# UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

+ + + + +

#### CONSUMER ADVISORY COMMITTEE

+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY MAY 19, 2017

+ + + + +

The Advisory Committee met in the Commissioners Meeting Room, 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C., at 11:00 a.m., Ed Bartholme, Chairman, presiding.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:
MIGNON CLYBURN, Commissioner

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

EDUARD BARTHOLME, Committee Chairman
ZAINAB ALKEBSI, Deaf and Hard of Hearing Consumer
Advocacy Network

ELIZABETH BARKET, Competitive Carriers Association

DEBRA BERLYN, National Consumers League SEAN CARROLL, Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Cable\*

AMINA FAZLULLAH, National Digital Inclusion Alliance\*

B. LYNN FOLLANSBEE, USTelecom\*

PAUL GOODMAN, Center for Media Justice Media Action Grassroots Network\*

SUSAN GRANT, Consumer Federation of America
JIM GRAVES, Electronic Privacy Information Center

MITSUKO HERRERA, National Association of
Telecommunications Officers and Advisors
SARA KAMAL, Public Knowledge
ROSS LIEBERMAN. American Cable Association

ROSS LIEBERMAN, American Cable Association KENNETH MALLORY, National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates

KEN MCELDOWNEY, Consumer Action\*

STEVEN MORRIS, NCTA- The Internet and Television Association

ERIC NULL, New America Foundation, Open Technology Institute\*

STEVE POCIASK, American Consumer Institute MARK RICHERT, American Foundation for the Blind KEVIN RUPY, USTelecom

JONATHAN SCHWANTES, Consumers Union CARMEN SCURATO, National Hispanic Media Coalition KEVIN TAGLANG, Benton Foundation\*

LARRY WALKE, National Association of Broadcasters OLIVIA WEIN, National Consumer Law Center KRISTA WITANOWSKI, CTIA- The Wireless Association

#### COMMISSION STAFF:

SCOTT MARSHALL, Designated Federal Official
JAMES BROWN
JERUSHA BURNETT
ANITA DEY
BRIAN HURLEY
CHARLES MEISCH
KAREN PELTZ STRAUSS
MARK STONE
PATRICK WEBRE

ALSO PRESENT: LINDA VANDELOOP

\*Present by teleconference

## CONTENTS

| Welcome & Call to Order  Eduard Bartholme5                           |
|--|
| Introductions & Meeting Logistics Eduard Bartholme                   |
| Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau (CGB) Update Patrick Webre  |
| Comments from Commissioner Clyburn Mignon Clyburn                    |
| What's Next After the Incentive Auctions Charles E. Meisch, Jr40     |
| Update on Robocall Strike Force Linda Vandeloop64                    |
| Update on Using Complaint Data and the CHC  James Brown80            |
| Overview: The March 2017 Robocall Blocking NPRM/NOI Jerusha Burnett  |
| Robocalls Outreach & the Unwanted Calls Anita Dey119                 |
| Introducing the Broadband Deployment Advisory Committee Brian Hurley |
| Consideration of Robocall Recommendation Ed Bartholme148             |

### 1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 11:01 a.m. 2 3 CHAIR BARTHOLME: So welcome thanks, everybody for taking time to come down to 4 5 the Commission today or joining by phone. I also 6 want to give a special thank you to Liz Barket and 7 CCA for providing lunch for us and that should show up around noon. So, we get a meal out of this so, 8 9 thank you, Liz, we're very appreciative. 10 Let's start by going around the table 11 and doing introductions. I'm going to start with 12 Scott Marshall to my right. MR. MARSHALL: Hi, it's Scott Marshall 13 with the CGB and I staff the committee. 14 I think I've met everybody now. I think so. It's good to 15 16 have you here. Thanks very much for coming. 17 MEMBER GRANT: Hi, Susan Consumer Federation of America. 18 19 MEMBER LIEBERMAN: Ross Lieberman, 20 American Cable Association. 21 RICHERT: Richert, MEMBER Mark 22 American Foundation for the Blind, also joined by

| 1  | my colleague, Sarah Malaier.                         |
|----|--|
| 2  | MEMBER ALKEBSI: Zainab Alkebsi,                      |
| 3  | National Association of the Deaf, representative     |
| 4  | of Deaf and Hard of Hearing Consumers Advocacy       |
| 5  | Network.   |
| 6  | MEMBER SCURATO: Carmen Scurato with                  |
| 7  | the National Hispanic Media Coalition.               |
| 8  | MEMBER WEIN: Olivia Wein, National                   |
| 9  | Consumer Law Center and I am here with my colleague, |
| 10 | Margaret Saunders.                                   |
| 11 | MEMBER WITANOWSKI: Krista                            |
| 12 | Witanowski, CTIA.                                    |
| 13 | MEMBER BARKET: Liz Barket with CCA.                  |
| 14 | MEMBER SCHWANTES: Hi, it's Jon                       |
| 15 | Schwantes, Consumers Union.                          |
| 16 | MEMBER GRAVES: Jim Graves, EPIC.                     |
| 17 | MEMBER WALKE: Larry Walke, NAB.                      |
| 18 | MEMBER MALLORY: Kenneth Mallory,                     |
| 19 | National Association of State Utility Consumer       |
| 20 | Advocates and I am joined by our alternate Thaddeus  |
| 21 | Johnson.   |
| 22 | MEMBER HERRERA: Mitsuko Herrera with                 |

| 1   | the National Association of Telecommunications      |
|-----|---|
| 2   | Officers and Advisors in Montgomery County. And     |
| 3   | I believe that my colleague, Rick Ellrod from       |
| 4   | Fairfax County, as an alternate, will also be here. |
| 5   | MEMBER MORRIS: Steve Morris from                    |
| 6   | NCTA.   |
| 7   | MEMBER KAMAL: Sara Kamal from Public                |
| 8   | Knowledge.  |
| 9   | MEMBER POCIASK: Steve Pociask with                  |
| LO  | the American Consumer Institute.                    |
| L1  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: And on the phone?                  |
| L2  | MEMBER TAGLANG: Kevin Taglang for the               |
| L3  | Benton Foundation.                                  |
| L4  | MEMBER CARROLL: Sean Carroll,                       |
| L5  | Massachusetts Department of Telecom and Cable.      |
| L6  | MEMBER NULL: Eric Null, OTI.                        |
| L7  | MEMBER GOODMAN: Paul Goodman, Center                |
| L8  | for Media Justice.                                  |
| L9  | MEMBER FOLLANSBEE: Lynn Follansbee,                 |
| 20  | USTelecom.  |
| 21  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Anyone else on the                 |
| 2.2 | line?   |

| 1  | Okay, I wanted to say a special welcome            |
|----|--|
| 2  | to a couple of new members, who have replaced      |
| 3  | members with some of our organizations that had    |
| 4  | transitioned.                                      |
| 5  | Kevin Taglang with Benton Foundation is            |
| 6  | on the phone. Jim Graves with EPIC, welcome.       |
| 7  | MEMBER TAGLANG: Thank you.                         |
| 8  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Amina is now                      |
| 9  | switched from Benton to representing the National  |
| 10 | Digital Inclusion Alliance and she is on the phone |
| 11 | as well.   |
| 12 | Carmen Scurato                                     |
| 13 | MEMBER SCURATO: Scurato.                           |
| 14 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Scurato, my                       |
| 15 | apologies, with the National Hispanic Media        |
| 16 | Coalition, and Sara Kamal with Public Knowledge.   |
| 17 | And Kevin.   |
| 18 | MEMBER RUPY: Kevin Rupy from                       |
| 19 | USTelecom.   |
| 20 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Okay and Lynn's also              |
| 21 | on the phone from USTelecom.                       |
| 22 | So keeping us on track, any logistical             |

| 1  | announcements, Scott? Just remember to raise your  |
|----|--|
| 2  | hand when you want to speak so that they recognize |
| 3  | and activate your microphone. For those of you on  |
| 4  | the phone, I am going to do my best effort to make |
| 5  | sure that I stop and ask if you have questions,    |
| 6  | thoughts, or input. If I, for some reason, forget, |
| 7  | please email Scott and myself and we will get that |
| 8  | information and then be more responsive to you.    |
| 9  | So, that should keep us moving along.              |
| 10 | MR. MARSHALL: That should. It's                    |
| 11 | Scott here. Yes, you can call me; that's probably  |
| 12 | better Ed has a lot to do here and we'll pause     |
| 13 | because there is no way the folks on the phone,    |
| 14 | while the mics are live, can really interrupt us.  |
| 15 | So, we've got to pause on a regular basis to make  |
| 16 | sure that you are able to participate fully.       |
| 17 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Great. So, first up               |
| 18 | today, we're going to have Consumer and            |
| 19 | Governmental Affairs Bureau update. And we have    |
| 20 | a new Acting Bureau Chief with CGB, Patrick Webre, |
| 21 | and he's going to be joining us first.             |

MR. WEBRE:

22

Good morning, everyone,

and welcome to the Spring CAC Plenary Meeting. I want to thank Ed for his leadership of the committee and also Scott for being our tireless designated federal officer. And I want to thank all of you for your dedication to the cause of consumer education, empowerment, and protection.

About a month ago, I was privileged to be named by Chairman Pai as Acting Chief of CGB.

This is sort of a homecoming for me, since I previously worked in CGB and focused a good deal of my time on consumer education and outreach, including the DTV transition, which I'm sure many of you remember. So, I know firsthand the importance of continuous consumer engagement and I am excited to serve in my new role and to be working with you.

Consumers' issues are among the most important to the Commission. Soon after being named to lead the agency, Chairman Pai met with you to talk about his interest in and his support of consumer-related issues. And when he recently spoke about his first 100 days as chairman, he again

listed consumer protection as among his highest priorities.

We have seen some of these priorities already taking shape. In March, the Commission adopted an NPRM proposing ways for carriers to stop illegal robocalls before they reach consumers. We have also promoted broadband deployment in rural and unserved areas, taken steps towards greater disability access, and improved how we operate. You will be hearing more about these topics on your agenda today and there will be much more to come.

While we plan to do a lot, we can't do it alone. We need your help. You are the experts on consumer education, on disclosures to help guide consumer choice, and on so many other things. I know you have already been thinking about things like helping consumers avoid illegal robocalls and how to more easily file complaints when consumers do receive them. So, my thanks to you for all you've already done and for all you continue to do on behalf of American Consumers.

With that, I will turn it over to two

of my deputies who will give you updates on their areas of responsibility. They are Mark Stone and Karen Peltz Strauss. And I believe Mark is going to go first.

Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. STONE: Good morning to all of you. Nice to see you all here. I wanted to give you a short overview of what CGB has been doing in my area since you all last met.

So no surprises here. We have been hard at work addressing illegal robocalls. Ιn Patrick mentioned, the Commission March, as adopted proposals that would facilitate voice service providers' blocking of robocalls that are highly likely to be illegal robocalls, including those with caller ID and numbers that cannot exist or for numbers not yet assigned. And you will hear more about this later today but I want to mention it because it's an important step in the Commission's work protecting consumers from illegal robocalls. And that work was, in part, a response to the efforts of the industry's Robocall

Strike Force. That group asked the Commission to help clear regulatory uncertainty so industry can better stop illegal robocalls before it can reach consumers. You will hear more about that later on, as well, but I want to mention that the Strike Force gave us an update on its work back in April and we are excited about their work and what it means for consumers.

And we continue to receive requests for clarification from parties seeking other regulatory uncertainty. One recent example is for a technology sometimes called ringless voicemail. In essence, it deposits voicemails for consumers without ringing the phone. The petitioner has asked the Commission to clarify that this type of technology is not subject to the TCPA's consent requirements.

As we do with all these requests, we have sought comment with reply comments being due on June 2nd.

Finally, I do want to note that we do actually do things other than robocalls on my side

of CGB. In March, the Bureau granted an emergency temporary waiver to Jewish Community Centers to help them and law enforcement better respond to threatening phone calls. The waiver allowed JCCs and the carriers that serve them to access caller ID information on those calls, even when the caller has asked to mask that information. At the same time the Bureau granted that waiver, it also sought comment on whether to make the waiver permanent and we are reviewing that record now.

And lastly, I want to thank all of you for your hard work. I know it is still early in your term yet but I know you have hit the ground running and we really appreciate it.

I also wanted to specifically thank Scott Marshall for all his hard work organizing things from the FCC's perspective. Scott, thank you so much.

MS. PELTZ STRAUSS: Hi, I'm Karen Peltz Strauss and it's nice to see all of you again. As you know, I do the -- I receive the disability end of CGB. So I am going to bring you up to date on

what we've done since we last met and then tell you about some upcoming items.

First, in March, March 23, 2017, the Commission released a report and order on video relay services. The order contains a number of proposed improvements, trials, pilots.

I will give you a couple of examples. We have authorized a trial of something called skills-based routing. For those of you who are not familiar with video relay service, it is a service that enables people who use sign language to communicate with other people through operators, who sign what a deaf person says or who actually, rather, speaks what a deaf persons signs to them to a hearing person, and then signs back to the deaf person. So, it is basically an interpreter. It's called a communications assistant.

Right now, the way calls are handled, they are first come, first serve. So, you make a call, you connect with a video relay service, and the video relay service operator, whoever that communication assistant is, just connects your

call.

We have authorized something called the trial of skills-based interpreters, which will allow the use of interpreters who have specialized knowledge of medical, legal, and computer support terminology to have calls routed specifically to them, to ease, to facilitate the communication that takes place over these calls.

We also are authorizing a trial of what is called deaf interpreters. Deaf interpreters work with hearing interpreters to facilitate communication for people that have lower or minimal language skills. So, you would have actually two interpreters and a person maybe with cognitive disabilities, or physical disabilities, or lower language skills, will then communicate with the deaf interpreter, who will then communicate with the hearing interpreter.

We also approved a pilot of something called at-home VRS call handling. Right now, all calls through VRS are handled at call centers. This actually authorizes at-home work stations

that are very secure and private. We have put into place a number of safeguards to make sure that confidentiality and call quality is maintained. This is something that is new. We are trying it out, given the emphasis on telework in our society and we are going to give it a go for one year, beginning November. The other two trials start in August.

We are going to determine, based on various reports that we received from providers for both trials and pilots whether or not to continue these programs.

The VRS also announced that we will start publishing summaries of how fast each provider answers calls. That's called their speed of answer. We are trying to make this information public to allow consumers to have an easier time selecting amongst their providers, based on quality and a speed of service.

And we have amended our rules to allow hearing people to get what is called VRS numbers. VRS is a closed system. Up until now, only deaf

| people were able to get telephone numbers within    |
|---|
| the system. The benefit of a telephone number is    |
| that you don't have to use an IP address to call    |
| somebody. So you can just use a regular ten-digit   |
| number and reach a person who is using VRS but only |
| deaf people were entitled to these numbers. So if   |
| you got, for example, a call from a VRS user and    |
| you wanted to call that person back, you could do   |
| so dialing a ten-digit number and you didn't need   |
| their IPS address. Again, the calls are taking      |
| place over broadband. This actually allows people   |
| who are hearing, who sign, to be able to get such   |
| numbers so that they could sign directly to people  |
| who are VRS users, kind of like Skype, FaceTime,    |
| et cetera, but it is within the VRS system. And     |
| a lot of people use equipment that is specially     |
| designed for the VRS system, so this allows a lot   |
| more direct communication between hearing people.   |
| For example, I sign but I couldn't get a number     |
| before. Now, I'll be able to get a number and I     |
| could sign to deaf friends and colleagues.          |

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

The VRS order also adopted a notice of

inquiry on performance goals and service quality What we're trying to do is determine metrics. metrics that will achieve the congressional goals, such as functional equivalency through accuracy interpretation, voice and video quality, interoperability, et cetera. And we asked a lot questions about these of what metrics and performance goals should be.

Finally, it adopted a further notice on the compensation, methodology, and rates for VRS, as well as a number of other issues, including whether to set aside some money each year from the relay fund for research and development, which we have done so far.

Next, we are engaged in making final decisions on the National Deaf-Blind Equipment Distribution Program. This is a program also called iCanConnect, wherein we provide up to \$10 million annually from the relay fund to support local programs that distribute communications equipment to low-income people who are both deaf and blind. I know, for those of you who have been

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

here before, I have mentioned this a number of times. Since 2012, we have operated the NDBEDP, which you learn to say very easily when you work in this area, but the iCanConnect program is a pilot program. It has helped I think about 4,000 deaf-blind people so far.

In the past, we certified one state, one entity per state or territory to operate this program. The program is transitioning to a permanent program, no longer a pilot, as of July first, and we are now looking anew at the entities that should be certified in each of the states and territories. There are now 56 entities or territories and states; one in each state, plus D.C., Puerto Rico, U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and Northern Mariana Islands.

And we have been receiving, we received from around February 7th to April 7th applications from entities. And just this last week, May 12th, we released a public notice announcing certification of the first 13 entities. We are doing this on a rolling basis. So we are going to

continue releasing notices announcing the entities that are getting certification.

