to a television and enables customers to select channels and programming offered by their service provider. It may also include features such as allowing customers to record programs.

⁷ See the [Secretary General Letter dated 26 July 2024](#).

Interventions and reply

5. The Commission received five interventions in support of David Lepofsky’s application⁸ and three interventions in comment.⁹ The three parties that filed interventions in comment expressed support for the application and the provision of accessible services.
6. In response to the application, Bell acknowledged that David Lepofsky has encountered barriers but argued that it has not discriminated against persons who are blind or partially sighted. Bell also submitted that it had reasonably accommodated him and complied with all of its legal obligations. David Lepofsky replied to Bell’s response.
7. The positions of these two parties on specific issues are addressed below.

Legal framework

8. The Supreme Court of Canada has stated that when tribunals like the Commission make decisions under their own statutes like the *Broadcasting Act* (the Act), they must apply the guiding principles of human rights law and adapt them to their statutory mandate.¹⁰
9. In general, human rights law focuses on whether there has been discrimination, meaning that an individual has been disadvantaged based on a protected characteristic—for instance, a discriminatory barrier disadvantaging a person with a disability. If discrimination is found, the next step is to determine if reasonable accommodation has been provided, up to the point where it causes undue hardship.
10. An assessment of what constitutes reasonable accommodation will be informed by the competing interests at stake in a given case.¹¹ The Commission’s assessment must take into account its regulatory authority and the policy objectives within its statutory mandate.
11. In this case, relevant policy and regulatory objectives relate to accessible programming, the promotion of technological innovation, audience preferences, and administrative and regulatory burden on regulated entities.

⁸ Alliance for Equality of Blind Canadians (AEBBC), ARCH Disability Law Centre, CNIB Foundation, Regroupement des aveugles et amblyopes du Québec, and Vision Impaired Resource Network. AEBBC requested additional remedies. However, under the *Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission Rules of Practice and Procedure*, interveners are not generally permitted to seek their own relief in a Part 1 proceeding.

⁹ Accessible Media Inc., Broadcasting Accessibility Fund Inc., and Public Interest Advocacy Centre (PIAC). PIAC stated that it “supports the application in substance.”

¹⁰ *Council of Canadians with Disabilities v. VIA Rail*, 2007 SCC 15 (*Council of Canadians with Disabilities*).

¹¹ See paragraph 127 in *Council of Canadians with Disabilities*.

Issues

12. After examining the record for this application in light of applicable regulations and policies, the Commission considers that it must address the following issues:

- whether Bell is in breach of its obligations relating to (i) the accessibility of programming and (ii) the provision of programming with described video;
- whether the current regulatory requirements are adequate given the accessibility-related concerns raised as part of this proceeding; and
- whether Bell should be required to:
 - remove its 60-day retention limit for cloud-based recordings of programs;
 - change its corporate approach to accessibility, including by (i) engaging in specific forms of consultation and reporting, and (ii) making changes related to employment matters, governance structures and its provision of training; and
 - provide compensation or make a charitable donation.

Is Bell in breach of its obligations?

With respect to the accessibility of programming

13. Section 7.3 of the *Broadcasting Distribution Regulations*¹² (the Regulations) requires broadcasting distribution undertakings (BDUs) such as Bell to offer an accessible set-top box¹³ (or alternative) or demonstrate, with concrete evidence, that accessible technology does not exist or is not compatible with its systems.

14. Bell started offering an accessible set-top box in October 2023. At that point, Bell began rolling it out region by region.

15. Bell has three service regions: Atlantic Canada, Central Canada (which includes Ontario, where David Lepofsky resides, and Quebec), and Manitoba. The rollout started in Bell's Atlantic Canada service region. In summer 2024, it expanded to include customers in Bell's Central Canada service region.

¹² That section of the Regulations (SOR/97-555) reads as follows:

Except as otherwise provided under a condition of its licence, a licensee shall make available to its subscribers such equipment, software or other technology that will allow any individual who is blind, visually impaired or who has fine motor skills disabilities to identify and have access to its programming services — including programs with described video — if that equipment, software or other technology is available for purchase by the licensee and is compatible with its distribution system.

¹³ For the purposes of this decision, an “accessible set-top box” is a device that supports screen reading technology and allows customers who are blind or partially sighted to identify and access programming independently.

