ORDER

Adopted: January 7, 2000
Released: January 10, 2000

Comment Date: February 23, 2000
Reply Comment Date: March 24, 2000

By the Chief, Mass Media Bureau:

1. On November 18, 1999, the Commission adopted and released a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in this docket.¹ The Notice seeks comment on proposed rules to foster more widespread video description, and established filing deadlines for comments and reply comments of January 24, 2000, and February 23, 2000, respectively.

2. On December 21, 1999, the Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA) and the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB) filed a joint motion to extend the filing deadlines for comments and reply comments to February 23, 2000, and March 24, 2000, respectively.² The Commission has not received any opposition to the motion.

3. MPAA and NAB provide several reasons for their request. NAB states that it is conducting a survey of its members on their current technical capabilities to provide description of programming, as well as their uses of the audio channel through which the description would be provided. NAB is also holding a board of directors meeting in the near future, during which the Notice will be discussed. NAB explains that additional time will allow it to complete and evaluate its pending survey, and to prepare comments that reflect discussions during the directors’ meeting. NAB also states that its member broadcast networks are examining the cost of providing video description, in particular whether they will need to upgrade existing facilities to distribute described programming, and the effect that video description will have on their program production systems. NAB explains that additional time will allow the networks to complete their analysis of these issues, and gather more information upon which to base comments.


² National Association of Broadcasters and Motion Picture Association of America Joint Motion for Extension of Time of Comment and Reply Comment Deadlines, MM Docket No. 99-339 (filed December 20, 1999).
4. MPAA states that its members are major producers of programming for television broadcast stations and cable systems, and so may actually provide the description of any programming the Commission may ultimately require. MPAA explains that additional time will permit it to survey its members about their current practices with respect to video description, research copyright laws, and understand the contractual issues between producers and creators.

5. In view of the foregoing, we conclude that good cause has been shown to grant the motion for a one-month extension of the filing deadlines in this proceeding. A one-month extension of the pleading cycle appears likely to produce a better record and will not unduly delay the completion of this proceeding. Moreover, given the lack of opposition to the motion, grant of the joint motion would not appear to affect adversely other participants in the proceeding.

6. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that the motion of the MPAA and the NAB is GRANTED.

7. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the comment period in this proceeding is EXTENDED to February 23, 2000.

8. IT IS FURTHERED ORDERED that the reply comment in this proceeding is EXTENDED to March 24, 2000.
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