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I. Introduction

1. By this Public Notice (Notice) and consistent with the requirements of the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010 (CVAA), the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau (CGB or Bureau) of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC or Commission) hereby seeks comment from the public to inform the preparation of the biennial report required by the CVAA, to be submitted to Congress by October 8, 2016. Public comment will assist the Commission in assessing the level of compliance with congressional mandates that telecommunications and advanced communications services (ACS) and equipment used with these services be accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, the effect of related recordkeeping and enforcement requirements, and the extent to which accessibility barriers still exist with respect to new communications technologies. The Bureau will seek public comment on its tentative findings on these matters before the Commission submits the biennial report to Congress.

II. Background

2. The CVAA requires the Commission to take various steps to ensure that people with disabilities have access to emerging communications technologies in the 21st Century. The CVAA also requires the Commission to submit a report to Congress every two years on the level of compliance with the CVAA’s communications accessibility obligations, the extent to which accessibility barriers still exist to new communications technologies, and related matters. The first of these biennial reports was submitted to Congress on October 5, 2012, two years after the CVAA was enacted. The second report

---


2 See section 717(b)(1) of the Communications Act, as added by the CVAA, codified at 47 U.S.C. § 618(b)(1). The Bureau is preparing this biennial report pursuant to its delegated authority. 47 CFR § 0.361.


4 Id.

5 Implementation of Sections 716 and 717 of the Communications Act of 1934, as Enacted by the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010, Biennial Report to Congress as Required by the
was submitted to Congress on October 8, 2014. In this Notice, we seek comment on a range of issues to inform the preparation of the biennial report for 2016. As required by the CVAA, the Bureau also will seek comment on the tentative findings contained in this report before its submission to Congress.

3. Among other things, the CVAA requires the Commission’s biennial report to contain the following assessments, which are further described below:

- An assessment of the level of compliance with sections 255, 716, and 718 of the Communications Act (Act);
- An evaluation of the extent to which any accessibility barriers still exist with respect to new communications technologies; and
- An assessment of the effect of the requirements of section 717 of the Act on the development and deployment of new communications technologies.

4. Pursuant to section 255 of the Act and the Commission’s implementing rules and requirements, telecommunications and interconnected voice over Internet protocol (VoIP) service providers and equipment manufacturers are required to make their services and equipment accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, if readily achievable (defined as “easily accomplishable and able to be carried out without much difficulty or expense”). The Commission has defined services


7 In this Notice, we seek comment only on those report-related issues that can be best informed by public input. For example, the CVAA requires the Commission to include information on the number and nature of complaints received by the Commission alleging violations of sections 255, 716, and 718 of the Communications Act, a description of the actions taken to resolve such complaints, the length of time taken to resolve each complaint, and the extent to which any appeals or writs of mandamus have been filed in response to Commission actions to resolve those complaints. See 47 U.S.C. §§ 618(b)(1)(C)-(F). This information already is in the possession of the Commission and, therefore, not the subject of this Notice.


9 47 U.S.C. §§ 618(b)(1)(A), (B), and (G).

10 47 U.S.C. § 255 (referencing 42 U.S.C. §12181(9)); 47 CFR Part 6 and Part 7. When accessibility is not readily achievable, covered entities must ensure that their services and equipment are compatible with existing peripheral devices or specialized equipment commonly used by individuals with disabilities to achieve access, if readily achievable. Id. In 2007, the Commission extended the section 255 accessibility obligations to interconnected VoIP service providers and equipment manufacturers. See Implementation of Sections 255 and 251(a)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934, as Enacted by the Telecommunications Act of 1996: Access to Telecommunications Service, Telecommunications Equipment and Customer Premises Equipment by Persons with Disabilities; Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities, Report and Order, 22 FCC Rcd 11275 (2007). The Act defines “telecommunications” as the transmission, between or among points specified by the user, of information of the user’s choosing, without change in the form or content of the information as sent and received.” 47 U.S.C. § 153(50). It defines “telecommunications service” as “the offering of telecommunications for a fee directly to the public, or to such classes of users as to be effectively available directly to the public, regardless of the facilities used.” 47 U.S.C. § 153(53). The Act defines “interconnected VoIP service” as such term is defined in section 9.3 of the Commission’s rules. 47 U.S.C. § 153(25). Section 9.3, in turn, defines interconnected VoIP as a service that (1) enables real-time, (continued….)
covered under section 255 to include local and long distance telephone service, call waiting, speed dialing, call forwarding, computer-provided directory assistance, call monitoring, caller identification, call tracing, and repeat dialing. Equipment covered under section 255 includes, but is not limited to, customer premises equipment, such as wireline, cordless, and wireless telephones, fax machines, and answering machines. In addition, the Commission’s section 255 rules cover voice mail and interactive voice response systems (phone systems that provide callers with menus of choices).