16. Bell has not yet made plans to roll the device out in its Manitoba service region. Further, in all regions, Bell only offers its accessible set-top box to customers who have also subscribed to its Internet services.
17. Other BDUs began offering accessible set-top boxes before Bell. Bell stated that these options were not compatible with its systems.¹⁴
18. In December 2022, one of Bell's vendors began offering accessible set-top box software. Bell stated that it could not roll this option out broadly due to compatibility issues. Bell also indicated that it had already begun working on its own solution by that time and that it had begun providing free Apple TV 4K devices in September 2022 to its BDU customers who require screen readers. These devices offer a built-in screen reader and access to Bell's BDU services on its Fibe app.
19. David Lepofsky stated multiple times that he was not directly notified of Bell's Apple TV 4K offer. Bell responded that this was because David Lepofsky had already advised Bell that he had purchased his own Apple TV 4K device before Bell launched this offer. David Lepofsky also questioned whether Bell's offer was being effectively communicated to its customers who rely on screen readers.
20. The Commission acknowledges that not having access to an accessible set-top box creates a significant barrier for customers who are blind or partially sighted. At this time, not all Bell customers have access to an accessible set-top box.
21. Nevertheless, while Bell did not provide detailed or technical evidence to explain why providing an accessible set-top box to all of its customers was not possible, it did provide an interim solution with its Apple TV 4K offer starting in September 2022.
22. As such, Bell is making accessible technology available to customers who are blind or partially sighted, which is consistent with its obligations under the Regulations. These customers can access Bell's BDU services, either with an accessible set-top box or with an Apple TV 4K device. As a result, the Commission considers that there is no evidence of discriminatory denial of access to persons with disabilities in the human rights sense and the Apple TV 4Ks represent a reasonable accommodation.
23. In light of the above, the Commission finds that Bell is not in breach of its obligations under section 7.3 of the Regulations. However, the Commission considers the accessible set-top boxes to be a more accessible solution than the other interim measures Bell has introduced. Furthermore, in the Commission's view, Bell has not provided compelling evidence that it cannot expedite the rollout, or that it has effectively communicated its Apple TV 4K offer to all customers who could potentially benefit from it.
24. As such, the Commission **proposes to order** Bell, by **condition of service**, to report to the Commission twice yearly on 1 June and 30 November on (a) the status of the rollout

¹⁴ In particular, Bell noted that Rogers provides an accessible set-top box through a Comcast Cable platform designed to work with DOCSIS (Data Over Cable Service Interface Specification) cable infrastructure, which Bell noted it does not use.

of its accessible set-top box; and (b) on the number and type of devices provided as an interim solution (that is, its Apple TV 4K offer or any future offer with the same purpose). These reports will be posted on the Commission's website.

With respect to programming with described video

25. Bell indicated it was fully compliant with its regulatory obligations to provide programming with described video on its linear television stations, discretionary services and BDUs.
26. David Lepofsky did not dispute this. Rather, he indicated that Bell's on-demand and online services do not always provide programming with described video even when that programming is being provided by other services that Bell operates.
27. The Commission notes that although it expects licensees of on-demand services to, where possible, acquire and make available described versions of programming,¹⁵ online services, such as Bell's websites and applications, and on-demand services are not currently required to do so.
28. As a result, the Commission finds that Bell is not in breach of its current obligations with respect to described video.
29. However, the Commission has already determined that requirements for described video need to be re-examined in light of the inclusion of online streaming services in the modernized Act, as well as that Act's greater emphasis on accessibility.¹⁶
30. The Commission has already launched a public consultation to re-examine described video requirements with the stated goal of identifying, removing and preventing barriers to accessibility.¹⁷ The parties to this proceeding were informed of the launch of that consultation and were invited to participate by way of a [letter dated 25 June 2024](#). Furthermore, the public record of that consultation is now closed, and after analyzing submissions, the Commission will issue a decision.

Are the current regulatory requirements adequate?

31. David Lepofsky indicated that subsection 5(a) of the *Canadian Human Rights Act*¹⁸ requires Bell to remove barriers to accessibility, and that not doing so is contrary to the purpose and principles of the *Accessible Canada Act*.

¹⁵ As set out in the appendix to Broadcasting Regulatory Policy 2017-138.

¹⁶ See paragraphs 11 through 13 in Broadcasting Decision 2023-287.

¹⁷ See Broadcasting Notice of Consultation 2024-138.

¹⁸ That subsection provides that it is a discriminatory practice in the provision of goods, services, facilities or accommodation customarily available to the general public (a) to deny, or to deny access to, any such good, service, facility or accommodation to any individual, or (b) to differentiate adversely in relation to any individual, on a prohibited ground of discrimination.