Next, we have one of the committees that is parallel to yours, the Disability Advisory Committee has been renewed for a second term. It held its first meeting on March 21st and the next meeting is June 16th. So, we invite you all to that.

We are continuing our efforts to try to promote something called direct video calling. I can't remember whether I mentioned this to you before but this is an effort which is slightly different than relay services, which promotes the use and placement of people who are deaf or hard of hearing who sign in customer service centers, so that people who sign who are deaf can communicate directly with those individuals.

So, for example, Verizon or Microsoft, both of them actually have this, at present, have deaf individuals in their customer service centers and a person who signs can call directly over broadband and communicate with that individual,

without having to go through a relay. It makes a lot of sense in today's day and times to have those individuals placed there. The calls are more private; they are more accurate; they are faster.

So now just for some things that are coming up. On Monday, in honor of Older Americans Month, May 22nd from 1:00 to 2:00 EDT we will be webinar focused hosting а of on range telecommunications and video programming issues related to older Americans. The event is free and registration is not required. It will be streamed live on our website, www.fcc.gov/live with open captions and it will provide information and tips about the value of broadband activity, dealing with favorite topic, robocalls, our reporting suspicious calls to the FCC's Consumer Complaint Center, and a host of disability access matters, including governing hearing rules and compatibility, closed captioning, emergency access, and relay services.

Next, in June, we will be recognizing outstanding private and public sector ventures

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that advance accessibility for people with disabilities in our annual awards ceremony for the Chairman's Awards for Advancement Accessibility. Those will be -- the ceremony will be held on June 13th at 4:45 at the M-Enabling Summit at the Renaissance Hotel in Arlington, The Chairman will be also giving the Virginia. keynote at that event and I can say we have some this year. phenomenal winners We received nominations February April between and innovations that were introduced to the public all last year, 2016.

Finally, I just want to mention two video programming requirements that are about to go into effect. These are pursuant to rules that were adopted in the past.

The first one has to do with multi-video programming distributors or MVPDs. In response to rules adopted in 2015, as of July 10, 2017, these distributors will have to pass through audio information about emergencies, when they are provided on linear programming accessed on second

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

screen devices, such as tablets, smartphones, laptops, and similar devices, when the programming is sent over the MVPD's network as part of their MVPD services.

And the purpose of this -- that is a lot of legal jargon. The bottom line is that emergency information shown over these second screens via linear programming has to be accessible to people who are blind and visually impaired and it has to be done through audio.

So, we already had requirements. This is pursuant to the 12st Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act. We already had requirements in place requiring such emergency programming on television to be accessible. This expanded it to second screens, linear programming on second screens. Again, it goes into effect on July 10th.

Another deadline and the last thing that I will talk about is that IP -- that clips of video programming shown live or near-live -- and near-live is basically your late night shows that

| 1  | are pre-taped only a few hours before they are shown |
|----|--|
| 2  | live when they are shown on television, if clips     |
| 3  | of those live or near-live programs are then shown   |
| 4  | via internet protocol, they are going to have to     |
| 5  | have captions as of July first of this year.         |
| 6  | So, that's all I have. Thank you very                |
| 7  | much and it's great to see all of you again.         |
| 8  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: So, Commissioner                    |
| 9  | Clyburn has come into the room and I would like to   |
| 10 | invite her to come up and say hello, if she has a    |
| 11 | couple of minutes.                                   |
| 12 | And then we will do questions, if you                |
| 13 | guys can stick around for a minute after that.       |
| 14 | Thank you.   |
| 15 | COMMISSIONER CLYBURN: Well, hello.                   |
| 16 | That will be the most compliant I am all day.        |
| 17 | So, it is so great number one, I'm                   |
| 18 | sorry I'm not going to be able to spend as much time |
| 19 | with all of you as I would like. But I just wanted   |
| 20 | to, once again, thank you. Just to listen to the     |
| 21 | end of the report from Karen, is a reminder and it   |
| 22 | underscores just how important your role is and how  |

much that we benefit from hearing all of your points of view. Because if there is any one thing, regardless of what happens, you know behind us once a month, or regardless of how much we might posture or differ, the one thing we can agree on is that communities, particularly in communities where the market forces may not address all of their needs, that you are our eyes and ears on the ground, making sure that we answer the call.

So, I always thank you but I cannot thank you enough. The American public will not be able to thank you enough for, again, being our conscience, because that is what you are. You are our consciences and it will take everybody at this table and so on -- and I am remembering this commercial. I think it was a Pantene commercial, and so on, and so on, and so on.

I don't have good hair but you know I've got good intentions and if we continue with that and so on, and so on, and so on, and knowing that even though you are representative, we need to ensure that the circle is always widened in terms

of the players, in terms of the responsibilities we have; in terms of what you need to remind us of as policymakers. Each time we come, or each time you assemble, you will have yet another positive nugget or a positive policy story to be able to share.

So in the two minutes that I have left before I am supposed to be getting into a car -- it's nothing personal but I am going to eat lunch today because I didn't do it yesterday.

I don't know if you have any questions or concerns.

One of the things you are going to talk about and I was really hoping to be there -- I know she is -- Montgomery County always is going to raise her hand. But before I turn over and look at her, you know I just like to pick on her.

But I am not going to be able to hear about something that has gotten a lot of news coverage and of course takes up a lot of our time and you are going to take that up, I believe, before lunch when it comes to unwanted calls. It is --

I got a call -- I'm trying to prep for the meeting and I see my cousin, who doesn't call often, she calls. So I'm like -- is this being taped?

(Laughter.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

COMMISSIONER CLYBURN: Anyway, SO she's calling. I'm like ugh. I said but no, this is my cousin. She doesn't usually call. So I pick up the phone -- well, I called her back. And I said is anything wrong. She lives in Charleston, not far from my house, so I'm scared there is anything She said you know, I clearly get about wrong. eight to ten calls a day on my landline. I'm like, I write down the numbers, I do all -- what Lord! I just can't take it. can I do? This is too much. And you know I've gotten savvy; I know what not to say; how to respond; all these other things. I'm on this. on the Do Not Call List. I did everything I know to do. Now, I'm taking down numbers.

I said fabulous that you are taking down numbers. I would love for you to take that another step and be among the hundreds of thousands that

| 1  | have reached out to the FCC and complained but you |
|----|--|
| 2  | have gone a step further by writing down numbers   |
| 3  | that are repetitive.                               |
| 4  | Look, we need to do everything that we             |
| 5  | can for me not to have to talk to my cousin so     |
| 6  | frequently, as much as I love her.                 |
| 7  | And so it's important. It affects all              |
| 8  | of us and I'm chuckling today because, literally,  |
| 9  | I am trying to prep for that meeting and she said  |
| 10 | I can't take this anymore. I'm like, neither can   |
| 11 | I.   |
| 12 | So thank you for what you do. We are               |
| 13 | going to be innovative, all hands-on, Strike Force |
| 14 | and everybody else working to see what relieve we  |
| 15 | can bring. It will never be enough but the efforts |
| 16 | will always be worth it.                           |
| 17 | Yes, ma'am, the gentlelady from                    |
| 18 | Montgomery County?                                 |
| 19 | MEMBER HERRERA: Thank you, ma'am.                  |
| 20 | I just want to follow-up on the idea of            |
| 21 | being the conscience on the Commission through     |
| 22 | several chairmen.                                  |

1 COMMISSIONER CLYBURN: Thank you. And I would like to MEMBER HERRERA: 2 3 know, we were just having a conversation this morning and a lot of us were talking about there 4 was a lot of hard work that went into efforts, 5 6 things like Lifeline reform. COMMISSIONER CLYBURN: 7 Yes. MEMBER HERRERA: And there is a sense 8 of these things being rolled back. 9 There is a sense that there is a lot of conversation about how 10 11 we can help industry and not much conversation 12 about how we are helping consumers in underserved 13 areas. Do you have some thoughts of how can we 14 be, as the CAC, an effective conscience? 15 16 COMMISSIONER CLYBURN: We need to 17 continue to make the business case for everything we do. And what I mean by that, I appreciate you 18 19 bringing up Lifeline. Lifeline for those who are 20 economically stressed could be the conduit for so 21 many of the technological and other benefits that

our communities need.

We need to do a better job maybe working with healthcare professionals, particularly those who work with the underserved and those who have, again, economic challenges, to see whether or not there are devices, concepts, software, zero-rating packages, to get politically charged -- we have shown yesterday that we don't have a problem taking certain stances, right -- that we can build perpetually better models.

So I think we need to expand, be Pantene models, expand our reach with the -- how do I want to describe them -- with those who provide the services that could be better delivered through a more connected model, through a phone that doesn't have de minimis service, through a device that might have some type of software or sponsored data compliment that would be -- so I think we need to do a better job going to the healthcare providers, the other agencies that provide goods and services, and the like, and to try to make the business case from the outside-in. I think that will help us come to better conclusions and kind of shift the

narrative, so to speak.

We need to do a better job showing the benefits. We know it. We can see it. But I don't think we do a great job connecting the dots with the goods and services. With the end user goods and services, I think we can do a better job and I commit to being a partner on that.

Did you have another part to that question? Because, again, I didn't eat breakfast either, so I'm kind of rough here.

MEMBER HERRERA: No, I just would be remiss if I did not thank you that when you were Acting Chairman, the only woman chairman of the FCC, you went and approved the prison calling reform, which I think is not only being the conscience but actually putting actions, not just talking about it, but taking action.

And I think that what you have outlined about the business case in talking about the importance of connecting people to their communities was more important and that is a good lesson for us to kind of keep in mind in those

things.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

COMMISSIONER CLYBURN: Thank you so much. You are going to make it hard for me to pick on you today after that.

But I really want to thank you and it partners, like you talking about this, talking about some of the challenges with -- I use your county as an example in so many ways in terms of how we need to make sure that this agency and others, when we talk about 5G and other small cells, that we do not disadvantage you; that we don't make your jobs harder; that we provide you with the tools and maybe sometime with a place to talk about some of these issues; that if we can be sort of a neutral party when things get a little tough, you know speaking with some of the representatives at the table and others, that we work things out as opposed to, again, getting a little political again, maybe, the nuclear option in terms of preemption.

I think there is a lot of real estate to travel along before we go to what I would call the FCC nuclear option, when it comes to that. And

I really hope that we can talk more about how we can empower cities and how we can gain a better understanding with providers, to provision those services that people need to make their lives better.

Any other questions before I -- you're been very generous. Thank you.

Well, I'll always be here, except when I'm hungry. But sincerely, thank you all for what you do. You know how to contact me. And anything I can do to make your lives easier to really do more to ensure that the American public, particularly those who might be more vulnerable -- there are more than 50 million people who we have identified, and that numbers is growing as we get more mature, that we have identified that might have advanced or special needs that will require more by way of technological assistance, a way they could benefit more. You know 50 million people, that significant and I think, again, with your continued support, we can answer the call of them, of inmates, of cities, and of all of you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 So thank you very much. I appreciate it. 2 3 CHAIR BARTHOLME: Does anybody have questions for -- Mark. 4 Thank you. 5 MEMBER RICHERT: Mark 6 Richert, American Foundation for the Blind. 7 want to congratulate the Commission on doing next Monday's webinar. It is very important to be 8 9 reaching out to the aging community. I wanted to mention for this group that 10 11 the American Foundation for the Blind, over the 12 last really about a year or so, has been launching something called the 21st Century Agenda on Aging 13 There may be folks in this room, 14 and Vision Loss. either directly or through your network who may be 15 interested in at least knowing about what we're 16 17 doing there and participating perhaps in that. you were to visit AFB.org/aging, you'll find out 18 19 So, I wanted to mention that but I about that. 20 wanted to congratulate the Commission on doing this 21 webinar next Monday.

Karen, I had a question for you about

it. It seems like the focus of the webinar is on communications, not -- will it also extend to anything touching video programming?

MS. PELTZ STRAUSS: Hi, Mark. Thanks for your question. It is going to touch on video programming as well. For the disability segment, the individual that is going to be presenting from the Disability Rights Office will touch on accessibility tools for video programming.

MEMBER RICHERT: Okay, great. You went through the litany of things that were going to be on the agenda of closed captioning, emergency information, et cetera, and I would encourage the Commission to be sure to emphasize the value of video description. This will be a tremendous opportunity to get the word out about something that our community in blindness and low vision has — you know I think we've done what we can and we're going to do more but it will be a great opportunity and I hope the Commission will emphasize that next Monday.

MS. PELTZ STRAUSS: We'll make sure

that they do -- that we do that. 1 CHAIR BARTHOLME: Mitsy. 2 3 MEMBER HERRERA: Hi, I have a question. In looking at the robocall NPRM that was released, 4 5 the Commission is basically suggesting, along the 6 lines you specified, that there were certain types 7 of calls because they are spoofed or they are not registered that are likely to be fake. 8 The question I have is it looks like 9 10 this would be a voluntary effort that providers 11 could do and you are essentially creating some safe 12 harbors for them so that if they do it, they won't 13 have legal issues with it. The question I have for you is, if it 14 is voluntary, is the FCC going to report and make 15 16 available to consumers which providers are doing it. 17 MR. STONE: So I'm not sure that we 18 19 asked those questions whether we should do that in 20 So that is something certainly we the notice. 21 could consider, certainly if folks made the point

I don't think though, necessarily,

in the record.

we teed that up squarely.

You know we would certainly hope that providers with -- if there is legal cover provided by any ensuing order that would say it's okay. It's not a problem to not complete these calls. When the calls are highly probable to be illegal, go ahead and block those calls. And we would certainly, as part of that, encourage that happening.

As far as how there would be accountability or the FCC sort of making public who does that and who does not is not something that is squarely teed up.

MEMBER HERRERA: And the second one is that in there you noted that there 10,000 victims that the IRS reported of tax scams. If people had a -- it was a robocall or some kind of fake call that was used to do that, for those victims, do they report that it came over the phone to the IRS? Do they provide it to the FTC? Do they provide it to the FCC?

MR. STONE: So we always think when

| 1  | there is an illegal robocall consumers are more    |
|----|--|
| 2  | than welcome and should file complaints with us.   |
| 3  | The IRS is also very interested in that as well.   |
| 4  | The FTC, I think, generally tends to               |
| 5  | focus more on sort of deceptive marketing practice |
| 6  | and things like that but the FTC is always a       |
| 7  | resource as well.                                  |
| 8  | So we are and I know that you all are              |
| 9  | interested in this. We are certainly working on    |
| 10 | enhancing our current robocalls outreach and       |
| 11 | guidance, including addressing questions like      |
| 12 | that. Where should a consumer come in the specific |
| 13 | case with a specific question? So we are working   |
| 14 | on that. It's a great question.                    |
| 15 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Anybody on the line?              |
| 16 | Thank you guys for doing this.                     |
| 17 | Next up we have an update on the                   |
| 18 | incentive auctions and what happens next with      |
| 19 | Charlie Meisch, who is the Senior Advisor for      |
| 20 | Communications and Policy on the Incentive         |
| 21 | Auctions Task Force.                               |

MR. MEISCH: Thanks all of you all for

having me back. And I wanted to say thanks to Mark and Karen, who just left the room, for making sure there was a buffer between myself and Commissioner Clyburn, who probably had better one-liners in two minutes than I will have in the next 15.

So, I was here I think for the January meeting and we had just hit the final stage rule of the auction. So we used some results but not all of the results. And later that afternoon, we released our plan for figuring out the transition, the post-auction transition schedule.

so what I can do today is tell you the rest of the results of the auction, in case you missed the several days of press that ensued back in April, giving you a little bit more of window into the post-auction transition, which I think the area where we would all agree, certainly the Task Force agrees, that this group could be most helpful in helping us get the word out on what consumers can expect over the next three years.

I will tell you a little bit about or an update on what we're doing for consumer

education and I will give you a little bit of a preview of our plans. So back in January we started to put that in motion.

And then because this came up in the questions back in January, I want to give a quick update on what we're doing for low-power TV and transmitter stations.

So starting with the forward auction results, sort of generally, these are some things you heard when I was here in January. The auction repurposed 84 megahertz of spectrum from the UHF TV band for mobile broadband use; 70 megahertz of that was licensed, for licensed use that was auctioned; and then the other 14 for unlicensed use and wireless microphones.

We brought in \$19.8 billion in gross revenues from the auction that translated to maybe \$19.3, after credits for small business and rural bidders.

A little over \$10 billion went to winning broadcasters, which as you have heard now. You know the broadcasters couldn't talk about this

when I was here in January but since then, a number have come out and talked about specifically what they are going to do with that money, including some are reinvesting it in their facilities, or in programming, or starting other types of projects related to localism and news gathering. Interesting stuff happening there.

And of course, \$7.3 billion to the Treasury for deficit reduction. That number was around \$6 billion when I was here in January but there was more bidding to be done. So this where we have ended up to this point.

The remainder of that money, as I think you know, most of which is the \$1.75 billion that will go to reimbursing broadcasters who are still on the air who have been reassigned to new channels.