5. Section 716 of the Act requires ACS providers and equipment manufacturers to make their services and equipment accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, unless doing so is not achievable. These requirements apply to providers of non-interconnected VoIP services, electronic messaging services, and interoperable video conferencing services, and to manufacturers of equipment used with these services. Section 718 of the Act requires Internet browsers built into mobile phones to

(Continued from previous page) two-way voice communications; (2) requires a broadband connection from the user’s location; (3) requires Internet protocol-compatible customer premises equipment; and (4) permits users generally to receive calls that originate on the public switched telephone network (PSTN) and terminate on the PSTN. 47 CFR § 9.3. In other words, interconnected VoIP services enable people to make calls to and receive calls from users of traditional telephone service.


12 The Communications Act defines “telecommunications equipment,” as “equipment, other than customer premises equipment, used by a carrier to provide telecommunications services, and includes software integral to such equipment (including upgrades).” 47 U.S.C. § 153(52). It defines “customer premises equipment” as “equipment employed on the premises of a person (other than a carrier) to originate, route or terminate telecommunications.” 47 U.S.C. § 153(16).


14 47 U.S.C. § 617. See also 47 U.S.C. §153(1) (defining ACS as “(A) interconnected VoIP service; (B) non-interconnected VoIP service; (C) electronic messaging service; and (D) interoperable video conferencing service”). Although the Act’s definition of ACS also includes interconnected VoIP service, the accessibility obligations of interconnected VoIP service providers and equipment manufacturers are governed by the requirements of section 255 of the Act. See 47 U.S.C. §§ 255 and 617(f). Section 716 defines “achievable” to mean with reasonable effort or expense, listing four factors the Commission must consider when making such determinations. 47 U.S.C. § 617(g).

15 See 47 U.S.C. §§ 617(a), (b), and (g). In contrast to interconnected VoIP services that enable people to make and receive calls over the Internet and the telephone system, non-interconnected VoIP services include services that enable people to make or receive calls over the Internet or enable real-time voice communications solely over the Internet. 47 U.S.C. § 153(36). Electronic messaging services enable real-time or near real-time text messages between individuals over communications networks. 47 U.S.C. § 153(19). Examples of electronic messaging services include e-mail, SMS text messaging, and instant messaging. Implementation of Sections 716 and 717 of the Communications Act of 1934, as Enacted by the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010; Amendments to the Commission’s Rules Implementing Sections 255 and 251(a)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934, as Enacted by the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 26 FCC Rcd 14557, 14574, para. 43 (2011) (ACS Report and Order and ACS FNPRM) available at http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-11-151A1.pdf. Interoperable video conferencing services are real-time video communications, including audio, to enable users to share information. 47 U.S.C. § 153(27). The Commission is considering the definition of “interoperable” as it applies in the context of “interoperable video conferencing services” as part of its ongoing ACS rulemaking proceeding. See ACS Report and Order and ACS FNPRM, 26 FCC Rcd 14684-14687, paras. 301-305; see also 47 CFR Part 14.
be accessible to and usable by individuals who are blind or visually impaired, if achievable.\textsuperscript{16} Section 717 of the Act added new recordkeeping and enforcement obligations for entities covered by the accessibility obligations contained in sections 255, 716, and 718 of the Act.\textsuperscript{17}