32. ARCH Disability Law Centre and the CNIB Foundation shared this view. Other parties commented on how barriers could be removed, or on the Commission's obligation to ensure their removal.¹⁹
33. Bell submitted that the accessibility of programming is also a concern for other BDUs. It alleged that other BDUs (namely, Saskatchewan Telecommunications and Bragg Communications Inc., carrying on business as Eastlink) do not appear to offer an accessible set-top box and that TELUS only recently introduced its first such device in March 2023.
34. The Commission does not have any authority under the *Canadian Human Rights Act*. It considers, though, that the record for this proceeding supports the need for new approaches that align with the principles of the *Accessible Canada Act* to realize a Canada without barriers by 1 January 2040, particularly by identifying and removing barriers.
35. The modernized Act includes stronger language addressing the inclusion of persons with disabilities in the broadcasting system, and within its authority under that Act, the Commission can order the removal of barriers to accessing programming.²⁰
36. The Commission began requiring some licensed BDUs to provide an accessible means of accessing programming approximately a decade ago.²¹ The United States put a similar requirement into place the following year²² and, as the Commission noted in 2015, that requirement impacted a significant proportion of the equipment suppliers to Canadian BDUs.²³
37. The Commission considers that it should be possible for most Canadian BDUs to meet this requirement. This may include certain exempt BDUs,²⁴ as a number of licensed broadcasters also operate these exempt services.
38. The modernized Act also covers online undertakings, such as online streaming services and, in the Commission's view, the record for this proceeding indicates that viewers using screen readers may experience difficulty identifying and accessing programming provided by some of these services.

¹⁹ For example, the CNIB Foundation submitted that the *Broadcasting Act* calls for accessibility and allows the Commission to order the removal of barriers. PIAC reminded the Commission of its obligations under the *Accessible Canada Act* and section 7 of the [Order Issuing Directions to the CRTC \(Sustainable and Equitable Broadcasting Regulatory Framework\)](#) to regulate with a view to supporting programming accessibility.

²⁰ See, for instance, the amendments to paragraphs 3(1)(p), 3(1)(p.1), 5(2)(e.1) and 9.1(1)(k) of the Act.

²¹ Section 7.3 of the Regulations came into force on 1 December 2015.

²² The United States, under the *Twenty-First Century Communication and Video Accessibility Act*, required that set-top boxes and other such hardware manufactured or imported for use in that country be made accessible by 20 December 2016.

²³ See paragraphs 65 and 66 in Broadcasting Regulatory Policy 2015-104.

²⁴ Certain exempt terrestrial BDUs with fewer than 20,000 subscribers, which operate under the exemption order (Broadcasting Order 2017-320) appended to Broadcasting Regulatory Policy 2017-319, are not subject to section 7.3 of the Regulations (or any comparable requirement).

39. In light of the above, the Commission considers that the requirement currently set out in section 7.3 of the Regulations no longer reflects the realities of the market, the policy objectives of the *Broadcasting Act*, or the principles of the *Accessible Canada Act*.
40. Specifically, based on the record of this proceeding, the Commission has determined that:
- there are barriers to the accessibility of programming that negatively impact persons who are blind or partially sighted;
 - the current requirements are insufficient to fully address these barriers; and
 - the voluntary removal of barriers does not appear to be enough to ensure equitable access.
41. As such, the Commission is launching a public consultation (Broadcasting Notice of Consultation 2025-272) aimed at developing more appropriate accessibility requirements to address these barriers, including for individuals who rely on screen readers.

Should Bell be made subject to any other requirements proposed by David Lepofsky?

With respect to Bell's 60-day limit for recordings

42. David Lepofsky's current set-top box (which does not support screen reader technology) allows users to record programs to a hard drive. Those recordings remain available until deleted from the device.
43. The accessible set-top box that Bell is in the process of rolling out, which uses a cloud-based recording system, only allows recorded programs to be played back for 60 days.
44. David Lepofsky asked for that playback limit to be removed. He argued that sighted customers can choose freely between devices with different features but only devices with screen readers are accessible to customers who are blind or partially sighted. He indicated that the choice available to some customers of an inaccessible set-top box without a playback limit discriminates against persons with disabilities.
45. Bell opposed this and indicated that other BDUs also impose similar limits. Bell added that, as of 1 May 2024, all customers using a cloud-based recording system are subject to a 60-day retention limit. Only customers with its oldest (hard drive-based) set-top boxes are able to play back older recordings.
46. The Commission has not historically regulated personal video recording services. It also recognizes that the rollout of accessible set-top boxes represents an ongoing transition to new technology. Once all legacy devices have been phased out, all recordings will be subject to the same playback limit applied by the BDU and the related potential for discrimination will be removed. Following this decision, the Commission will monitor the ongoing transition to ensure that it is completed effectively and efficiently. Once it is completed, further direct Commission intervention would not be necessary.