On the reverse side of the auction, in particular, this is the broadcaster portion of the auction, there were 175 winning stations. Of those, 145 which successfully bid to go off-air but that doesn't mean what you think it means. The off-air option essentially meant that the bidder

was willing to relinquish their current license solely in exchange for some level of cash payout, monetary payout, as opposed to the next category we are going to talk about in a second.

But of those 145, though, 92 percent of them have expressed an interest in sharing a channel with another station in their market. They have stated the intent to channel-share. They have the option to do so. Some have already negotiated filed agreements and with the Commission saying that they are going to share the particular station in the market. And there are several months for the stations to continue negotiations, if they haven't actually filed or reached an agreement already. So we'll know more in the coming months how many of those 133 stations actually effectuated a channel-sharing agreement.

The other 30 winners were band changing winners. In other words, those stations bid to relinquish their current license in exchange for a less of a monetary payout and a new license to operate on a different channel lower in the TV band

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

somewhere in the VHF band.

And the thing that really jumped out of the results, at least from our perspective, is you had winning stations sort of covering any category you can think of. You had commercials stations and non-commercial stations, stations owned by large station-owner groups and independent stations, you had them in big markets, in small markets, rural markets.

And very interesting, to me anyway, was the fact that the amount of the winnings really varied. You had nine-figure winners, and you had the largest of which brought in -- individual station, that is, that brought in over \$300 million. You had several stations that won the six-figure winnings.

So how these stations really defined the economic opportunity that was available to them at this auction was a choice they made on their own and it varied. There was no cookie cutter way of looking at that.

On the forward auction, speaking of

diversity, we had 50 different winning bidders for the licenses. As you probably read, the two largest winners, both in terms of the number of licenses won and the amount of money they did were T-Mobile and DISH.

And we have now the licensing process for licenses is underway. these new Just yesterday we -- I wouldn't blame you if you missed this, given all the other news yesterday, but the first batch of applications that have been accepted for filing in this process, we even put out a public notice on that, which means that we completed the initial review, the applications were complete and we can now begin the public process of reviewing those licenses and the public can petition if there are concerns in that process.

Speaking of processes underway, so now, we are officially, as of the middle of April we closed the auction, we are in the post-auction transition process.

What does that mean? This is the process by which we, along with the broadcast

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

industry are going to work to clear this new 600 megahertz wireless band by reassigning stations to new channels and then they do the construction and other engineering required to effectuate those changes.

You can see on the screen here there are a little over a thousand stations who don't need to do anything. They can remain on their current channel, which leaves 987 stations who have been reassigned; 30 of those are the band-changing winning bidders from the auction that I mentioned earlier. They bid to move to a new channel. They will pay for those moves using part of their monetary wins from the auction.

The image on the screen here is an example of the sort of engineering physics challenge that the Commission faced in trying to determine the order in the schedule of this transition. Moving 987 stations at the same time would be an immense coordination effort and leaves a lot of room for Murphy's Law, I guess.

So what we did is we put together a plan

that tries to make sure that we can break up what you are looking at here, this massive daisy chain of stations that can't move unless the other moves, which can't move unless the next guy moves, and so on and so forth.

And as I mentioned before, when I was here in January, we had just put out the final adopted plan determining that order and schedule. What we put out, along with the closing PN in this auction is the actual schedule. And what it does is it breaks all of the 987 stations into ten phases that will -- they have all begun and over the next 39, I guess now 38 months, you know stations will be, as I mentioned before, doing the construction and engineering required to effectuate a channel move.

The key date I think in terms of consumer outreach, or one of the key dates -- actually all ten of these are key dates but the first one is that phase on ends on November 30, 2018. Okay, so we have got about a year and a half before we get to that point.

However, there may be some consumer rescanning required before we get to the end of phase 1. Why is that? We have winners, stations who have agreed to off-air and actually intend to We know that at least that is the 12 do so. stations who didn't indicate they wanted to channel share but they wanted an off-air bid. And then the channel-sharers themselves who when they actually effectuate those agreements or consummate those agreements, then they will move on to someone else's facility and share a channel. And so in that market, they will have to let their viewers know that they are moving, which is why we have started putting into motion some of the outreach efforts and the education efforts that I described back in January.

We see our role in this process as complementary to the -- I think Chairman Pai put it really well at the NEB show. He made the case that look, if you're trying to get a message out that is important in a local community, there is no better way to do that than their local broadcast

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

stations. And obviously, the stations themselves have an incentive to make sure their viewers know where to find them, when they move.

So, our view is we have a supporting role to play. One of the ways we can do that is to leverage the fact that consumers actually do rely on us for information on how to access over-the-air television and things like that and what stations they have available to them. So I'm going to get into that a little bit in a second here.

We want to make sure that the consumers and households that are the hardest to reach, I'm thinking traditionally this is seniors, this is Americans with disabilities, these are households where English may not be the first language spoken. How do we get into those homes to make sure that they're receiving the message here?

And then the groups represented here and other national partners that we work with who have an interest in making sure folks get the message, how can we work with you and support you in those efforts?

So, a few of the things that I was talking about January are already in place, as I The two main ways that consumers interact with us is through our Consumer Call Center and on our website. And so right now on the consumer web page, there is a section dedicated to post-auction Q and A. How will I find out where my stations have What do I need to do? If I am a cable or moved? satellite customer, do I need to do anything? Questions like that. This Q and A is also the basis for if we do get calls from consumers in the Call To my knowledge, we have not but, as the Center. news starts to spread that this is happening and happening soon, we expect that we will.

What is on the web today is in both English and Spanish and we are working on other languages as well. And we also have a printable version of this that, a downloadable version that our partner organizations can use in packets or if there is opportunity to distribute electronically, we will work with them.

I also mentioned back in January that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

we are working on PSA-style video showing folks how to rescan their TVs, their tuners to make sure they are getting -- reflecting any changes in the That is now live. over-the-air lineup. available. The ULR on the screen, www.fcc.gov/rescan, you can view or download the We are trying to figure out, we are working video. with the broadcast industry right now to figure out how to best make this available to stations, should they want to use it to spread the word.

Two of our most popular consumer guides downloaded from the Consumer CGB website, one is what kind of over-the-air antenna do I need. And we've updated that as well as what I'll call the paper version, the analog version of the PSA that I just described on rescanning. These are two of our most popular and we have updated them to reflect what consumers may need to know now that the incentive option is over and the repack is upon us, particularly to the extent that there are markets that were maybe UHF only before but now they have got some stations who moved to VHF. You may need

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

a dual band antenna. So you need to make sure you have one.

Similarly, we have got these consumer tip cards. We have got one on the rescanning. I think we've got one in the works on the antenna purchasing. This is great. I actually brought these to the NAB show and we brought these out to have them available for other events, if we can find a way to distribute them but it is an asset we have that we can deploy.

This is really more related to the post-auction transition itself but it has to the potential to pay some dividends on the consumer education side. The Media Bureau announced that we were going to assign regional coordinators to ten geographic regions, so that during the repack itself we can gather information that may be useful. You know say we find something in phase for а station in Georgia that they experiencing that may also be useful information in phase 5 in that same market. Or if we find a particular issue with supply chain in the region,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

or something like that, we can share information and try to address that at the Commission level as quickly as possible.

But the other thing it allows us to do, it gives us someone who is listening to what is happening in different regions that may impact consumers. And having that early warning system built into our transition process helps us share information, whether it's internally or perhaps in working with groups represented here and others, to make sure that we're working in unison with the best information.

Right now, and I think this is going to be an iterative process, a list that grows, but we are working on another -- we have a consumer guide that directly addresses unlicensed wireless microphones. These are in the new wireless microphone-ruled regime that has come out of the changes from the auction, if your organization has fewer than 50 mics in use, then you really would qualify for the unlicensed. So we have heard from

everything from churches to community theaters, to high school sports and the like, local TV that is using unlicensed, they want to know what do we need to do; how do we make sure we are interfacing with the white space databases and understanding what our obligations are. So we are working, the CGB and the Office of Engineering and Technology are working on that now and that should be ready fairly soon.

I mentioned before that there are going to be markets where stations may be moving or going off-air before November of 2018 and so we are gathering the data on that now. It will be informed a little bit by some processes that will go on this summer, where the reassigned stations can come to the Commission and ask for some modification to the assignment, the facility that we've assigned them. So, once we know for sure where everyone's going to end up, then we can start to do a little bit of advanced work in these markets.

In addition to our consumer tips being

some of the most popular downloads on the CGB site, it is our most popular social media content as well. And so we are working on a plan now to build a campaign around social media for the consumers' tips I've just described, as well as finding one other way to give a heads up as a phase deadline or other key deadlines that are coming up.

And last but not least, getting the National Partner Outreach moving. I am here with you today. I hope I will be back to give you further updates but I'm also meeting with and giving a briefing for the Disability Advisory Committee next month, as well as t.he Intergovernmental Advisory Committee. And I will speak to anyone who will listen, which brings me to point 2.

We have a list of national meetings coming up over the next few years and we're working on a plan for doing whatever will be useful in that context and the same with point 3 here, which is what can we do and how can we help at the chapter level, local level getting the word out.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Quickly, as promised on LPTV, so I think the question I got last time was do we know the impact LPTV, generally speaking on specifically on how that might impact diversity, viewpoint diversity in the media landscape. answer remains not quite yet because, mentioned last time, we won't actually know for sure which stations would be displaced until we get through the process I just described a moment ago, where throughout the summer we will have one last chance to see where all the other auction and reimbursement-eligible stations end up. given them our assignments. They have two opportunities to come in requesting changes. we get through that process, we will have a solid database of what the remaining available channels will be on a very, very geographic-specific basis.

And we just outlined for the LPTV and translator industry through a recent PN what they can -- you know the time line and the procedures for them coming in to us; once that database is solid, to come to us and make requests. What

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

happens if two stations or more request the same thing, that could be in conflict. What other steps can they take to mitigate the impacts, including minor modification, engineering modifications that they can make to avoid interfering with other stations.

So I think more on that to come.

All of the information that I have just described and a plethora of other things available t.he web on at fcc.gov/incentive-auctions, plural. Here will find everything from the schedule for the repack and the transition, all of the Commission-level Bureau-level and decisions related to the auction and the transition, the consumer page, auction results, transition, data files for broadcasters, pretty much anything you can think of I hope is on there.

Take a look. If you find something missing or something you'd like to see, call or email me. And I realize my phone number is not on there but email works just fine.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| 1   | Speaking of questions, I can take some              |
|-----|---|
| 2   | if you have any.                                    |
| 3   | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Anyone have                        |
| 4   | questions? Zainab.                                  |
| 5   | MEMBER ALKEBSI: Hi. Thank you. So                   |
| 6   | you mentioned that the consumer information will    |
| 7   | be shared in English, and Spanish, and that you are |
| 8   | working on other languages at the moment. Will      |
| 9   | that include American Sign Language?                |
| LO  | MR. MEISCH: Excellent question. If                  |
| L1  | it is okay, I would like to get back to you because |
| L2  | I don't have the list but I think that's important. |
| L3  | MEMBER ALKEBSI: Okay, thank you.                    |
| L 4 | Yes, I do want to make sure that that information,  |
| L5  | which is very valuable, is accessible for the deaf  |
| L6  | and hard of hearing community. Thank you.           |
| L7  | MR. MEISCH: So I should add, I mean                 |
| L8  | anything that is on the website, the website,       |
| L9  | obviously, will be in compliance with 508. So at    |
| 20  | least in that context, it will be available but I   |
| 21  | will check for more.                                |
| 22  | MEMBER MCFIDOWNEY. Hi this is Kan                   |

McEldowney. I guess a follow-up question to that is, I mean think it would be important to look at the stations that may be going off the air and sharing channels and finding what languages they broadcast in and making sure that the information is provided in those languages.

MR. MEISCH: That's a great point. And at least on the station side, so our rules for the transition require that the stations give 30-days' notice. I'm trying to visualize that section of the PN because I'm fairly certain we say that it has got to be in the language that they broadcast in. But let me look into that and I will see if we need to address that.

That's a great point. Thank you.

CHAIR BARTHOLME: Mitsy.

MEMBER HERRERA: Mitsy Herrera from Montgomery County just quickly. As part of the auction process planning and implementation, was there any analysis done by the Commission in terms of if the providers were not paying above cost of running the auction -- so you have costs to run the

auction and then there is the additional money will be funding that goes into the Treasury.

If the purchaser is only paying the cost to run the auction, is there any analysis of what percentage that investment in purchasing the spectrum represents as part of their whole operations or how much potentially that could free up for funding to put into deployment into underserved areas?

MR. MEISCH: Well I think that the way the auction was structured -- this might help the answer the question. I may be sucked through a side door.

The way the auction was set up was the licenses that the forward auction bidders were bidding on was sort of disaggregated from the stations that were purchased in the reverse auction to clear that spectrum. Does that make sense?

So, you may have a market that was cleared without us having to purchase any stations in that market but then we sold licenses that would sort of overlay that. So, there was not really a

one-to-one relationship between money spent in a particular market for the wireless auction and reverse auction winnings that would help to clear that market, if that makes sense. It may not make sense.

MEMBER HERRERA: Well what I'm trying to get at is that the Commission has teed up several questions in which they are looking limiting preempting and compensation for right-of-way poles to cost. So what I am asking is, in the equivalent, in the Commission case of the spectrum, what is the cost, if you limited the spectrum similarly to just compensation, is there any evidence that the Commission had that said that either that would free up X number of dollars that telecom companies could use for investment similarly showing that what they are paying for the auction is only a minor percentage of what their overall investment operating costs are.

MR. MEISCH: I know of no such analysis but, again, I think that the auction structure goes at it from a different way.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| 1  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Any other questions?                |
|----|--|
| 2  | Okay, thank you.                                     |
| 3  | MR. MEISCH: My pleasure.                             |
| 4  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: And we look forward                 |
| 5  | to staying in the loop on this.                      |
| 6  | MR. MEISCH: Save time for me anytime                 |
| 7  | you'd like and I will come down.                     |
| 8  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Great.                              |
| 9  | MR. MEISCH: Thanks, everybody.                       |
| 10 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Next we are going to                |
| 11 | be joined by Linda Vandeloop. She is the Assistant   |
| 12 | Vice President of External Affairs at AT&T and you   |
| 13 | may remember her from the January meeting. She is    |
| 14 | going to give us an update on the Strike Force and   |
| 15 | its progress since January.                          |
| 16 | MS. VANDELOOP: Is this working? Yup.                 |
| 17 | Well, good afternoon and thank you for               |
| 18 | inviting me here to talk about one of my favorite    |
| 19 | topics. And I know that probably sounds kind of      |
| 20 | strange but it really is because when I got involved |
| 21 | in the Strike Force I worked with people, there were |
| 22 | 30 plus companies and organizations and a lot of     |

them, historically, we were on the opposite side of every issue and this was such a great example of people working together and teamwork and making progress. And everybody was in it 100 percent. In fact, we had people begging to join the Strike Force.

So the Industry Robocall Strike Force brought together key members of the ecosystem who have the ability to make a contribution in combatting the robocall problem. And so working together, and we really were, most of us were really focusing internally in our companies about how do we solve the problem, but working together we were able to develop a much more robust set of mitigation tools that we would have been separately and working alone. And so this is a good example of the whole being greater than the sum of the parts.

So the Strike Force really kick started the process but there is a whole lot more to do. And AT&T is very, very active, an active participant, along with the other members of the Strike Force but the process is changing a little

bit. AT&T is no longer leading the Strike Force. Several associations and standards bodies who are much better organized to continue the work that the Strike Force identified in the initial report have taken over the leadership of the process. And Kevin and Krista are two of the leaders in that ongoing process.

So over the past six months, ACT, the App Association, ATIS, CTIA, USTelecom have continued the work that was identified in the October 26th report and it was still in the focused areas of the authentication, empowering consumer choice, the detection, assessment, traceback and mitigation area, and the regulatory support.

Each organization met regularly with their members over the past six months. And it is really important to note that for the purposes of addressing the robocall problem, these groups expanded the membership beyond the association or the standards body membership because we know we really need the whole ecosystem involved to really come up with a solution. So for example, the

Traceback Group is made up of not only the USTelecom members, but wireless, CTIA members, and wholesale members, and people who really need to work together to identify the problem and come up with the mitigation tools.

And then in addition to meeting with their individual groups, ACT, ATIS, USTelecom and CTIA all met together for planning and coordination purposes to make sure nothing fell through the cracks and to make sure that we're all coming up with the comprehensive solution that is needed.

So, just a few things and there was a report published April 28th of this year, with a lot more detail on what the Strike Force has done and will be doing. But a few examples: area of the authentication, ATIS formally which is the published the SHAKEN Framework, framework for the caller ID authentication. also partnered with Neustar to offer a testbed to members and non-members as well, so that this framework could be tested. And this will be available until the end of 2017. And so as of the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

April report, ten companies have already executed the agreements that are needed or are in the process of executing those agreement. And others have also executed a nondisclosure agreement.