6. On October 7, 2011, the Commission adopted rules to implement the accessibility mandates of section 716 for ACS and equipment used with ACS, and the recordkeeping and enforcement provisions of section 717.\textsuperscript{18} Covered entities have been required to take accessibility into account in the design of their products and services since January 30, 2012,\textsuperscript{19} and to keep records pertaining to the accessibility of their products since January 30, 2013.\textsuperscript{20} Service providers and equipment manufacturers must also maintain records to demonstrate compliance with sections 255, 716, and 718, which may be requested by the Commission when a complaint is filed.\textsuperscript{21} On April 26, 2013, the Commission adopted rules to implement the accessibility mandates for Internet browsers built into mobile phones under section 718.\textsuperscript{22} Full compliance with the rules implementing sections 716, 717, and 718 of the Act has been required for covered entities introducing new products and services into the marketplace or substantially upgrading existing products and services since October 8, 2013.\textsuperscript{23} In addition, since October 2013, the Commission has been obligated to investigate an informal complaint alleging a violation of section 255, 716, or 718 of the Act and issue an order concluding the investigation within 180 days of the filing of the complaint, unless the complaint is resolved before that time.\textsuperscript{24} In this biennial report, the Commission will consider the impact that these CVAA provisions have had on the accessibility of covered products and services, as well as the extent to which generally industry has achieved compliance with these sections. It will also consider the extent to which accessibility barriers still exist with respect to new communications technologies, and the effect of the recordkeeping and enforcement requirements on the development and deployment of new communications technologies.

III. Comment Sought on Industry Compliance with Sections 255, 716, and 718

7. We seek comment on the level of compliance with the obligations of sections 255 and 716, and the Commission’s implementing rules and requirements to make telecommunications and ACS,
as well as equipment used with these services, accessible by people with disabilities since issuance of the 2014 CVAA Biennial Report on October 8, 2014. Specifically, we seek input on the state of accessibility of services and equipment used with the following: (1) “non-mobile” services, including, but not limited to analog and digital telephone handsets and cordless phones used with landline and ACS; and (2) “mobile” or wireless services, including basic phones and smart phones. Are manufacturers and service providers including people with disabilities in their market research, product design, testing, pilot demonstrations, and product trials? To what extent are covered entities working cooperatively with disability-related organizations in their efforts to incorporate accessibility, usability, and compatibility of equipment and services throughout their processes for product design, development, and fabrication? Are covered entities making reasonable efforts to validate unproven access solutions through testing with people with disabilities or with organizations that have expertise with people with disabilities?

8. For guidance on determining the state of accessibility for telecommunications and interconnected VoIP covered under section 255, we direct commenters to the definition of “accessible” contained in Parts 6 and 7 of the Commission’s rules. For guidance in determining the state of accessibility of ACS covered under section 716, we direct commenters to the definition of “accessible” contained in Part 14 of the Commission’s rules. For example, to what extent are the input, control, and mechanical functions of these telecommunications services and ACS and devices used with these services locatable, identifiable, and operable (1) by people without vision, hearing, speech, or color perception; (2) by people with limited vision, hearing, color perception, manual dexterity, reach and strength, or cognitive skills; (3) by people with prosthetic devices; or (4) without time-dependent controls? To the extent that accessible services and devices are available, how easy is it to locate these services and devices in mainstream retail establishments? To what extent are services and devices offered with a range of low-end and high-end features, functions, and prices available to the general public also accessible to individuals with disabilities? Where services and devices are not accessible, to what extent are service providers and manufacturers making these compatible with peripheral devices and specialized customer premises equipment commonly used by people with disabilities to achieve access?

9. We note that the 2014 CVAA Biennial Report concluded that new offerings and accessibility for consumers who are blind or visually impaired were now included in feature phones, but that some accessibility gaps still existed in such phones. We are particularly interested in learning to what extent such mobile devices, as well as smartphones and devices that are used with non-mobile (landline and interconnected VoIP) services, are accessible to individuals who are blind or visually impaired. Finally, to what extent do barriers still exist with respect to products and services covered under section 255 of the Act?

See supra n.6.

We seek comment on the full range of mobile phones and other wireless devices that are used for telecommunications and ACS, including basic mobile phones used primarily or exclusively for voice calls, as well as high-end wireless devices that are used for voice, text, data, and other computing capabilities.

See 47 CFR §§ 6.7(1), (2); 7.7 (1), (2); 14.31(a)(1).

See 47 CFR §§ 6.7(b)(3); 7.7(b)(3).

See 47 CFR §§ 6.7(b)(4); 7.7(b)(4).

See 47 CFR §§ 6.3(a); 7.3(a).

47 CFR §§ 14.21(b).

See 47 CFR §§ 6.3(b); 7.3(b); 14.20(a)(3).

10. To what extent are providers of telecommunications and ACS and manufacturers of equipment used with these services ensuring access to information and documentation – including user guides, bills, installation guides, and product support communications – for people with disabilities? For example, are companies providing information in Braille and other alternate formats? To what extent are companies providing training on the accessibility of their products and services to customer service representatives, technical support personnel and others having direct contact with the public? We seek comment on any other issues relevant to assessing the level of compliance with sections 255 and 716, as well as the Commission’s implementing rules, as these pertain to the accessibility and usability of telecommunications and ACS and equipment used with these services.