47. In light of the above, the Commission denies the request that Bell be required to remove its 60-day retention limit for cloud-based recordings.

With respect to Bell's corporate approach to accessibility

In regard to consultation and reporting

48. David Lepofsky asked that Bell (including its chief executive officer and senior management) be required to engage in public consultations with accessibility stakeholders and publicly report on the results.

49. In the Commission's view, there is significant overlap between these requests and existing requirements.²⁵ For instance, Bell is already required to engage in consultations with persons with disabilities and publish reports, including an accessibility plan (every three years) and progress reports (during intervening years). Bell must also maintain a mechanism for any interested person to provide feedback and report on how this feedback was taken into consideration, and this feedback process includes its senior management.

50. As such, the Commission considers that there are mechanisms already in place to allow for transparent and ongoing input from accessibility stakeholders on accessibility matters and that no additional requirements are necessary.

In regard to employment matters, governance structures and training

51. David Lepofsky asked that Bell be required to:

- include consideration of accessibility-related concerns when conducting performance management exercises, including when making pay and promotion decisions;
- establish three additional positions with responsibilities related to accessibility (specifically, a chief accessibility officer, an independent ombuds and an official monitor to oversee and facilitate the implementation of his requested remedies); and
- provide accessibility training at all levels, including senior managers, board members and customer service representatives.

52. Aside from certain narrow exceptions,²⁶ the Commission generally does not have the authority over a broadcaster's employment structure or the way it manages its staff.

²⁵ See the *Accessible Canada Act* and the *Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission Accessibility Reporting Regulations*.

²⁶ For instance, the Commission exercises certain authority over corporate governance and employment with respect to employment equity for small broadcasters as well as with respect to the transfer of ownership or control of licensed broadcasters.

53. The Commission also does not generally set the specific details of a broadcasting company's training practices (including those of BDUs), except for requiring that customer service representatives be able to adequately assist persons with disabilities.²⁷
54. In light of the above, the Commission denies the requests relating to employment matters, governance structures and training.
55. Nonetheless, as the Commission considers that David Lepofsky provided evidence of certain gaps in service adequacy,²⁸ it reminds Bell that its customer service representatives must be able to adequately assist persons with disabilities.

With respect to compensation or a charitable donation

56. David Lepofsky asked that Bell be required to compensate him for services he could not fully use, or that it be required to make a charitable donation at his direction.
57. The Commission does not have the jurisdiction to award damages. It can only award compensation within limited circumstances that do not apply in the context of this application.²⁹
58. In light of the above, the Commission denies this request.

Conclusion

59. In light of all of the above, the Commission approves, in part, the application by David Lepofsky regarding certain broadcasting services provided by Bell.
60. As such, and in line with the Commission's work on making the broadcasting system more accessible and furthering the policy objectives of the *Broadcasting Act*, as well as the principles of the *Accessible Canada Act*, the Commission is launching a public consultation in Broadcasting Notice of Consultation 2025-272. That consultation is aimed at developing accessibility requirements that will remove barriers to identifying and accessing programming, whether offered through set-top boxes, websites or mobile applications.

²⁷ The Commission introduced this policy in Broadcasting and Telecom Regulatory Policy 2009-430. It last imposed this requirement on Bell, as a BDU licensee, in Broadcasting Decision 2018-270 and Broadcasting Decision 2020-356 (which was administratively renewed in Broadcasting Decision 2023-245).

²⁸ See pages 229 and 230 of the application for an email with the following subject line: "Serious Accessibility Problems with Bell Fibe Service for Blind Customers Like Me".

²⁹ There are limited circumstances in which the Commission can require compensation under the Act (e.g., subsection 5(2) of the *Simultaneous Programming Service Deletion and Substitution Regulations*).

The proposed order

61. The Commission **proposes to order** Bell Canada and Bell Media Inc., by **condition of service**, to report by or before 1 June and 30 November in every year on:

- (a) the status of the rollout of its new set-top box; and
- (b) the number and type of devices provided as an interim solution.

62. Consistent with subsection 9.1(4) of the Act, interested persons and Bell may make representations only on the wording of the proposed order by no later than **27 October 2025**. The Commission will issue a final order following the close of the comment period and its review of the submissions, if any.

Encouragements

63. The Commission encourages Bell to complete the rollout of its accessible set-top box in a similar manner as this rollout was completed in the Atlantic and Central Canada regions that it serves. The expected date of completion of that rollout is to be included as part of the first report filed in response to the proposed order set out in the appendix to this decision.

64. The Commission encourages Bell to more clearly communicate to its customers its interim solution (that is, its Apple TV 4K offer or any future offer with the same purpose).

Reminder

65. The Commission reminds Bell that it must make its general call centres accessible to the point of providing reasonable accommodation to persons with disabilities by:

- training customer service representatives in handling enquiries from persons with disabilities and familiarizing them with the service provider's products and services for persons with disabilities; and
- making its Interactive Voice Response systems accessible.

Other matters

66. The Commission takes this opportunity to highlight the role the Commission for Complaints for Telecom-television Services (CCTS) plays. Although, in this case, David Lepofsky did not allege that there was a breach of contract, the Commission notes that complaints related to contractual disputes may be submitted to the CCTS.

67. The CCTS is Canada's independent organization dedicated to resolving complaints about telecommunications and television services. Additional information is available on the organization's website [For consumers](#).

Secretary General

Related documents

- *Call for comments – Removing barriers to identifying and accessing programming*, Broadcasting Notice of Consultation CRTC 2025-272, 16 October 2025
- *Call for comments – Development of a regulatory policy for the distribution of described video and audio description*, Broadcasting Notice of Consultation CRTC 2024-138, 25 June 2024
- *Cogeco On Demand – Licence renewal*, Broadcasting Decision CRTC 2023-287, 25 August 2023
- *Various television programming services and networks, and broadcasting distribution undertakings – Administrative renewals*, Broadcasting Decision CRTC 2023-245, 8 August 2023
- *Various terrestrial broadcasting distribution undertakings – Licence renewals*, Broadcasting Decision CRTC 2020-356, 22 October 2020
- *Various terrestrial broadcasting distribution undertakings – Licence renewals and imposition of requirements relating to a set-top box audience measurement system*, Broadcasting Decision CRTC 2018-270, 2 August 2018
- *Revised exemption order for terrestrial broadcasting distribution undertakings serving fewer than 20,000 subscribers*, Broadcasting Regulatory Policy CRTC 2017-319 and Broadcasting Order CRTC 2017-320, 31 August 2017
- *Standard requirements for on-demand services*, Broadcasting Regulatory Policy CRTC 2017-138, 10 May 2017
- *Let's Talk TV: Navigating the Road Ahead - Making informed choices about television providers and improving accessibility to television programming*, Broadcasting Regulatory Policy CRTC 2015-104, 26 March 2015
- *Accessibility of telecommunications and broadcasting services*, Broadcasting and Telecom Regulatory Policy CRTC 2009-430, 21 July 2009

Appendix to Broadcasting Decision CRTC 2025-271

Proposed order imposing a condition of service

Condition for carrying on certain broadcasting distribution undertakings

Pursuant to subsection 9.1(1) of the *Broadcasting Act*, the Commission proposes to make an order imposing the following condition of service on Bell Canada.

Interpretation

affiliate in relation to any person, means any other person who controls that first person, or who is controlled by that first person or by a third person who also controls the first person.

licensee means a person who is authorized by a licence issued by the Commission to carry on a broadcasting undertaking under the *Broadcasting Act*.

Application

The proposed condition of service set out herein applies to Bell Canada and any licensee that:

- (a) is an affiliate of Bell Canada; and
- (b) carries on a broadcasting distribution undertaking.

Condition of service applicable to any broadcasting distribution undertakings carried on by Bell Canada or any affiliate thereof

1. The licensee shall report twice yearly:
 - (a) on the status of the rollout of its set-top box capable of supporting screen reader technology; and
 - (b) on the number and type of devices provided as an interim solution, at no cost, to customers requiring screen readers. This includes its current provision of Apple TV 4K devices, or any future offer with the same purpose.

The licensee shall file reports by or before 1 June and 30 November in every year. Once a set-top box capable of supporting screen reader technology is available throughout all of its service areas, the licensee shall file a final report.

Each report shall be filed electronically and made publicly available as additional information related to the proceeding addressing the Part 1 application 2024-0069-6.