And so the testing is going to do on and towards the end of the year, there will be more information on that.

For empowering consumer choice, ACT launched a public-facing website with relevant information for app developers, to encourage them to develop robocall-related apps. And they also developed and held a workshop for the app developers.

CTIA and USTelecom had both brought subject matter experts to educate the members on what is available today. And then several of the members have already introduced their own robocall mitigation tools. So AT&T introduced Call Protect, T-Mobile launched Scam ID, and both of them are free and network-based to identify and stop potentially illegal calls.

On the detection and -- wait a minute

| 1  | assessment, detection, traceback and                |
|----|---|
| 2  | mitigation, additional Do Not Originate trials      |
| 3  | have taken place. And as you might remember from    |
| 4  | the original report, there was a Do Not Originate   |
| 5  | trial on the IRS numbers and we worked with IRS and |
| 6  | stopped a significant of the IRS scam calls.        |
| 7  | So other trials have been executed and              |
| 8  | have been proven effective.                         |
| 9  | Also, the Traceback Group has either                |
| 10 | doubled or almost doubled the number of members.    |
| 11 | How many are we at?                                 |
| 12 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Twenty-one.                        |
| 13 | MS. VANDELOOP: Okay, so we have got                 |
| 14 | one to go to meet the commitment that was made in   |
| 15 | the original Robocall Strike Force report.          |
| 16 | On regulatory support, the FCC has been             |
| 17 | extremely supportive and, as Mark had talked about  |
| 18 | earlier, the issue with the NPRM and NOI to support |
| 19 | the industry so that carriers can block the calls.  |
| 20 | Now some calls, you know we made an                 |
| 21 | announcement to answer one of the questions         |
| 22 | earlier, we made an announcement a few months ago   |

that using existing tools, using our big data analysis to try and identify robocall campaigns and some contracts that we have with wholesale providers, we were able to block a billion robocalls in about six months. And so we're continuing that process but we're limited. only block certain calls from certain carriers because of the agreement. So this NPRM and NOI is going to help tremendously, I mean the whole industry. And I don't think there's going to be any hesitation for most companies, particularly those involved in the Traceback Group, as well as I don't think they're going to the Strike Force. hesitate when they have the ability and the safe harbor to block the calls. It's going to happen.

And so the work has not stopped. We're all committed to continuing the work until the robocalls stop. And so I also want to thank you for the work you're doing because consumer education, getting the word out, making the tools available to customers is important. I think you know we're all in this together and we need

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| 1  | everybody's help in getting these types of calls    |
|----|---|
| 2  | stopped.  |
| 3  | So, I wanted to leave lots of time for              |
| 4  | questions, even though I am way over anyway.        |
| 5  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Susan.                             |
| 6  | MEMBER GRANT: Hi, I'm Susan Grant,                  |
| 7  | Consumer Federation.                                |
| 8  | I know you don't know the answer to this            |
| 9  | yet because I just asked you about it yesterday but |
| 10 | I do want to flag that one of the concerns about    |
| 11 | this ringless voicemail technology that delivers    |
| 12 | prerecorded messages directly to cell phone         |
| 13 | voicemail boxes is whether the tools that you're    |
| 14 | providing to thwart robocalls will be effective     |
| 15 | with this new technology.                           |
| 16 | So, I would be very interested to hear              |
| 17 | what you find out about that.                       |
| 18 | MS. VANDELOOP: Yes, we'll have to                   |
| 19 | understand more how those calls are routed and what |
| 20 | the technology is.                                  |
| 21 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Jonathan.                          |
| 22 | MEMBER SCHWANTES: Thanks, Ed.                       |

| 1  | Linda, thank you. Jon Schwantes,                   |
|----|--|
| 2  | Consumers Union. And I know you have worked very   |
| 3  | closely with my colleague, Maureen Mahoney, and I  |
| 4  | appreciate your work.                              |
| 5  | You said the work will continue. Do                |
| 6  | you know if you will report back in say six months |
| 7  | again?   |
| 8  | MS. VANDELOOP: We don't have any plans             |
| 9  | for a formal report in six months but you know I   |
| 10 | think everybody plans to make sure that the work   |
| 11 | that we're doing is communicated. I think you have |
| 12 | seen a lot more company statements and public      |
| 13 | announcements of some of the things that we're     |
| 14 | doing and we are all definitely open to talk to    |
| 15 | people when they are interested. Those that I know |
| 16 | are interested I try and give them like regular    |
| 17 | updates to the extent possible. But as far as a    |
| 18 | formal report, there is no plans at this time.     |
| 19 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Do we have any                    |
| 20 | questions from the phone?                          |
| 21 | MEMBER MCELDOWNEY: No just this is                 |
| 22 | Ken McEldowney again from Consumer Action. I just  |

want to applaud the work that the carriers are 1 doing, in terms of taking the lead on this. I think 2 3 it has been very effective so far. MS. VANDELOOP: 4 Thank you. 5 CHAIR BARTHOLME: Mitsy. 6 MEMBER HERRERA: I guess I will pose 7 the same question that I posed to Mark. Is it going to be voluntary? And is there a way to create a 8 sort of simple mechanism for consumers to know 9 10 which of these carriers have voluntarily agreed to 11 do what? 12 MS. VANDELOOP: It's a good question that we can look at. You know as far as -- I'm 13 14 pretty sure it's not going to be necessary because people are going to be bragging about it, to the 15 extent possible. 16 17 We have also got to be careful about giving too much information to the bad guys. 18 19 we don't want them to know, necessarily, oh, okay, 20 so AT&T is blocking and there is a couple other 21 companies that are blocking, so we are going to try

and route our traffic over Company X that isn't

blocking. So we have got to be careful on how we give that -- or what information we give out.

MEMBER HERRERA: I mean I just would say from an educated consumer and choice perspective, I mean Commissioner Clyburn, I mean I didn't want to say to her I think that's a big reason why people have dropped their landline calls is you just get so many more robocalls on your landline than you do on your mobile device.

But it seems like if you want to give consumers a tool that says what can you do about this, then you want to have a carrier who has voluntarily adopted the tools that we think will be helpful. If everybody does it, that's great. It seems to me nobody wants to have a requirement to do it, it's all going to be voluntary. It just that a really good like is seems empowerment tool in addition to sign up for the Do Not Call, et cetera, et cetera, make sure your carrier --

MS. VANDELOOP: And I agree but, on the other hand, we just have to balance it with giving

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the bad guys, because they're really smart. 1 we're already seeing signs of them saying oh, I know 2 3 that person is blocking these kinds of calls; we're going to go around it. 4 You know some of the things, too, is in 5 6 addition to that, carriers can also be very vocal 7 the tools that thev're giving about So that would be other good customers, too. 8 9 information as far as like I can talk about us, but 10 other companies have other tools that they're 11 providing their customers. 12 Like we have got the Call Protect. 13 know you will continue to see more and more announcements from other companies who either have 14 expanded the types of customer call control type 15 16 Before the end of the year, I know you will 17 see some more announcements. CHAIR BARTHOLME: Rick. 18 19 MR. ELLROD: Rick Ellrod from Fairfax 20 County, Virginia. 21 It seems to me those two rationales are 22 contradictory. Ιf are saying it's not we

| 1  | necessary in the public's eyes what companies are    |
|----|--|
| 2  | making records available because everyone brag       |
| 3  | about them and know about them and, at the same      |
| 4  | time, we can't make it public because the bad guys   |
| 5  | will know who is doing it, well, you can't have both |
| 6  | those things at once.                                |
| 7  | It seems to me it would make sense to                |
| 8  | have basic information available that this company   |
| 9  | gives you a method, something like that, without     |
| 10 | going into the technical details of the method that  |
| 11 | could be used against it.                            |
| 12 | MS. VANDELOOP: Yes, and that is what                 |
| 13 | I was trying to say. I didn't do a very good job     |
| 14 | of it but thank you.                                 |
| 15 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Any other questions?                |
| 16 | Mark.  |
| 17 | MEMBER RICHERT: Mark Richert,                        |
| 18 | American Foundation for the Blind.                   |
| 19 | I have never been shy about revealing                |
| 20 | how much I don't know in questions. So, this will    |
| 21 | probably be one of those moments.                    |
| 22 | Are there tools right now that                       |

essentially allow a consumer to receive calls only from those origins that they identify in advance, well in advance, so effectively being able to say look, I'm only going to receive calls from the stuff that's in my contacts, for example, something along those lines. If there is already something, I'd love to hear about it. If not, clearly you would want to make some exceptions to that. You wouldn't either intentionally want someone to inadvertently block emergency calls, for example. But I wonder if you could address that. Thanks.

MS. VANDELOOP: I mean there are tools available for -- I don't think you can limit it to just five or six numbers and I don't think we have the capability if there is any tools yet to just be able to pick up the calls in the -- and correct me if I'm wrong, Kevin, or Krista, just to be able to pick up the calls from the contact list.

But there are tools, things like I mentioned like the Call Protect, which there is blacklists that show calls that have been

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

identified as extremely likely fraud or just blocked; others are marked as potential spam; and then I think Kevin had some other tools.

MEMBER RUPY: I was just going to add that there are tools, the generic term for it is a white list and many providers offer that white list service. And the way that service basically works is the consumer can select whatever the limit is, 10, 15, 20 numbers that they want to receive. And through that white list service, those are the only calls that consumer will receive that are listed on the white list service. And that can be a useful tool but the key here I think is to emphasize that there are a lot of different tools that do different things and we want to empower consumers to select the tools that make the most sense for that.

And the FCC has all that, a lot of those tools listed on its website.

CHAIR BARTHOLME: Okay. I think we're going to take our lunch break now. We are a little behind schedule so I am going to ask that we do about

a ten-minute lunch break. 1 There was a blip on the broadcasting of 2 3 the video feed but once it is into the archive and the FCC and available on the website, it will be 4 fixed in there in full. 5 6 So please to return to the table by 7 12:35. Feel free to have your lunch with you. Just a reminder, the lunches provided are for 8 9 committee members and staff working the room. Alternates and others in the room are welcome to 10 11 grab a lunch after those people have gotten theirs. 12 And thank you, again, to CCA, for providing us with lunch today. 13 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter 14 went off the record at 12:25 p.m. and resumed at 15 16 12:35 p.m.) 17 CHAIR BARTHOLME: Thank you, everybody, for taking a timely break. 18 19 Our next speaker coming up is James 20 He is with the Consumer Data Office -- I'm Brown. 21 sorry, he is the Consumer Data Officer for the CGB

and he is going to be updating us on the complaint

| 1  | data and the CHC. James is joining us by phone and  |
|----|---|
| 2  | I believe he has a PowerPoint presentation as well. |
| 3  | MR. BROWN: I do. Thanks, Ed. Can                    |
| 4  | you just let me know when the PowerPoint is up and  |
| 5  | then I'll start from there?                         |
| 6  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Are they doing it                  |
| 7  | remotely?   |
| 8  | MR. BROWN: They should be doing it                  |
| 9  | from the Commission meeting room.                   |
| LO | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Okay, so we have                   |
| L1 | Great, so you can get going and Brittany            |
| L2 | is going to help advance the slides for you.        |
| L3 | MR. BROWN: Perfect, thank you.                      |
| L4 | So the FCC launched the Consumer Help               |
| L5 | Center in the fall of 2014. The Consumer Help       |
| L6 | Center is made up of three areas: 1) education      |
| L7 | materials; 2) filing consumer complaints; and 3)    |
| L8 | consumer complaint data.                            |
| L9 | So today, I'm going to focus on filing              |
| 20 | consumer complaints and consumer complaint data.    |
| 21 | Some of the parts about filing consumer complaints  |
| 22 | might be a repeat for some but we think it's        |

important to go over them.

So consumers can file complaints any time on any device. The website to file complaints is consumercomplaints.fcc.gov.

So what you are seeing right now is the way that we have organized the consumer complaint website. Complaints are organized in a way that allow consumers to flex them in six product areas. The product areas are TV, phone, internet, radio, emergencies, and access for people with disabilities.

We have also added a place where consumers can tell us their stories. So the Tell Us Your Story area was rolled out in the fall of 2016 and it was developed to allow consumers that don't have an actual complaint but would like to share their stories involving issues about telecommunication services to do so.

So what we have done before is some consumers were submitting what they would deem as a complaint but it was really just, kind of they were just voicing their opinion about something and

| 1  | so the share your story is supposed to kind of help |
|----|---|
| 2  | along those lines.                                  |
| 3  | So in the case of Tell Us Your Story,               |
| 4  | consumers can select on the right side of the       |
| 5  | website and describe their story. In this case,     |
| 6  | consumers won't hear back from the FCC but the FCC  |
| 7  | could use the information to help inform decisions  |
| 8  | and policies going forward. However, in most        |
| 9  | cases, consumers are still filing an actual         |
| 10 | complaint.  |
| 11 | I'm going to go back to the left side               |
| 12 | of the screen. A consumer complaint can be filed    |
| 13 | for a variety of issues including things like       |
| 14 | billing, service quality, unwanted calls, and       |
| 15 | more.   |
| 16 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: James?                             |
| 17 | MR. BROWN: Yes.                                     |
| 18 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: If we could                        |
| 19 | interrupt, could you let us know when you need the  |
| 20 | slides advanced?                                    |
| 21 | MR. BROWN: I'll do that, yes. So,                   |
| 22 | you're still on the first slide.                    |
|    |   |

1 CHAIR BARTHOLME: Okay, great. MR. **BROWN:** Yes. So, to file a 2 3 consumer complaint, a consumer would select from one of the six product areas like phone or TV and 4 5 then select an issue that best represents their 6 complaint. Next slide, please. 7 So now you should be at the second So in this example, you are looking at a slide. 8 phone form where the issue selected is billing. 9 10 Every form is set up in exactly the same way. 11 an issue is selected, and based on the issue, 12 certain questions are populated. So once the form is completed and 13 14 submitted, we can them email in real time that acknowledges the FCC's receipt of the complaint. 15 16 Next slide, please. 17 So now actually looking at an actual email after a complaint is submitted to the FCC. 18 19 What's important here is every time we receive a 20 complaint from a consumer, we acknowledge it in If additional 21 real time. We send out an email.

information needs to be provided by the consumer,

they can respond directly to the email they received from us and when they respond to the email, the information that they sent in gets updated in real time. So, we're always having kind of a real-time interaction with consumers, as long as their responding to the emails that we send back to them. Next slide, please.

All right, so depending on the type of complaint submitted, a few different things can So one, the FCC could email consumers with happen. information like a consumer guide that helps explain consumer issues. In one of the prior demonstrations, someone had mentioned that one of the more popular consumer guides is still along the lines of tuning TV antennas or digital antennas. So sometimes we get complaints about a consumer not being able to get a certain over-the-air channel or something like that. So this would be example where we would probably send back consumer guide letting them know how they could retune their tuner, how they get an over-the-air antenna, or something like that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

There is also instances where another state or federal agency is better suited to handle a complaint, such as the state POC, the Federal Trade Commission. And so in these cases, we would email the consumer back letting them know what agency we think would be better suited for their specific issue.

We also might use the information just to share among the FCC to help with FCC actions, like unwanted calls. So in that case, we're not resolving individual complaints but we use the information internally to help with FCC actions.

In all of these instances, we are still interfacing directly with the consumer through emails, letting them know what the status of their complaints are.

And then finally, if a complaint involves a service provider, in the issue described in the FCC field the provider should address, then we do what we call serve the complaint on a provider. So this is more of an official process where a complaint gets served on the provider and

in that case, we generate another email to the consumer letting them know what is going on and then the providers have 30 days to respond directly to the consumer, as well as the FCC, letting the parties know how the complaint was addressed. Next slide, please.

So this graphic is actually showing what I went over. It is basically how the FCC handles complaints. And the key here is we have this graphic, as well as some FAQs and other information the of on top consumercomplaints.fcc.gov. So at any time the consumer hits the FCC complaint site, how we handle the complaints, frequently asked questions, and some other information that is readily available for all consumers to look at. Next slide, please.

So just to make sure we're all on the same slide, we should be looking at the Consumer Data Center now.

So when we launched the Consumer Help Center in the fall of 2014, we started to release some data about companies -- or sorry, not

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

companies -- about complaints weekly in the form of spreadsheets, as well in charts and graphs. So we did that for the first 18 months or so and then about a year ago, we launched what we're calling the Consumer Complaint Data Center.

So with this launch, we started to use a product called Socrata, so it's S-O-C-R-A-T-A. It's a commercial product and we use it to release consumer complaint data daily.

So the data we are releasing daily includes a complete list of complaints, along with certain fields for each complaint. We also provide a specific data set that is specific for unwanted calls.

So the unwanted calls dataset we know is currently being used by companies that provide blocking technology to consumers and then we can tell that these companies are actually using our publicly available API to access this data, sometimes every few minutes, sometimes every hours, sometimes once a day but the API, itself, they use a lot by these companies to stop the

unwanted calls with data that we're providing.

Next slide, please.

So what you're looking at now is how the data is actually made available to the public. So it's available in a table view that allows anyone to filter and sort the columns. So that's small there but anyone can access the data by going to fcc.gov./consumer-help-center-data.

And so if you are there, above each column, we have these two little lines. And so by clicking on the lines, you can filter and sort each column. And so by filtering it, some of them are actually, you can filter by words. So like if you want to filter on the State of the complaint, you could just select Maryland, or Virginia, or D.C. and it just will go to the complaints in real-time. You can also just kind of sort ascending or descending.

We also provide more advanced analysis of the data by using additional filters. So, on the top right, there is this blue button called filters. And once you are inside the data set,

that allows you to just do more refined searches.

Each of the analysis that you do you can actually save yourself. So, if you went in here and you wanted to kind of search for complaints across an area defined by specific form and a date range, those searches can be saved and there is a unique URL that you could use to re-access the searches each time.

The data also can be downloaded in about ten different formats, including common formats that allow you to get the data inside spreadsheets.

Next slide please.

So we also provide some canned visuals, so some charts and maps at a high level like the number of phone complaints over time. These visuals also get updated daily and you also are able to create your own visuals, once you access the data sets. And next slide, please.

So, to conclude, consumers and can file complaints 24/7. We also have a consumer support line that is available Monday through Friday, where we can help answer consumer questions. And then,

| 1  | more recently, we launched the Consumer Complaint   |
|----|---|
| 2  | Data Center about a year ago with data that is      |
| 3  | updated daily.                                      |
| 4  | So, I will stop there and see if there              |
| 5  | are any questions.                                  |
| 6  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Great. Do we have                  |
| 7  | any questions from anyone in the room? Susan.       |
| 8  | MEMBER GRANT: I actually have a bunch               |
| 9  | of questions but I will try not to dominate this.   |
| 10 | I was recently looking in the database              |
| 11 | for information about whether older people had      |
| 12 | how many older people had reported a particular     |
| 13 | problem and I couldn't see anything about age. So,  |
| 14 | I looked at the complaint form itself and noticed   |
| 15 | that there is no request for age or date of birth   |
| 16 | or year of birth, rather.                           |
| 17 | MR. BROWN: Sorry, you broke up at the               |
| 18 | end. I heard the part about searching for age and   |
| 19 | then some static.                                   |
| 20 | MEMBER GRANT: I looked at the                       |
| 21 | complaint form and there was no question for either |
| 22 | your age or your year of birth. Is that something   |

that the FCC has considered? And if it decided not 1 to do that, is there a particular reason why? 2 3 MR. BROWN: So I don't know if that there was any particular reason why. 4 I mean it is 5 currently not collected. I mean it is something 6 that we could take into consideration. But you're 7 correct, currently on the forms, it is not a question that we ask. 8 9 MEMBER GRANT: I wouldn't want to make 10 it a requirement, obviously, but as an option, that 11 information could be really useful. I was asked 12 a question actually by a Senate committee and I was looking for documentation and you have really good 13 information but you didn't have that. 14 15 Okay, thank you. MR. BROWN: It's 16 good feedback. 17 MEMBER GRANT: Okay, great. 18 information that given consumers are about 19 complaint submission and notification, it says if 20 submitted complaint have а about you 21 telecommunications billing or service issue, your

complaint is being processed and so on, you know

| 1  | by a particular division. But it doesn't say if       |
|----|---|
| 2  | you're complaint is about something else who is it    |
| 3  | handled by. And I don't know how many complaints      |
| 4  | there are about other issues but is there some        |
| 5  | general information that is provided that I missed    |
| 6  | somewhere about where other kinds of complaints are   |
| 7  | handled?  |
| 8  | MR. BROWN: No, there is currently not                 |
| 9  | something that particularly describes where other     |
| 10 | complaints are being handled.                         |
| 11 | MEMBER GRANT: Okay. Are there                         |
| 12 | consumers who complain about other issues?            |
| 13 | MR. BROWN: The complaint of other                     |
| 14 | issues all the complaints are handled. We just        |
| 15 | haven't specifically said like where they are         |
| 16 | handled. So, consumers would get information back     |
| 17 | for every complaint that they file, kind of letting   |
| 18 | them know what's happening with that complaint.       |
| 19 | So, like I said before, I mean it could               |
| 20 | be that same day, or the next day, or within a couple |
| 21 | of days, we send back a consumer guide that says      |
| 22 | we think this might handle your complaint. In some    |

cases, we do let them know that based on the type 1 of complaint that they file, that it something that 2 3 we wouldn't individually handle or we are not going to serve on a provider but we would use the 4 5 information for trends and patterns and other actions the FCC takes. 6 7 MEMBER GRANT: Okav. And then besides unwanted MR. BROWN: 8 calls, our biggest complaint category would be 9 10 billing issues and most of those are served on 11 So, the consumers would get that providers. 12 acknowledgment that their complaints were served 13 on providers. I just didn't know what 14 MEMBER GRANT: the point was of telling them this if it doesn't 15 16 apply to their complaint and it doesn't tell them where those complaints go. 17 I guess since people are hearing back 18 19 directly, that's probably the most important thing 20 but I just don't know how useful this bullet is. 21 And that's good feedback as MR. BROWN:

We can look at the content.

well.

22

I mean I think

| 1   | that's been up there since the beginning of our     |
|-----|---|
| 2   | launch. So it might be time to just relook at what  |
| 3   | we're saying as well.                               |
| 4   | MEMBER GRANT: And do                                |
| 5   | telecommunications complaints include complaints    |
| 6   | about internet service providers?                   |
| 7   | MR. BROWN: Yes, they do.                            |
| 8   | MEMBER GRANT: I realize this is a                   |
| 9   | contentious subject but, while they still do, I'm   |
| LO  | not sure that a consumer would understand that.     |
| L1  | MR. BROWN: Would understand yes,                    |
| L2  | okay.   |
| L3  | MEMBER GRANT: And then I think the FCC              |
| L 4 | has generally done a really good job in using plain |
| L5  | language but and this is nit-picking now but        |
| L6  | looking reviewing your complaint, not all           |
| L7  | complaints are actionable or constitute a rule      |
| L8  | violation. That could be made a little bit more     |
| L9  | plain language.                                     |
| 20  | And I think those were all of my                    |
| 21  | MR. BROWN: As a non-attorney, I would               |
| 22  | agree with you.                                     |

| 1  | MEMBER GRANT: I think those were all                 |
|----|--|
| 2  | of my questions. Thanks so much.                     |
| 3  | MR. BROWN: Okay, thank you.                          |
| 4  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Any other questions?                |
| 5  | MEMBER MCELDOWNEY: Hi, this is Ken                   |
| 6  | McEldowney. I'm from Consumer Action.                |
| 7  | You may have the answer to this. What                |
| 8  | are the options for consumers for whom English is    |
| 9  | not their primary language?                          |
| 10 | MR. BROWN: So right now the option                   |
| 11 | would be to call our hotline, the Consumer Hotline   |
| 12 | and then we would take the complaint over the phone  |
| 13 | for them.  |
| 14 | We are currently looking at offering                 |
| 15 | the complaint forms in other languages. But right    |
| 16 | now it would be call and then we would help you over |
| 17 | the phone.   |
| 18 | MEMBER MCELDOWNEY: Is the Consumer                   |
| 19 | Guide available in languages other than English?     |
| 20 | MR. BROWN: Yes, so I don't work for                  |
| 21 | Consumer Guides but I believe all Consumer Guides    |
| 22 | are available in Spanish and then there are          |

| 1  | languages being considered as well.                 |
|----|---|
| 2  | MEMBER MCELDOWNEY: Okay, thank you.                 |
| 3  | MR. BROWN: Yes.                                     |
| 4  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Olivia.                            |
| 5  | MEMBER WEIN: Hi, it's Olivia Wein,                  |
| 6  | National Consumer Law Center.                       |
| 7  | I noticed on slide 2 it's mandatory for             |
| 8  | consumers to enter their name the company name      |
| 9  | on the form. And I was wondering if it is possible  |
| 10 | in these searches to also provide the company name. |
| 11 | MR. BROWN: So currently, we don't                   |
| 12 | release the company name in the public data that    |
| 13 | we're releasing.                                    |
| 14 | MEMBER WEIN: Is there a reason for                  |
| 15 | that? Other agencies do. Like CFPB, you can         |
| 16 | search by company.                                  |
| 17 | MR. BROWN: Yes, I think it's something              |
| 18 | that's been considered and I think it's still being |
| 19 | considered but I don't have an answer as to the     |
| 20 | specifics of why or when it could be released.      |
| 21 | MEMBER WEIN: Thank you.                             |
| 22 | MR. BROWN: Mitsy.                                   |

MEMBER HERRERA: I have a question but just to follow on Olivia's, in the past when we had conversations, there was specific things that came up where if you have AT&T as your carrier but you're calling to complain about an unwanted call, the company you're complaining about is not AT&T, your carrier, it is the unknown company and I don't think they resolved that. And in some ways, I think that having the company name there may be a little bit misleading. I'm not quite sure how to -- but I'm not complaining about that company.

MR. BROWN: Sure.

MEMBER HERRERA: So there could be some option for like third-party, unknown third-party might be --

MR. BROWN: So I think in this case so company name is required but only for certain issues. So in that slide 2 I was showing where billing was collected. So if you're complaining about your phone and a billing issue, then we ask for the company name. But if you are actually complaining about an unwanted call, which is a

1 separate issue, then we don't ask for the company So it's not -- let's say I had AT&T and I'm 2 name. 3 complaining about an unwanted call from X Company. MEMBER HERRERA: Okay so my question 4 was, and you probably weren't here to listen in. 5 6 Commissioner Clyburn came in this morning. addition to Pai's mom, we have Clyburn's cousin as 7 our real world. So, what she said was her cousin 8 had a lot of unwanted calls and she kept logs of 9 10 these phone numbers. And Commissioner Clyburn 11 specifically asked her to please file these 12 complaints with the FCC. So the first question I have is on slide 13 6 -- or sorry -- on slide 8, is -- and I'm not sure 14 if this is an entry form or if this is how you report 15 16 Are unwanted calls part of phone issues or 17 telemarketing issues? MR. BROWN: So what 18 Sure. you're 19 looking at in slide 8 is the complaint data summary 20 So what you are looking at here is just releases. 21 charts and graphs that are canned.

And so phone issues would encapsulate

every issue that we collect on a phone form. 1 That include would unwanted calls. And then 2 3 telemarketing issues just carves out those that are specific to telemarketing. 4 5 MEMBER HERRERA: Okay, so what I'm 6 trying to -- so you go pick the phone. 7 So the real question I'm trying to ask is if Commissioner Clyburn's cousin wants to know 8 how many people in my area or my state complained 9 or have similar calls, what percentage of the calls 10 coming in about telephone issues are unwanted 11 Is there a way to pull that data out of the 12 calls? publically available data? And if it is not part 13 14 of the public, is there a way for consumer groups or these attorneys who are really trying to help 15 16 get at some of this stuff, to get to that data? So I'm going to jump 17 MR. BROWN: Sure. to -- if you guys could go back to slide 2 just for 18 19 a second. So, every complaint that is filed is 20 21 submitted on what we call a form. So if you are

going to report an unwanted call, it is reported

| 1  | on a form called Phone and then there's an issue     |
|----|--|
| 2  | called Unwanted Calls. All right, so unwanted        |
| 3  | call, the consumer would select unwanted calls as    |
| 4  | their issue and then fill out the complaint form.    |
| 5  | So then jumping ahead to slide 8, what               |
| 6  | you would be looking at here, obviously if you could |
| 7  | click on it, is the photo shows what would be a pie  |
| 8  | chart and what would show you for all the complaints |
| 9  | filed on a phone form what percentage of each issue  |
| 10 | makes up that pie. So unwanted calls would           |
| 11 | probably be about 50 percent. They are actually      |
| 12 | the higher number of the phone complaints that we    |
| 13 | get involve unwanted calls.                          |
| 14 | MEMBER HERRERA: Okay, so is that data,               |
| 15 | can you sort that by date so that you could show     |
| 16 | like a trend in that?                                |
| 17 | MR. BROWN: Yes, you can.                             |
| 18 | MEMBER HERRERA: Or can you do any                    |
| 19 | geographic sorts?                                    |
| 20 | MR. BROWN: Jumping back to if you                    |
| 21 | go to slide 7, so that's just showing a table view.  |
| 22 | And so we have two data sets. One is a complete      |

| data set of all complaints and that will include     |
|--|
| unwanted calls wove into that data set. And then     |
| we have a separate data set that just shows unwanted |
| call data, both axes where we show the date the      |
| ticket was created, which was the date the           |
| complaint; the date of the issue itself so with      |
| unwanted calls, we ask the consumers to tell us the  |
| date they got the call, so that's there; the State   |
| and the zip code that the consumer is complaining    |
| from; as well as the number that they received       |
| that the unwanted call came in from. And so all      |
| of that data is available on the table view and that |
| can be sorted and filtered and rolled out by State,  |
| with time and so forth.                              |
| MEMBER HERRERA: Thank you very much.                 |
| Very helpful.  |
| MR. BROWN: Yes.                                      |
| CHAIR BARTHOLME: James                               |
| MR. BROWN: Yes.                                      |
| CHAIR BARTHOLME: just to clarify on                  |
| that last point that you made, currently, though,    |
| there is no way to graphically pull the data based   |

| 1  | on a set date range.                                |
|----|---|
| 2  | So for example, you couldn't show that              |
| 3  | in the last quarter maybe there was a dip in        |
| 4  | robocalls because of the Strike Force efforts       |
| 5  | around blocking IRS numbers or something like that  |
| 6  | in the publicly available sort of pie charts and    |
| 7  | outputs that are available on the website right     |
| 8  | now.  |
| 9  | MR. BROWN: No, I mean we would either               |
| 10 | create more graphs ourselves or individual users    |
| 11 | could do that. That is just kind of somewhat        |
| 12 | advanced in that like the advanced filtering tools. |
| 13 | But currently, when you, going back to slide 8, if  |
| 14 | you were to click on like one of those graphs, it   |
| 15 | is just showing you basically the entire pie over   |
| 16 | time. You could carve out                           |
| 17 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Since this started                 |
| 18 | in October of                                       |
| 19 | MR. BROWN: 2014.                                    |
| 20 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Right.                             |
| 21 | MR. BROWN: But it is something that we              |
| 22 | could definitely consider and we have talked about  |

this before, which said we could do stock charts of quarters, or years, or months and then, in addition, individuals could come and do that themselves as well. So, if you didn't want it in quarters, if they wanted to do a six-month trend or something like that, they are able to do that as well.

CHAIR BARTHOLME: Olivia.

MEMBER WEIN: Hi, Olivia Wein,
National Consumer Law Center.

So this is going back to the scenario of a consumer motivated enough to keep a little diary of time of call, the number that shows up on the caller ID. So, looking at the complaint form on page 2, if I were to click on unwanted calls, is there a way for me, without like having to fill out a form for each particular call, to just sort of batch load so I could put in phone number and time for each incident? So, I sit down once. I'm angry. I'm going to do it just once but if I have to fill out like ten forms because I got ten of these calls, that adds to the pain of the robocall.

BROWN: MR. Sure, so it's a good question. So I should also say so in October 2016 the unwanted call form itself, the number of questions were reduced by like 75 percent. used to be somewhere in the neighborhood of like 50 or 60 questions that could potentially be filled out and now it's about 20. So I realize it is 20 but we did reduce the amount. But currently, you will still have to fill out a complaint for each individual call. So if you receive ten calls throughout the day, it would be ten separate complaints. But we have heard this issue and it is something that we are considering basically along those lines. So, if you are getting ten calls, come up with a better consumer-friendly way for consumers to say I received ten calls without submitting ten forms.

CHAIR BARTHOLME: Well, James, I would encourage you to stay tuned. And if our afternoon recommendation passes, we should follow-up and discuss some complaint idea, entry ideas that we have about streamlining that process.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| 1   | MR. BROWN: Okay, sounds good. Thank                 |
|-----|---|
| 2   | you.  |
| 3   | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Thank you for                      |
| 4   | joining us. It was a great presentation.            |
| 5   | MR. BROWN: Sure. Okay, thank you.                   |
| 6   | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Next up, keeping                   |
| 7   | with our robocall theme of the day, we have Jerusha |
| 8   | Burnett joining us. She's an Attorney Advisor for   |
| 9   | the Consumer Policy Division in CGB and she's going |
| LO  | to be providing us with an overview of the March    |
| L1  | 2017 robocall blocking NPRM and NOI.                |
| L2  | MS. BURNETT: Just getting the right                 |
| L3  | slideshow up here. I'm good.                        |
| L 4 | All right. So yes, as was just said,                |
| L5  | my name is Jerusha Burnett. I am an attorney in     |
| L6  | the Consumer Policy Division and I have been asked  |
| L7  | to talk to you about the recent, well March NPRM    |
| L8  | and NOI on robocall blocking.                       |
| L9  | So as many of you, or perhaps all of you            |
| 20  | are aware, one of the major impetuses for the NRPM  |
| 21  | and NOI was a request from the Robocall Strike      |
| 22  | Force. And the Strike Force, in their initial       |

report, specifically asked the Commission to amend the call completion rules to make clear that voice service buyers could block certain robocalls without violating their call completion obligations. So, we thought that was a great suggestion and took it up. And this is part of one of the results.

So first up, there are two parts to this. There is a notice of proposed rulemaking and a notice of inquiry and they look into slightly different issues.

The notice of proposed rulemaking, to start with, proposed rules that would allow provider-initiated blocking of certain calls without including those blocked calls in call completion rates. Now, it proposes a few main things. First, the codification of PN, the Consumer and Government Affairs Bureau released in September of 2016. Second, to allow voice service providers to block calls originating from certain categories of unassigned numbers. And then it also asks a few questions about special treatment

for internationally-originating calls, in case there are situations where those need to be treated differently by providers.

It, finally, also seeks comment on the current definition of "illegal robocall" just to make sure that we have a definition that is both fully inclusive but not wrapping in things that shouldn't be there.

So first up is the codification of this Consumer and Government Affairs public notice. Now, this public notice made it clear that providers can block calls, where the owner of the number purportedly originating the call asks for those calls to be blocked. So this is the IRS Do Not Originate request situation. So the IRS has a hotline. Some fraudulent actors will spoof that hotline number to get people to answer the phone and to trick them into believing it is actually the IRS calling them. But the IRS never makes calls from that number. So, the CGB PN clarified the IRS can go to voice service providers and say look, I never originate calls from this number; please

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

block any calls claiming to be from this number. And it does this on the grounds that no reasonable consumer would want to receive a call that is almost certainly illegal.

This section also asks about sharing information on these requests to make sure that a consumer doesn't have to go, or the IRS, or whomever, doesn't have to go to every individual provider to get that number blocked but, instead, can submit one or a couple of requests and the information can be shared across the industry.

Now, there are certainly efforts already to do this and we were very clear that we don't want to stall or interrupt those efforts in any way. We want to find out what we can do to help them.

So second is unassigned number. Now, this would allow blocking of calls or expressly allow blocking of calls where the number is one of a number -- a list of categories of unassigned numbers. So first and probably simplest is invalid numbers. These are numbers such as ones

where they use an N11 code, like 911 in place of an area code or a number that uses an area code that simply does not exist at all. So we ask about allowing to block those calls.

We also ask about allowing to block calls that originate from numbers that are valid but not yet allocated to a voice service provider. We paid special attention to how much information the voice service providers have and how up-to-date that information is as to whether a number has been allocated because we do not want to sweep in calls that are being legitimately -- that have already been allocated and assigned to a subscriber, we don't want that subscriber's calls to get blocked.

Similarly, we ask about calls purporting to originate from numbers that have been allocated to a voice service provider but are not currently assigned to a subscriber. This is similar to the unallocated but a little bit different in that we want to make sure that we know how much information both the provider to whom the number is allocated and the provider to whom the

number is not allocated has because it may be that the provider to whom the number is allocated will have a significantly more up-to-date and valid information. And so there might be further limitations that need to be placed if the number is allocated to a different provider.

So, that's the basics of the NPRM.

Now, there is also a notice of inquiry, which seeks information that goes a bit further than what the NPRM proposes to allow somewhat broader blocking, based on objective criteria. So unassigned numbers, these sort of the quintessential objective criteria. You know this number is not assigned to a subscriber. You know no one is actually originating a call from this Now, spoofing number, so it's probably spoofed. isn't, by definition, illegal but you will at least have some level of information there.

This is more about other objective criteria that might be useful. It also inquires about creating a safe harbor for blocking calls based on these objective criteria and asking

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

specific questions on how to protect legitimate callers from being blocked.

So first off, what kind of objective criteria is this talking about? Well, talking about things such as soliciting and reviewing information from other carriers, performing historical and real-time call subscriber of analytics, contacting the the spoofed number, or the caller ID authentication standards that have been in progress. But it also asks for other methods because it is entirely possible that people out there have some really great objective methods that the Commission simply isn't aware of. And so we definitely want as much information on those methods as we can.

It asks, and it is very careful about how accurate these methods are because, again, we don't want to block legitimate calls, and it looks at whether some method might be more appropriate when the balking is initiated by the consumer because consumer-initiated blocking has been permitted previously, expressly permitted

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

previously. Voice provider-initiated blocking is a little trickier because your consumer might have different levels that they are willing to accept on false positives, on the possibility of a call that they want to receive getting blocked. So, if the consumer is choosing that blocking, that's fine but we want to be very careful when the provider is choosing that blocking.

So some methods might be great for consumer-initiated blocking but a little risky for provider-initiated blocking.

So what about these legitimate callers who might get blocked by these calls? Well, the NOI recognizes that this might occur. For example -- so, let's take an example. Say you have a call center that is conducting a robocall campaign but has legitimately received express consent, the right level of expressed consent from all the people it's calling. So they are perfectly -- you know they're operating within the law. They are allowed to make those calls. And in fact, some of the people they are calling may well very much want

those calls. That's why robocalls are legal. But their call patterns might look very, very similar to a call center that is conducting a completely illegal campaign.

So, we want to be sure that those legal

So, we want to be sure that those legal callers are not being blocked because some element of their call patterns comes across the same way.

So a couple of things the NOI considers are the possibility of creating a white list of legitimate callers so their calls are never blocked, based on the objective criteria. So you can have these legitimate call centers say look, I want to be added to this list and they don't get blocked.

We also look at how a legitimate caller might contact the voice service provider if they believe their calls are being wrongfully blocked.

So the time line for this, the NPRM and NOI was adopted in March, on March 23rd, and the summary was just published in the Federal Register this week on May 17th. So with that, comments will be due on July 3rd with reply comments due on July

31st.

1.3

And so that's the quick overview of this NPRM and NOI. Does anyone have any questions? Go ahead.

MS. SAUNDERS: I'm Margot Saunders, Olivia Wein's colleague from National Consumer Law Center. You said that you were looking into allowing certain robocallers that had consent, so that those calls which are legal calls would not be blocked. How would you determine whether or not they actually had consent?

MS. BURNETT: So the NOI, it is a notice of inquiry so it is very early stages and that is actually something we would love to have some comments on, how to do that. In fact we ask about how to create some sort of a white list or similar. So we haven't thought put a detailed structure yet. If it were an NPRM, we'd have a much more detailed structure but for a notice of inquiry it's because we feel like we need more information before going to the NPRM stage. So we would love you to provide any comments on that you might have.

| 1  | MS. SAUNDERS: Thank you.                            |
|----|---|
| 2  | MS. BURNETT: Anyone else?                           |
| 3  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Anyone on the phone?               |
| 4  | No. Mitsy.  |
| 5  | MEMBER HERRERA: Mitsy Herrera from                  |
| 6  | Montgomery County. Can I just ask the same          |
| 7  | question I asked of Mark? Would you consider, I     |
| 8  | guess either on your own or if somebody is going    |
| 9  | to put this in the record, is if you look to see    |
| 10 | that these are good things, should companies either |
| 11 | be required to do them or should they be required   |
| 12 | to disclose whether or not they are doing them so   |
| 13 | that consumers can understand if I want these       |
| 14 | protections, which providers are going to offer     |
| 15 | them?   |
| 16 | MS. BURNETT: So that is not squarely                |
| 17 | before the Commission in this proceeding. But as    |
| 18 | with the legitimate caller question, I would        |
| 19 | certainly welcome that in the record. But it is     |
| 20 | not squarely before in our clearly proposed rules.  |
| 21 | That said, if it was put in the record,             |
| 22 | again, part of this is an NOI, so it contemplates   |

| 1        | the possibility of moving forward to an NPRM on that |
|----------|--|
| 2        | section later. So even if it doesn't make it into    |
| 3        | the rules with the NPRM portion, it might be         |
| 4        | something that we could move forward with but right  |
| 5        | now, it is not squarely before the Commission.       |
| 6        | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Steve.                              |
| 7        | MEMBER MORRIS: I have a totally                      |
| 8        | selfish question here. Have you given any thought    |
| 9        | to maybe moving the deadline for comments back a     |
| 10       | few days so it doesn't fall in the middle of a       |
| 11       | four-day weekend?                                    |
| 12       | MS. BURNETT: Unfortunately, the                      |
| 13       | comment deadline is set based on was set when        |
| 14       | the NPRM was adopted and was also then established   |
| 15       | by the date of publication. So we were at the mercy  |
| 16       | of when the Federal Register actually published.     |
| 17       |  |
|          | MEMBER MORRIS: But you have authority                |
| 18       | MEMBER MORRIS: But you have authority to move it.    |
| 18<br>19 |  |
|          | to move it.  |
| 19       | to move it.  MS. BURNETT: We have not discussed      |

| 1  | MS. PODEY: Hi, Stephanie Podey from                 |
|----|---|
| 2  | NCTA. Just one question. How do the items           |
| 3  | proposals differ from what the Strike Force         |
| 4  | recommended or proposed?                            |
| 5  | MS. BURNETT: So, the Strike Force's                 |
| 6  | recommendation, I don't have the exact wording in   |
| 7  | front of me, but was basically about allowing       |
| 8  | blocking based on objective standards and amending  |
| 9  | the call completion rules to do so.                 |
| 10 | So the major difference, I would say is,            |
| 11 | well, one, that we are starting out with just one   |
| 12 | subset of that in the NPRM but also that there is   |
| 13 | a little more detail on things like protections for |
| 14 | legitimate callers and things like that, as opposed |
| 15 | to sort of a general allowance of blocking.         |
| 16 | Anything else? Great. Well, thank                   |
| 17 | you very much.                                      |
| 18 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Thank you.                         |
| 19 | So next we're joined by Anita Dey. She              |
| 20 | is the Assistant Bureau Chief with CGB and she is   |
| 21 | going to talk to us about robocall outreach and the |
| 22 | unwanted calls page.                                |

MS. DEY: Hi, everyone. It sounds like you've had quite a robocalls day already. I'll just keep it rolling then.

It's good to be back with you. I had the pleasure of speaking with you in January about this same topic and, obviously, I can see that you have a lot of interest in robocalls, including the consumer outreach and education that we do. And of course, you have already been talking about the Strike Force report, so I will touch on that as well in my overview of what we're doing.

So, as I had told you in January, we have been issuing robocall alerts, consumer alerts, and we issued alerts on gift cards, a utilities scam, financial scams, and of course the IRS scams.

Since then, we issued another alert. On March 27th, we released an alert about the Can You Hear Me scam. This is a scam, if you haven't heard of it, where callers are trying to get the victim to say the word yes during the call by saying something like can you hear me. And you say yes. It gets recorded. And then maybe the scammer is

trying to use that recording to authorize bank account authorizations or things like that.

So when we issued that alert, it really struck a nerve with the public because, of course, we have our social media account. So I have a couple of numbers. We had 10,533 Facebook clicks had 1,955 Twitter on the announcement. We And I also have the number of page engagements. views because, of course, that alert when on our fcc.gov. We had 4,815 page views of that alert. And to put it in perspective, that is about 20 times than the January financial scams alert that we put out. So that was a very big deal.

Our alerts have some standard information in them. They, of course, explain the scam. They tell consumers where to report it, which is usually us, the Federal Trade Commission, the gift card company if such a card was involved, and the police.

We also offer tips to help consumers protect themselves. Some of the tips will be specific to the scam. Some of the tips are more

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

general. So, I'm sure you all know this already but I figured it would be helpful to go through the general tips again.

Of course, don't answer calls from

unknown numbers. Let them go to voice mail. If you are unclear if a caller is legitimate, hang up, look up the company's phone number independently on a recent bill or on their website and call them directly. And of course, if you are initiating the communication yourself, you can verify that the request is actually legitimate.

If you answer and the caller, which can be a recording of course, asks you to hit a button to stop getting the calls, just hang up because scammers will use these tricks to identify and then target live respondents.

You can ask your service provider if a robocall blocking service is available. I have one and it's been incredibly helpful.

We also updated our unwanted calls consumer guide to reflect these and other tips and directed people to our website on web resources for

blocking calls. And if you're curious, you probably know this already, but it's <a href="https://www.fcc.gov/unwanted-calls">www.fcc.gov/unwanted-calls</a>. And there is more information and resources on robocall blocking tools.

So when we are thinking about the next alert, we draw from a variety of sources, internal and external, to determine what scams are affecting consumers most. We also coordinate with other agencies, depending on the topic and the circumstance. For example, when we kicked off this project, I guess in November, we coordinated with the Federal Trade Commission.

When we did the IRS scam in December, we collaborated with the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration.

And as I mentioned, you know thinking about future alerts, we are currently considering our next one, what it should be, and we would love your ideas. If you want to tell us what topics you think would be of most interest, for example, what topics and scams should we think about the next one

1.3

and future ones. Are there other tips that we should be giving consumers to make sure they don't fall victim? And how can we best spread our Of course, we are interested in low-cost high-impact distribution. Currently, our distribution, like I said, is social media. The consumer alert, I think our Office of Media Relations may send it out to its sources but I would have to confirm that. And then we send it out to the consumer groups that we know and I think some of you may be on our mailing list. But if you have other ideas, of course, please do let us know.

So a little bit more about the unwanted calls webpage. It's on fcc.gov, like I said. And on it, we highlight the work of the Industry Robocall Strike Force but we also supplement that work with other relevant information.

So the information includes resources from the Federal Trade Commission, the IRS, as well as the Do Not Call Registry, which of course we created with the FTC. We also give consumers general tips on understanding what a robocall is,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

when their consent is required, and some of the different requirements for robocalls to wireless and those to wired line phones.

We really want to have fresh and meaningful content on our websites. So we really welcome your suggestions for new content. And you can contact Scott, of course, with comments, we can talk about it in the Q and A, or you can make formal recommendations. Whatever works for all of you.

So just a couple more things about how we talk about robocalls in our day-to-day work. had a robocall webinar on February 16th, where the entire hour was dedicated to the topic. We talked about the TCPA, how it is enforced, technological solutions. And it is archived on our website and I wrote down the URL but it is really long to read out. So, if anybody is interested, I can send it to you. Just let me know.

And finally, this is Older Americans

Month and, of course, we know that many older

Americans are frequently targeted by scammers. So

we are including robocalls as a topic for our

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| 1  | monthly campaign the campaign this month.          |
|----|--|
| 2  | So of course, we have a social media               |
| 3  | component, Facebook being a popular tool for older |
| 4  | Americans and Twitter being a good tool for        |
| 5  | younger folks who have older Americans in their    |
| 6  | lives.   |
| 7  | We are going to have a webinar, again,             |
| 8  | May 22nd, and one of the topics will be robocalls. |
| 9  | We have a few other things on the agenda as well.  |
| 10 | And we have got teams going out to                 |
| 11 | senior centers this month, handing out information |
| 12 | and they will also being going to the D.C. Annual  |
| 13 | Senior Symposium, which happens to be June but we  |
| 14 | will count it as a part of Older Americans Month.  |
| 15 | So, that's what I have for you. I look             |
| 16 | forward to your questions. Thanks.                 |
| 17 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Kevin.                            |
| 18 | MEMBER RUPY: Hi, Kevin Rupy with                   |
| 19 | USTelecom.   |
| 20 | Do you have any analytics, Anita,                  |
| 21 | regarding how many visits you are getting to the   |
| 22 | FCC's unwanted calls page and, specifically, the   |

| 1  | tool section of the page, just out of curiosity?  |
|----|---|
| 2  | MS. DEY: I think we do. I know we have            |
| 3  | analytics for fcc.gov. I don't know how specific  |
| 4  | it gets. I'll have to go back to the people who   |
| 5  | actually do that and check with them. So I will   |
| 6  | get back to you.                                  |
| 7  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Margot.                          |
| 8  | MS. SAUNDERS: Just a quick question.              |
| 9  | Does the FCC envision enforcement actions against |
| 10 | robocallers, if they can identify them?           |
| 11 | MS. DEY: So since I am part of the                |
| 12 | outreach team, I can't speak to the current       |
| 13 | thinking on the enforcement situation with        |
| 14 | robocalls. I'm sorry just to sidestep the         |
| 15 | question like that. So why don't I talk to the    |
| 16 | folks on our team and get back to you?            |
| 17 | MS. SAUNDERS: Thank you.                          |
| 18 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Anyone on the line               |
| 19 | have a question?                                  |
| 20 | Other questions? All right, thank you             |
| 21 | for joining us.                                   |
| 22 | MS. DEY: Thank you so much.                       |

1 CHAIR BARTHOLME: And we'll get that link for the archived webinar in February and make 2 3 sure everybody gets it. And then we also can send the link for the webinar coming up on the 22nd. 4 5 that you'll have both the archived one and the next 6 one to take a look at. 7 agenda, Next on the we have an introduction to the Broadband Deployment Advisory 8 Committee, also known as the BDAC. 9 And Brian 10 Hurley, who is their designated federal officer, 11 from the Wireline Competition Bureau is going to 12 join us. MR. HURLEY: 13 Thank you everyone. Ιt 14 is a pleasure to be here. As Ed already mentioned, my name is Brian Hurley. I am in the Wireline 15 16 Competition Bureau here at the FCC and I am the 17 office for designated federal the Broadband Deployment Advisory Committee. 18 19 So I am just here to give a little bit 20 of an overview of the BDAC, as we call it, and kind of what we've done so far and where we're headed. 21

the BDAC is a Federal Advisory

Committee chartered under the Federal Advisory

Committee Act, just like the CAC. We were

officially established on March first of this year.

So that means our charter runs through March first

of 2019. And we can, of course, seek to renew it

for an additional two years, as other committees

have done.

The BDAC's mission, in a nutshell, it is to make recommendations to the Commission on how to accelerate the deployment of a high-speed or broadband by reducing internet access removing regulatory barriers to infrastructure investment. So the BDAC is really intended to be a means for stakeholders to share ideas and develop recommendations to the Commission on broadband deployment which will, in turn, enhance Commission's ability to discharge its statutory responsibilities broadband encourage to deployment to all Americans.

So, I'll just go and give you kind of a quick time line of BDAC activity, what we've done so far and kind of where we're headed during this

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

calendar year of 2017.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So on January 31st, we released a public notice soliciting nominations for BDAC. We sought from various representatives sectors industry, local communications State and regulators, and consumer and community organizations. As you may have heard, we received quite a volume of interest. We received over 380 nominations. I think that was probably a bit more than most of us were anticipating. But it was a very encouraging sign and there was certainly a wealth of great applicants to choose from.

So on April 6th of this year, we announced the 29 members of the BDAC. The chair of the BDAC is Elizabeth Pierce. She is the CEO of a company called Quintillion. It's an Alaska-based company that deploys fiber optic cable to serve very remote, extremely remote communities in northern and western Alaska.

And then our vice chair, her name is Kelleigh Cole and she is the Broadband Outreach Director for the State of Utah.

Excuse me. In that April 6th public notice, we also noticed five working groups that will be assisting the BDAC in carrying out its work and I will kind of go over those one-by-one briefly here in a moment.

So the BDAC held its first in-person meeting here in this room on April 21st. The meeting largely consisted of everyone kind of getting to know each other and staff making presentations to the BDAC just to kind of give them a sense of what was coming and kind of some of the context in which they would doing their work.

So the next step has been trying to set up the working groups for the BDAC and get those up and running. As I said, there are five working groups that we announced in the public notice. Since subsequent public notices over the last week or two, we have actually announced the membership of four of the working groups. So, we're still putting together the fifth one.

And then the next meeting of the BDAC, we are looking at July 20th, which I think is a

Thursday. And really the purpose of that meeting will be for the working groups to sort of present the work that they have done to date. It's an opportunity for the full committee to discuss and provide input on all of the product and, hopefully, give the working group some ideas and some feedback that will help them as they go forward in continuing to develop their recommendations.

And then we are looking at an end of the year meeting sometime in the October or November time frame. And the purpose of that meeting would be to vote on final recommendations for at least for 2017.

And as I will explain the working groups, two of those -- some of the deliverable we're hoping to get at that end of the year meeting are two Model Codes, one for State governments, one for municipal governments, both of which are intended to provide model provisions, guidelines on how to accelerate broadband deployments.

And I should mention the working groups, if you take a look, if you have seen any

1.3

of the public notices we have released so far on those, the working groups will include both members of the BDAC, the 29 members, as well as some additional applicants who were not selected for the full BDAC. So it is an opportunity to bring in some additional voices to sort of further enrich the work.

So I will just briefly run through the working groups. The first four of these we announced the members of and they are in the process of getting to work and scheduling their first calls and doing all of that.

So the first of the working groups, as I mentioned is TAC. It's the Model Code for Municipalities Working Group. And actually the CAC's own Debra Berlyn is a member of that group. So, thank you Debra for agreeing to do double duty on two groups.

So the purpose of this group is fairly straightforward. It is to draft a model code for municipalities to accelerate broadband deployment. And we have suggested some areas they

| 1  | could look at, things like franchising, zoning,      |
|----|--|
| 2  | permitting, dig once. But we are really leaving      |
| 3  | it open to the group to decide kind of what          |
| 4  | components, what elements should be included in      |
| 5  | this code as well as the State code. And for both    |
| 6  | codes, we have emphasized that it should be          |
| 7  | designed to meet the needs of broad diverse-ranging  |
| 8  | municipalities that differ in terms of their         |
| 9  | geography and population density size, different     |
| 10 | background, regulatory environments and other        |
| 11 | factors.   |
| 12 | So, that's one group. AS I said                      |
| 13 | MEMBER MCELDOWNEY: I'm sorry. Let me                 |
| 14 | ask a question. This is Ken McEldowney, Consumer     |
| 15 | Action.  |
| 16 | Would that also look at the ability of               |
| 17 | municipalities to establish their own broadband?     |
| 18 | MR. HURLEY: It's really up to the group              |
| 19 | to determine sort of what the components of the code |
| 20 | will include. So we haven't gotten far enough to     |
| 21 | say exactly what the components will be.             |
|    | 1 <b>i</b>   |

HERRERA:

MEMBER

22

Did you include

| 1  | anybody in there who is from a community that has   |
|----|---|
| 2  | launched their own broadband?                       |
| 3  | MR. HURLEY: I'm not sure, to be                     |
| 4  | honest.   |
| 5  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Your working group                 |
| 6  | memberships are posted on the BDAC site?            |
| 7  | MR. HURLEY: They are, yes for the first             |
| 8  | four of the working groups, yes. They should be     |
| 9  | there. If they're not, if you can't find them, I    |
| 10 | can certainly track them down for you.              |
| 11 | So the second working group I                       |
| 12 | mentioned, they are working on drafting a model     |
| 13 | code for State governments. Part of the role there  |
| 14 | will be to be look at the roles of State regulatory |
| 15 | agencies and other bodies in sort of addressing     |
| 16 | things that states can do to promote more robust    |
| 17 | deployment at the municipal level. And, again, if   |
| 18 | we want it to be able to cover a diverse range of   |
| 19 | States.   |
| 20 | So the third group is called the                    |
| 21 | Competitive Access to Broadband Infrastructure      |
| 22 | Group. A large focus of this group is on pole       |

attachments, access to utility poles. And I should actually mention another member of the CAC, Ross Lieberman has agreed to be a member of that group. So, thank you as well.

group will So be developing recommendations on how to promote speedier more efficient access to utility poles, while ensuring integrity of the safety existing and the They also look at recommendations on attachments. promoting access to other infrastructure, like ducks and conduits, rights of way.

So, the fourth group is the Removing State and Local Regulatory Barriers Group and they are looking at identifying patterns of instances of actions that have been taken at the state and local level that could serve as barriers to broadband deployment, providing recommendations to the Commission on how to address those.

And then there's a fifth group that we're still putting together the membership for and that is the Streamlining Federal Siting Group.

They are focused on recommendations to improve the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| 1  | process of siting infrastructure on federal lands,  |
|----|---|
| 2  | also on federally-managed properties, looking at    |
| 3  | such things as recommending standard procedures     |
| 4  | for facility siting, recommendations on how to      |
| 5  | standardize the duration of leases and easements,   |
| 6  | and just other aspects of that.                     |
| 7  | So, that's a quick overview of kind of              |
| 8  | the BDAC and the working groups that we in the      |
| 9  | process of putting together.                        |
| 10 | One final thing I will point out is we              |
| 11 | do have an open docket that we've set up, basically |
| 12 | as a repository for if anyone wants to submit       |
| 13 | comments for the BDAC, it is Docket 17/83. So,      |
| 14 | anyone is free to file anything there that they     |
| 15 | think would be interesting or worthwhile for the    |
| 16 | BDAC.   |
| 17 | So, thanks.   |
| 18 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Great. Any                         |
| 19 | questions? Steve.                                   |
| 20 | MEMBER MORRIS: Can you talk a little                |
| 21 | bit about how, if at all, the relationship between  |
| 22 | the BDAC process and the rulemaking proceedings,    |

where the Commission will be collecting comments from the -- about the same issues but --

MR. HURLEY: No, it's a good question and that is actually something we have thought about a little bit. I think to see precisely how they interplay is something that I think we'll have to see as both kind of processes develop.

One thing we have done, though, is we put out a public notice right at the beginning of the BDAC process, clarifying comments, and any presentations, and things that are made in the context of the BDAC like at a BDAC meeting or in one of our working group calls. Those are exempt from the ex parte rules that apply in those different rulemaking proceedings. So the idea there is that people can kind of -- within the context of BDAC, people can communicate openly and freely on these issues.

If it is determined at a later point that there is something that is discussed in BDAC that we think might be useful to inform what we're doing in rulemakings, then we'll make sure that

that information is put into the record and the docket for those rulemakings, if it is going to be, in any way, the basis for a decision. So that's kind of how we've been dealing with it.

CHAIR BARTHOLME: Mitsy.

MEMBER HERRERA: Mitsy Herrera from Montgomery County, Maryland.

The Commission has a long history of different rulemakings in which they have preempted municipalities and local governments in various areas so that they could promote deployment. And there are many States out there that have engaged in various schemes in which they have either created one-size-fits-all or preempted across the board.

Is the FCC staff planning to provide any analysis to look at? Where you have those experiments, have these types of restricting preempting local governments as a way of reducing barriers, has it actually led to more deployment compared to areas that have stronger regulatory regimes?

| 1  | MR. HURLEY: I mean so I would say in                 |
|----|--|
| 2  | the context of the BDAC, I mean it's really the BDAC |
| 3  | that is doing the work of developing.                |
| 4  | MEMBER HERRERA: But you've selected                  |
| 5  | all the people on the BDAC.                          |
| 6  | MR. HURLEY: We have. That's true.                    |
| 7  | MEMBER HERRERA: Right. So, I mean                    |
| 8  | you have other cases and we have had lots of         |
| 9  | conversations in various iterations of this group    |
| 10 | about data-driven analysis and whether these rules   |
| 11 | have actually had impact. So you have a good         |
| 12 | decade plus from cable franchising, to various       |
| 13 | States, to preempting local governments, to          |
| 14 | preempting municipal broadband. You have lots of     |
| 15 | examples of where you've done that.                  |
| 16 | So, is it useful to provide to the BDAC              |
| 17 | some empirical analysis? You collect all kinds of    |
| 18 | data about fiber deployment, copper line             |
| 19 | deployment. You've got lots of those reports and     |
| 20 | you've got statistical analysis departments.         |
| 21 | MR. HURLEY: I mean it's a fair                       |
| 22 | question and we're working with the BDAC in the      |

| 1  | different working groups to see kind of what        |
|----|---|
| 2  | information is useful to them but they are really   |
| 3  | kind of operating independently, in terms of        |
| 4  | deciding what information to gather and how to      |
| 5  | analyze everything.                                 |
| 6  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Anybody on the phone               |
| 7  | line? Rick.   |
| 8  | MR. ELLROD: I'm Rick Ellrod, Fairfax                |
| 9  | County.   |
| 10 | To follow-up on Mitsy's question, will              |
| 11 | the BDAC conduct a cost-benefit analysis before     |
| 12 | issuing recommendations?                            |
| 13 | MR. HURLEY: I mean not to sound like                |
| 14 | a broken record but it's really up to the BDAC to   |
| 15 | kind of determine what recommendations to make and  |
| 16 | sort of what analysis will underpin or underlie the |
| 17 | recommendations.                                    |
| 18 | MR. ELLROD: Well, let me ask another                |
| 19 | question about the structure of the BDAC. As you    |
| 20 | know, the majority of the BDAC members are from     |
| 21 | industry seeking preemption. The chairman of each   |
| 22 | working group is from the industries. What          |

specific procedures and methods are you putting in 1 place to ensure that the local governments who 2 3 actually make these rules and are familiar with how they are made, their input is fully heard and taken 4 into account? 5 MR. HURLEY: 6 I mean --7 MR. ELLROD: What specific procedures are you putting in its place? 8 MR. HURLEY: We've included members from 9 10 governments on the various working groups. 11 the members of the groups have the full opportunity 12 to advocate for their views. And we have been 13 working with the chairs of the different groups to 14 make sure that the meetings are being done and conducted in a way that everyone's having the full 15 16 opportunity to have their say. 17 CHAIR BARTHOLME: And to the extent 18 that we have issues overlap, I would hope that Scott 19 and you can help us find the pathways to the right 20 people so that our members would have discussions, 21 if that makes sense, with the corresponding members

groups

BDAC

working

of

22

ways

to

other

or

| 1  | communicate.   |
|----|--|
| 2  | MR. HURLEY: Absolutely.                              |
| 3  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: And have you and                    |
| 4  | Scott talked about forming sort of like a happy hour |
| 5  | support group?                                       |
| 6  | MR. MARSHALL: I'm all for that.                      |
| 7  | MR. HURLEY: Scott, let's talk.                       |
| 8  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Thanks for joining us.              |
| 9  | MR. HURLEY: Thank you.                               |
| 10 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: So next up, we have                 |
| 11 | a consideration of a recommendation.                 |
| 12 | MR. MARSHALL: Wow!                                   |
| 13 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: So the Robocall                     |
| 14 | Working Group, which Kevin and I co-chair, have put  |
| 15 | forth a recommendation that was distributed in       |
| 16 | advance as part of the meeting packets to everyone.  |
| 17 | There were two changes that I emailed                |
| 18 | around to the group this morning. Those are being    |
| 19 | considered friendly amendments by the working        |
| 20 | group. And I just wanted to make sure that           |
| 21 | everybody got those, had a chance to read those.     |
| 00 |  |

On top of the folder at each seat was a clean updated

| 1  | version of the recommendation that incorporates  |
|----|--|
| 2  | those changes that were sent out and highlighted |
| 3  | earlier.   |
| 4  | Does anyone have any questions about             |
| 5  | the  |
| 6  | MEMBER BERLYN: Do we have to move it             |
| 7  | first?   |
| 8  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: We can move the                 |
| 9  | recommendation, sure. Yes, do I get a motion?    |
| LO | MEMBER BERLYN: Motion to move.                   |
| L1 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Can I get a second?             |
| L2 | MEMBER MORRIS: Second.                           |
| L3 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Now, on the                     |
| L4 | amendments are there any questions or comments?  |
| L5 | Does anybody want them read out? Okay.           |
| L6 | Any further discussion?                          |
| L7 | MEMBER BERLYN: The amendments are                |
| L8 | about the whole thing.                           |
| L9 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: About the whole thing.          |
| 20 | Kristen.   |
| 21 | MEMBER WITANOWSKI: I just want thank             |
| 22 | you, Ed and Kevin, for this recommendation. I    |

think all the back and forth you had and the 1 2 openness with all the groups really made this a good 3 first recommendation for the CAC. So, thanks again for your leadership. 4 5 CHAIR BARTHOLME: Thank you. Debbie. 6 7 I want to second that, MEMBER BERLYN: just this is really 8 to say that а 9 comprehensive recommendation for us. So, thank 10 you Ed and Kevin. 11 CHAIR BARTHOLME: Mark. 12 MEMBER RICHERT: Thanks. Mark Richert, American Foundation for the Blind. 13 I'll third it but I do have a general 14 15 In item number four, it talks question. 16 specifically references accessible formats. Ι 17 have no problem with this language and I'm not 18 proposing any language changes. I assume that 19 we're all going to nod our head in agreement that 20 we are also talking here about the accessibility 21 of any online delivery of the complaint forms, et

just talking

cetera.

It's

not

22

hard

about

| 1   | materials.   |
|-----|--|
| 2   | CHAIR BARTHOLME: That was the                      |
| 3   | understanding, yes.                                |
| 4   | MEMBER RICHERT: And with that, thanks              |
| 5   | so much. I really appreciate the emphasis on       |
| 6   | allowing folks with disabilities to have an active |
| 7   | part in this process. I much appreciate it.        |
| 8   | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Can we call for the               |
| 9   | question?  |
| LO  | MEMBER HERRERA: I'm sorry, can I                   |
| L1  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Mitsy.                            |
| L2  | MEMBER HERRERA: I was trying to read               |
| L3  | faster. I was just thinking of the thing that      |
| L 4 | somebody mentioned today was, and I'm looking for  |
| L5  | the right spot in here, if you have ten if you     |
| L6  | are Clyburn's cousin and you have ten numbers that |
| L7  | you collected, is that number seven is             |
| L8  | MEMBER WITANOWSKI: It would allow                  |
| L9  | multiple unwanted calls to be reported, requiring  |
| 20  | a minimum amount of info.                          |
| 21  | MEMBER HERRERA: Great. Yes, she just               |
| 22  | mentioned that. So I'm looking at that, yes.       |

Okay, so that's great. I think that was really helpful because when you said you had to do 20 more questions for each one, that was good.

And then the other one is on number nine, where it says about the app for mobile devices, so what I have noticed within my colleagues is for -- and I don't think -- is CEA is not on this group anymore, right? Okay, so the issue is is that for different mobile phones, the ability, when you get a call in to say I want to block that number, some do, other ones you have to save it as a contact and then you block it.

So, I'm just wondering if there is any ability -- I think it is in this app section but it's either that or working with -- they should work with the device manufacturers, themselves, to make it easier for the consumer in some kind of one-touch to block that number.

And then I don't know if that makes it easier if you have the app to sort of say great, these are the numbers I've just blocked, please report them.

But is there a way to make a friendly 1 amendment to that? 2 3 CHAIR BARTHOLME: I would say that I 4 think that the scope of the recommendation was more focused on complaints than the ability to block. 5 6 And to the extent that this sort of app, perhaps 7 created by the Commission itself in collaboration with providers and device manufacturers would 8 9 facilitate complaining, as opposed just 10 blocking. 11 We do plan to tee up other things along 12 those lines in future recommendations but this was 13 focused specifically on facilitating complaint and 14 driving complaint data. 15 MEMBER HERRERA: Okay. 16 MEMBER WITANOWSKI: And Mitsy, I would Different platforms do 17 just -- you're right. things different ways. 18 But on CTIA's webpage 19 dealing with robocalls, we have videos for each of 20 the platforms showing consumers how to block calls on the individual platforms for IOS and BlackBerry, 21

and Android, and Windows.

22

So I would direct folks

| 1  | to that or point consumers to that webpage if      |
|----|--|
| 2  | they're getting confused. There are step-by-step   |
| 3  | instructions.                                      |
| 4  | MEMBER HERRERA: Okay. So I would                   |
| 5  | just withdraw the friendly amendment and just say  |
| 6  | that in a future recommendation I think that these |
| 7  | other strategies that really help consumers block  |
| 8  | the calls and having the FCC I don't know how      |
| 9  | they feel about linking to CTIA                    |
| LO | MEMBER WITANOWSKI: They do now on                  |
| L1 | their Unwanted Calls pages.                        |
| L2 | MEMBER HERRERA: Okay, that's great.                |
| L3 | So yes, I just think maybe an additional follow-up |
| L4 | recommendation is something that is focused on the |
| L5 | strategies to help consumers block calls would be  |
| L6 | useful.  |
| L7 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Sure. Zainab.                     |
| L8 | MEMBER ALKEBSI: Hi, this is Zainab                 |
| L9 | speaking. So I have a comment and a question.      |
| 20 | First of all, the comment is, thank you            |
| 21 | so much for all of your hard work on this and for  |
| 22 | making sure that you have checked in with us       |

members, specifically members with disabilities and how this would apply to us. That's something that we definitely needed.

And then that brings me to my question. And the question is about how we can relate number four and number nine to each other. Number four talks about the accessibility of educational resources and the complaint form; and then number nine talks about the app.

And I understand that that app is a way to file a complaint but that doesn't make any mention of accessibility. So, number nine doesn't talk about accessibility of the app.

So my question is about that, how those relate to each other.

CHAIR BARTHOLME: My understanding is, and if anybody in the group interpreted this differently during the creation process, please chime in, but number four was speaking to the existing complaint formats and forms that are already out there, so the web portal and other paths of entry, whether it's the telephone system that

CHC uses and things like that.

The development of the app would be a new additional way to input complaints. Having

1

2

3

4

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

should not be accessible. And I would hope and think that anything that the FCC creates and puts

7 out there for public use and consumption would meet

said that, though, there is no reason why that app

8 accessibility requirements and formats.

MEMBER ALKEBSI: So, okay, thank you. And I agree you know the concern is that it has been an afterthought. And so then there is a lot of time lost in that process. And so there is no harm as making this as clear as possible from the get-go.

CHAIR BARTHOLME: Is there a proposed change or language?

MEMBER ALKEBSI: Yes, to add that the development of the app include all accessibility considerations, et cetera, et cetera.

MEMBER HERRERA: Can you just -- is it possible after mobile devices you could say something like so it can be used by consumers with mobile devices, either including consumers with

| 1  | disability or including devices that feature         |
|----|--|
| 2  | that have accessibility features, one of those to    |
| 3  | insert right in there?                               |
| 4  | MEMBER ALKEBSI: This is Zainab                       |
| 5  | speaking. That doesn't really work for me because    |
| 6  | that is actually quite limited. It is limited to     |
| 7  | the accessibility of the device but we want to think |
| 8  | about the accessibility of the app itself.           |
| 9  | MEMBER HERRERA: But the app is only                  |
| 10 | used on the device.                                  |
| 11 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Mark, did you have                  |
| 12 | MEMBER ALKEBSI: Yes, that would work,                |
| 13 | putting the word accessible before the word app.     |
| 14 | MEMBER RICHERT: Following up on,                     |
| 15 | Mitsy, your comment, so right after that             |
| 16 | essentially saying it can or should, whatever the    |
| 17 | appropriate lingo is we're doing here, be            |
| 18 | accessible to and usable by people with              |
| 19 | disabilities.  |
| 20 | MEMBER HERRERA: Yes, you could just                  |
| 21 | add at the end the app should be accessible and      |
| 22 | usable by people with disabilities.                  |

| 1  | MEMBER RICHERT: Accessible to and                 |
|----|---|
| 2  | usable by.  |
| 3  | MEMBER ALKEBSI: This is Zainab                    |
| 4  | speaking. Yes, I agree with that.                 |
| 5  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Accessible to and                |
| 6  | useable by people with disabilities.              |
| 7  | (Simultaneous speaking.)                          |
| 8  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: So develop an app                |
| 9  | that can be used by consumers with mobile devices |
| 10 | to quickly file complaints for unwanted calls     |
| 11 | received on their device, period.                 |
| 12 | MEMBER RICHERT: And that is                       |
| 13 | accessible to and usable by.                      |
| 14 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: And that is                      |
| 15 | MEMBER HERRERA: But if you just make              |
| 16 | a separate sentence, it might be more you've kind |
| 17 | of crammed a lot into a single sentence.          |
| 18 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: The app                          |
| 19 | MEMBER HERRERA: The app should be                 |
| 20 | accessible to and usable by people with           |
| 21 | disabilities.                                     |
| 22 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: accessible to and                |

| 1  | useable by people with disabilities. |
|----|--------------------------------------|
| 2  | Anybody else need that re-read out?  |
| 3  | So do we have a motion to accept the |
| 4  | amendment?                           |
| 5  | MEMBER GRANT: I so move.             |
| 6  | MEMBER ALKEBSI: Second.              |
| 7  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: All in favor of     |
| 8  | accepting the amendment?             |
| 9  | (Chorus of aye.)                     |
| 10 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Opposed?            |
| 11 | (No audible response.)               |
| 12 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Abstentions?        |
| 13 | (No audible response.)               |
| 14 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Seeing none, are we |
| 15 | ready to call the question?          |
| 16 | MEMBER MCELDOWNEY: Yes.              |
| 17 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Does somebody want  |
| 18 | to move to call the question?        |
| 19 | MEMBER MCELDOWNEY: So moved.         |
| 20 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Thank you, Ken.     |
| 21 | Second?                              |
| 22 | MEMBER POCIASK: Yes.                 |

| 1  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: All in favor?                     |
|----|--|
| 2  | (Chorus of aye.)                                   |
| 3  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Opposed?                          |
| 4  | (No audible response.)                             |
| 5  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Abstentions?                      |
| 6  | (No audible response.)                             |
| 7  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Seeing none, it                   |
| 8  | passes. Thank you, everyone.                       |
| 9  | Next up we have some reports from the              |
| 10 | working Mitsy.                                     |
| 11 | MEMBER HERRERA: Sorry. Can I just                  |
| 12 | ask as a follow-up on this particular one, since   |
| 13 | we've had almost an entire devoted to robocalls?   |
| 14 | Can we ask that the Commission at the next two     |
| 15 | or at the remaining CAC meetings give us an update |
| 16 | on any progress or no progress on these items?     |
| 17 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: We can ask.                       |
| 18 | MEMBER HERRERA: Thank you.                         |
| 19 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Sure.                             |
| 20 | Next up on the agenda, we have reports             |
| 21 | from the working groups. So, let's start with      |
| 22 | Debbie, who is chair of the Privacy Working Group. |

MEMBER BERLYN: Thank you, Ed. So, I think it's fitting that I go first, seeing it's the working group that is actually not listed in your packet. And there is a reason for that that many around the table know. The Privacy Group probably the shortest-lived working group in the We had a lot of activity and I want to -- I CAC. will thank everybody in just a moment. But we had a very important task that was part of the Open Internet Order -- I'm sorry - the Privacy Order. I'm sorry, there is a reasons for OIO being on my mind but the Privacy Order.

And the CRA that was passed by Congress sort of put a halt to our work. So the standard privacy notice that we were tasked to complete was no longer relevant to the FCC's privacy rules. So, therefore, our work was curtailed and so the privacy working group has basically no task before it. And I guess, Ed, the privacy group is going to join other efforts at the CAC and no longer be working on privacy for now.

MEMBER MCELDOWNEY: But let's keep

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

this private.

2 MEMBER BERLYN: For now, shall we say,

3 Ken?

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

4 MEMBER MCELDOWNEY: Yes.

MEMBER BERLYN: Our group will be looking for other important consumer issues, as the Commission seeks our efforts to do.

So I want to thank the hard work of the members of the Privacy Working Group. We really put in a lot of time toward the standard privacy We were working towards a June first notice. deadline. We were meeting at least every other week, if not more often to try and come up with a great product. We were, I don't know, at least two-thirds of the way along in doing that. everybody who worked on that effort, many who are sitting around the table now, put in a great deal of time to do that. Susan and Ken on the phone, and Zainab, Krista, Elizabeth. Who am I missing? Oh, Lynn from USTelecom, Ed Dallas, who has moved on to another position, and John, thank you John from NCL.

| 1  | So you know many folks. I'm sure I                   |
|----|--|
| 2  | missed some but thank you everyone for the work that |
| 3  | you did on the working group and we look forward     |
| 4  | to other issues that we will tackle.                 |
| 5  | So, thank you.                                       |
| 6  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Thank you.                          |
| 7  | Steve, Technology Transitions.                       |
| 8  | MEMBER POCIASK: Yes, so not much to                  |
| 9  | report. Okay, we held a call. One of the requests    |
| 10 | that were made to have someone from AT&T on a call   |
| 11 | to talk about the status or the withdrawal from the  |
| 12 | trials. We had that call.                            |
| 13 | And second, we were tasked with getting              |
| 14 | a presentation with the FCC's point of contact but   |
| 15 | that position still remains vacant. So that kind     |
| 16 | of put a damper on some of that.                     |
| 17 | But where we are right now, so really                |
| 18 | there is little that has been done but we have eight |
| 19 | topics that were teed up and we're starting to get   |
| 20 | a little bit of input from members who were assigned |
| 21 | some of those tasks.                                 |
|    | 1  |

So, at this point in time, I think we're

| J  |  |
|----|--|
| 1  | just going to I'll be circling back with Mark        |
| 2  | DeFalco, who I don't think is on the call, and he    |
| 3  | and I will have to just set up a meeting. We'll      |
| 4  | go back through the issues that were raised, see     |
| 5  | what the status in, and try to move ahead with the   |
| 6  | ones that we think are probably bear the most fruit. |
| 7  | So, really not much to report.                       |
| 8  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Thanks, Steve.                      |
| 9  | Amina or Olivia.                                     |
| 10 | MEMBER FAZLULLAH: Hi, Olivia, should                 |
| 11 | I start or do you want to start?                     |
| 12 | MEMBER WEIN: Oh, go for it, Amina.                   |
| 13 | MEMBER FAZLULLAH: So, we had a short                 |
| 14 | working group meeting today. We chatted about        |
| 15 | potential recommendations. We are looking into a     |
| 16 | smaller subgroup within our working group to pull    |
| 17 | together consideration of a recommendation around    |
| 18 | a small section of the new net neutrality NPRM that  |
| 19 | may affect Lifeline. So we are looking into that.    |
| 20 | We are also keeping an eye on the                    |
| 21 | Lifeline broadband provider process. The             |
| 22 | Chairman's Office has indicated an interest in       |

opening up a docket to look into that particular 1 section of the Lifeline Modernization Order. 2 3 we are considering keeping tabs on that. will consider 4 does come out, we putting 5 recommendations together to participate in that 6 docket as well. 7 Right now on E-rate, we are just keeping track of sort of issues around E-rate and potential 8 9 changes to E-rate. As far as we can see right now, we don't 10 11 see any open dockets, though that doesn't preclude 12 from putting a recommendation together. นร 13 However, at this point we are just sort of in a wait and see mode. So, we will be sharing information 14 and looking into it. 15 16 It may be a good topic for us down the 17 road to get a report from the FTC just to get a sense of where things are headed. 18 19 The last area was digital inclusion. 20 And this is a little bit more far-reaching but we have started a discussion around the idea of a more 21

to

approach

comprehensive

22

infrastructure,

support, and digital inclusion. 1 So, we are looking into whether or not 2 3 it would be a single recommendation that would come from the working group, something that we would 4 5 collaborate with the other working groups like the 6 IP Transition Group. If we're talking about 7 things like infrastructure deployment, or easing deployment in rural areas, or considerations 8 9 around municipal broadbands. 10 And then also, we are also considering 11 working with other committees. So, we will be 12 looking into kind of what the best way to kind of work on these issues will be. 1.3 So those are sort of the topics I think 14 we discussed during our working group. 15 Olivia? 16 17 You got it, Amina. MEMBER WEIN: CHAIR BARTHOLME: Thank you. 18 19 So the Robocalls Working Group, we just 20 passed a successful recommendation, so that was 21 We're going to try and carry forward on

that momentum. We, obviously, had a presentation

| 1  | today about the NPRM and NOI that's been teed up.   |
|----|---|
| 2  | We'll be looking at that for possible areas of      |
| 3  | recommendation. I think there are a number of       |
| 4  | other issues in the robocall space that might be    |
| 5  | good for our group to focus on. Specifically, I     |
| 6  | would like to see if there are opportunities to     |
| 7  | follow-up on today's recommendation, whether it's   |
| 8  | providing specific input about complaint forms and  |
| 9  | some of the things that we've suggested to the      |
| 10 | Commission to help make it a little more actionable |
| 11 | for the Commission so that some of these            |
| 12 | consumer-friendly suggestions can become a          |
| 13 | reality.  |
| 14 | So, that concludes the robocall update.             |
| 15 | Does anybody have any questions on the              |
| 16 | working group updates?                              |
| 17 | Mitsy.  |
| 18 | MEMBER HERRERA: Just for the next                   |
| 19 | meeting and working groups, can you give us a rough |
| 20 | idea of when recommendations would need to be       |
| 21 | completed by, so that we can kind of be working the |

22

time line backwards?

| CHAIR BARTHOLME: Okay. So, the next                 |
|---|
| meeting of the full CAC is scheduled for September  |
| 18th. That's a Monday, as opposed to our            |
| traditional Friday. So, based on the 18th, about    |
| six weeks back, so essentially the beginning of     |
| August, loosely, we need to have a sentence or two  |
| about the concept of a recommendation. Ideally,     |
| we always try to have the language of a             |
| recommendation two weeks prior. Is that correct,    |
| Scott? Two weeks prior. So right after Labor Day    |
| would be the goal to have a text completed for      |
| distribution and preparation for the full CAC       |
| meeting.  |
| And as was mentioned earlier today, we              |
| can file comments ex parte. So even if we're        |
| slightly off from some of the posted comment cycles |
| for things that we're discussing and passing        |
| recommendations on, that would still be             |
| appropriate for us to provide that input.           |
| Do we have any comments from the public?            |
| Okay. Motion to adjourn?                            |
|   |

MEMBER GRANT: So moved.

| 1  | MR. MARSHALL: Before everybody leaves,            |
|----|---|
| 2  | though, I need your tent card back, if you would, |
| 3  | please, so we don't have to reprint them all the  |
| 4  | time.   |
| 5  | CHAIR BARTHOLME: All right.                       |
| 6  | MR. MARSHALL: And by the way, my thanks           |
| 7  | to Brittany Gomes, too, who has been absolutely   |
| 8  | great helping me support all of you fine folks in |
| 9  | your working groups and in the full committee.    |
| 10 | Thank her very, very much for all her good work.  |
| 11 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: So, quickly, a motion.           |
| 12 | MEMBER MCELDOWNEY: So moved.                      |
| 13 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Second.                          |
| 14 | All in favor?                                     |
| 15 | (Chorus of aye.)                                  |
| 16 | MR. MARSHALL: Thanks, everybody.                  |
| 17 | CHAIR BARTHOLME: Have a good weekend.             |
| 18 | MR. MARSHALL: Yes, enjoy the weekend.             |
| 19 | (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter             |
| 20 | went off the record at 2:06 p.m.)                 |