11. The 2014 CVAA Biennial Report concluded “industry has made efforts to comply with the CVAA’s requirements to ensure that [ACS] and the equipment used with these services are accessible to people with disabilities.” Have these efforts continued since the period covered by the 2014 CVAA Biennial Report, and if so, to what extent have these efforts impacted the accessibility of ACS (e.g., non-interconnected VoIP and electronic messaging services) and the devices used to access these services? We also seek comment on any other ways in which section 716 has had an impact on the accessibility of ACS and the equipment used with ACS to date.

12. To what extent have the obligations under section 718 had an impact on the accessibility of Internet browsers on mobile phones for individuals who are blind or visually impaired? Are manufacturers and service providers consulting with people with disabilities in their market research, product design, testing, pilot demonstrations, and product trials? To what extent are covered entities working cooperatively with organizations that have expertise with people with disabilities in their efforts to incorporate accessibility, usability, and compatibility of equipment and services throughout their processes for product design, development, and fabrication? For guidance on determining the state of accessibility, we direct commenters to the definition of “accessible” that governs section 718 obligations, contained in Part 14 of the Commission’s rules. For example, to what extent are the input, control, and mechanical functions of Internet browsers built into mobile phones locatable, identifiable, and operable by people without vision or with limited vision? To the extent that accessible Internet browsers on mobile phones are available, how easy is it to find them in mainstream retail establishments? To what extent are accessible Internet browsers offered in mobile phones with a range of low-end and high-end features, functions, and prices available to the general public? We seek comment on any other ways in which section 718 has had an impact on the accessibility of Internet browsers built into mobile phones to date.

13. To what extent are service providers and equipment manufacturers that are subject to section 718 ensuring access to information and documentation that they provide to customers with disabilities? For example, to what extent are companies providing training on the accessibility of their products and services to customer service representatives, technical support personnel and others having direct contact with the public? We seek comment on any other issues relevant to assessing the level of compliance with section 718 and the Commission’s implementing rules, as these pertain to the Internet browsers built into mobile phones.

IV. Accessibility Barriers to New Communications Technologies

---

34 See 47 CFR §§ 6.11; 7.11; 14.21(c).
37 See 47 CFR §§ 14.60(b)(4)-(5).
14. The CVAA requires the Commission to include, in its biennial report, an evaluation of the extent to which any accessibility barriers still exist with respect to new communications technologies.\textsuperscript{38} Our assessment of “new communications technologies” is not limited to telecommunications, ACS, or Internet browser technologies covered under sections 255, 716, and 718 of the Act.\textsuperscript{39} Instead, we seek comment on accessibility barriers with respect to “new communications technologies” that are both within and outside the scope of the Act.\textsuperscript{40} The 2012 \textit{CVAA Biennial Report} predicted that “many accessibility barriers in new communications technologies will likely be addressed by industry compliance with the new accessibility requirements under section 716 and section 718 when those requirements are fully effective.”\textsuperscript{41} We now seek comment on the extent to which this expectation has been met. To what extent have new types of communications services, hardware, software, applications, or plug-ins been deployed to the general public since the 2014 \textit{CVAA Biennial Report}? What accessibility barriers still exist with respect to these or other relatively new communications technologies? We seek comment on any other issues relevant to evaluating the extent to which accessibility barriers to new communications technologies still exist.

V. Effect of Accessibility Recordkeeping and Enforcement Requirements

15. As required by the CVAA, the Commission seeks comment on the effect of the accessibility recordkeeping and enforcement requirements on the development and deployment of new communications technologies that fall within and outside the scope of the Communications Act.\textsuperscript{42} Have companies identified best practices with respect to these recordkeeping requirements that can be shared with others? What impact, if any, has the requirement for consumers to request assistance from the Commission to resolve a dispute with a covered entity as a prerequisite to filing an informal complaint had on the development and deployment of new communications technologies that are accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities? To what extent have these recordkeeping and enforcement obligations increased collaboration among industry, consumers with disabilities, and other stakeholders?

\textsuperscript{38} 47 U.S.C. § 618(b)(1)(B).

\textsuperscript{39} See 2012 \textit{CVAA Biennial Report}, 27 FCC Rcd at 12220, para. 43.

\textsuperscript{40} The 2012 \textit{CVAA Biennial Report} rejected assertions that we should only consider “new communications technologies” that are not covered by the Communications Act and only those accessibility barriers that could not be eliminated with reasonable effort and expense. See 2012 \textit{CVAA Biennial Report}, 27 FCC Rcd at 12222, para. 45. Here, too, we seek comment on the full spectrum of new communications technologies.

\textsuperscript{41} 2012 \textit{CVAA Biennial Report}, 27 FCC Rcd at 12222, para. 46.

VI. Procedural Matters

16. *Ex Parte Rules.* The proceeding this Notice initiates shall be treated as a “permit-but-disclose” proceeding in accordance with the Commission’s *ex parte* rules. Persons making *ex parte* presentations must file a copy of any written presentation or a memorandum summarizing any oral presentation within two business days after the presentation (unless a different deadline applicable to the Sunshine period applies). Persons making oral *ex parte* presentations are reminded that memoranda summarizing the presentation must (1) list all persons attending or otherwise participating in the meeting at which the *ex parte* presentation was made, and (2) summarize all data presented and arguments made during the presentation. If the presentation consisted in whole or in part of the presentation of data or arguments already reflected in the presenter’s written comments, memoranda or other filings in the proceeding, the presenter may provide citations to such data or arguments in his or her prior comments, memoranda, or other filings (specifying the relevant page and/or paragraph numbers where such data or arguments can be found) in lieu of summarizing them in the memorandum. Documents shown or given to Commission staff during *ex parte* meetings are deemed to be written *ex parte* presentations and must be filed consistent with rule 1.1206(b). In proceedings governed by rule 1.49(f) or for which the Commission has made available a method of electronic filing, written *ex parte* presentations and memoranda summarizing oral *ex parte* presentations, and all attachments thereto, must be filed through the electronic comment filing system available for that proceeding, and must be filed in their native format (e.g., .doc, .xml, .ppt, searchable .pdf). Participants in this proceeding should familiarize themselves with the Commission’s *ex parte* rules.

17. *Filing Requirements.* Interested parties may file comments on or before the date indicated on the first page of this document. Comments may be filed using the Commission’s Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS). *See Electronic Filing of Documents in Rulemaking Proceedings*, 63 FR 24121 (1998). All comments should refer to CG Docket No. 10-213. Please title comments responsive to this Notice as “PN Comments – Accessibility of Communications Technologies.” Further, we strongly encourage parties to develop responses to this Notice that adhere to the organization and structure of the questions in this Notice.

- **Electronic Filers:** Comments may be filed electronically using the Internet by accessing the ECFS: [http://fjallfoss.fcc.gov/ecfs2/](http://fjallfoss.fcc.gov/ecfs2/).
- **Paper Filers:** Parties who choose to file by paper must file an original and one copy of each filing. If more than one docket or rulemaking number appears in the caption of this proceeding, filers must submit two additional copies for each additional docket or rulemaking number.
  - Filings can be sent by hand or messenger delivery, by commercial overnight courier, or by first-class or overnight U.S. Postal Service mail. All filings must be addressed to the Commission’s Secretary, Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission.
  - All hand-delivered or messenger-delivered paper filings for the Commission’s Secretary must be delivered to FCC Headquarters at 445 12th St., SW, Room TW-A325, Washington, DC 20554. The filing hours are 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. All hand deliveries must be held together with rubber bands or fasteners. Any envelopes and boxes must be disposed of before entering the building.
  - Commercial overnight mail (other than U.S. Postal Service Express Mail and Priority Mail) must be sent to 9300 East Hampton Drive, Capitol Heights, MD 20743.  

---

47 CFR §§ 1.1200 *et seq.*
18. **People with Disabilities.** To request materials in accessible formats for people with disabilities (braille, large print, electronic files, audio format), send an e-mail to fcc504@fcc.gov or call the Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau at 202-418-0530 (voice), 202-418-0432 (TTY). Individuals with disabilities may request assistance from the Disability Rights Office to file comments in the Commission’s Electronic Comment Filing System by sending an e-mail to dro@fcc.gov.

19. **Additional Information.** For further information about this Public Notice, please contact Rosaline Crawford at 202-418-2075 or by e-mail to Rosaline.Crawford@fcc.gov, Disability Rights Office, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission.