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By the Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau:

# Introduction

1. The Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau (CGB or Bureau) of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC or Commission) grants conditional certification to Rogervoice to provide Internet Protocol Captioned Telephone Service (IP CTS) on a fully automatic basis, pending verification that its actual provision of IP CTS meets or exceeds the Commission’s minimum standards.[[1]](#footnote-3) This grant of conditional certification authorizes Rogervoice to provide TRS Fund-supported IP CTS through January 20, 2026, or the date of grant or denial of full certification, whichever occurs earlier. The Bureau also finds good cause to grant Rogervoice’s request for waiver of the TRS rule regarding the language of consumer self-certifications.[[2]](#footnote-4)

# Background

1. Rogervoice requests certification to provide IP CTS on a fully automatic basis (i.e., using automatic speech recognition (ASR) only[[3]](#footnote-5) for captioning of all calls, without any reliance on communications assistants (CAs)).[[4]](#footnote-6) Rogervoice’s proposed ASR-only IP CTS will be delivered via an over-the-top (OTT) Android- or iOS-compatible application (also called Rogervoice) on a customer’s existing mobile device.[[5]](#footnote-7) A privately-held company, Rogervoice is authorized to provide IP CTS in France and also makes its application available in other parts of the world.[[6]](#footnote-8) Rogervoice states that it enables captioning in more than 100 languages and dialects.[[7]](#footnote-9)
2. On March 14, 2022, the Bureau sought comment on Rogervoice’s application.[[8]](#footnote-10) One comment and one reply comment were filed. A coalition of accessibility advocacy and research organizations (AARO) filed comments.[[9]](#footnote-11) While not opposing NexTalk’s application, AARO argues that all providers of ASR-only IP CTS should be required to offer a CA-assisted mode and to allow users to switch from ASR-only to CA-assisted mode during a call.[[10]](#footnote-12) AARO also states a general concern regarding the need to establish metrics for IP CTS service quality.[[11]](#footnote-13) Rogervoice filed a reply.[[12]](#footnote-14)
3. Rogervoice’s platform was tested for caption delay and accuracy by the Commission’s National Test Lab.[[13]](#footnote-15)

# Certification

1. We conditionally grant the application subject to verification—based on actual operating experience—that Rogervoice’s provision of IP CTS will meet or exceed the minimum TRS standards.[[14]](#footnote-16)
2. *Sufficiency of the Application*. Rogervoice’s application is facially sufficient to satisfy the Commission’s certification requirements. The application and supporting information provide a sufficient explanation, with documentary and other evidence, as to how the applicant will provide IP CTS and meet all minimum standards relevant to consideration of its application.[[15]](#footnote-17) Rogervoice also provides a description of its complaint procedures, confirmation that it will file annual compliance reports demonstrating continued compliance with the TRS rules, and a certification by a senior executive as to the accuracy and completeness of the information provided.[[16]](#footnote-18) Further, as discussed below, the application and supporting information, including the results of independent testing of caption delay and accuracy,[[17]](#footnote-19) sufficiently support Rogervoice’s specific claims regarding its use of ASR and the efficacy of such use in meeting the Commission’s minimum TRS standards for speed of answer, service continuity, caption delay, accuracy, readability, verbatim transcription, privacy, and emergency call handling.[[18]](#footnote-20)
3. *Speed of Answer.* Rogervoice has made a sufficient showing that, with its chosen ASR technology, it will meet or exceed the minimum TRS standards relating to speed of answer.[[19]](#footnote-21) Rogervoice notes that because it employs no CAs, a Rogervoice user will never experience a busy response due to CA unavailability, and adds that calls that reach the Rogervoice app are delivered to the customer within one to two seconds.[[20]](#footnote-22) Based on these statements and the applicant’s explanation of its technology and availability of service,[[21]](#footnote-23) we conclude that NexTalk has sufficiently supported its claims that its speed of answer will exceed the current IP CTS standard.
4. *Service Continuity*. We also find that Rogervoice has sufficiently demonstrated that it will be able to maintain service continuity. IP CTS providers must have redundancy features functionally equivalent to the equipment in telephone company central offices.[[22]](#footnote-24) According to Rogervoice’s Application, “Rogervoice’s servers are cloud-based, and Rogervoice’s service level agreement with its provider requires redundancy and backup power systems in place to ensure that Rogervoice’s customers are never without service.”[[23]](#footnote-25)
5. *Caption Speed/Delay.* There is sufficient supportfor Rogervoice’s claim that its ASR platform will transcribe captions in real time and in compliance with the current TRS standards relating to captioning speed, or delay.[[24]](#footnote-26) In performance testing by NTL, Rogervoice’s median caption delay for two call scenarios ranged from 1.2 to 1.3 seconds, compared to an aggregate average of 1.8 to 2.4 seconds for other IP CTS providers.[[25]](#footnote-27) Additionally, NTL testing supports Rogervoice’s assertion that captions will be transcribed in real time and in compliance with the typing speed standard of 60 words per minute.[[26]](#footnote-28)
6. *Accuracy and Readability*. Although the TRS rules do not currently provide quantitative standards for accuracy and readability, the typing, grammar, and spelling of captions must be “competent,” and conversations must be transcribed “verbatim,” with no intentional alteration of content unless a user specifically requests summarization.[[27]](#footnote-29) We find sufficient record evidence that Rogervoice’s service will meet or exceed the Commission’s competence and “verbatim” requirements. In testing by NTL, Rogervoice’s median Word Error Rates for three call scenarios ranged from 2.7% to 11.7%, higher than but comparable to other IP CTS providers’ aggregated Word Error Rate results, which ranged from 2.0% to 7.4% for the same call scenarios.[[28]](#footnote-30)
7. *Privacy*. The Commission’s confidentiality requirements for TRS call content prohibit the disclosure or retention of call content for any purpose, either locally or in the cloud.[[29]](#footnote-31) In addition, providers must protect the privacy of customer information.[[30]](#footnote-32) The Commission’s rules obligate a provider to protect call content and customer information regardless of the specific persons or entities (e.g., CAs, other employees, vendors, or agents) that a provider may designate to handle such information on its behalf.[[31]](#footnote-33) Rogervoice sufficiently describes how it will comply with the Commission’s TRS confidentiality requirements and customer proprietary network information (CPNI) rules.[[32]](#footnote-34) Rogervoice states that neither its ASR-only service nor any third-party vendor stores call transcriptions or recordings once a call is completed.[[33]](#footnote-35) Rogervoice adds that its systems for safeguarding customer data—which already comply with the French Data Protection Act and the European Union’s General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)—will comply with the Commission’s CPNI rules as well.[[34]](#footnote-36) Among other things, Rogervoice provides ongoing training to personnel on authorized use of CPNI and a disciplinary process for improper uses, and maintains records of all use of CPNI in sales and marketing campaigns.[[35]](#footnote-37)
8. *Emergency Call Handling*. Under the Commission’s TRS standard for emergency call handling, an IP CTS provider must ensure that 911 calls are given priority over non-911 calls.[[36]](#footnote-38) In addition, when responsible for placing or routing voice calls to the public switched telephone network, an IP CTS provider must ensure that the call is routed, and required caller information delivered, to the appropriate public safety answering point (PSAP).[[37]](#footnote-39) Rogervoice sufficiently establishes that it will handle emergency calls in accordance with these rules.[[38]](#footnote-40) Because Rogervoice does not use CAs, 911 calls are automatically at the top of the queue when they come in and do not require a prioritization mechanism.[[39]](#footnote-41) Further, according to the application, through a third-party vendor, Rogervoice has secured access to a commercially available database that enables the transmission of 911 calls to the appropriate PSAP.[[40]](#footnote-42) Rogervoice delivers the user’ name and registered location with each call, as well as a callback number that enables captions on callback.[[41]](#footnote-43) The Application also states that Rogervoice provides automated dispatchable location to the PSAP where technically feasible. Specifically, Rogervoice offers its users the option of giving Rogervoice access to their cell phones’ geolocation capability for purposes of 911 calls, and explains that such access will enable the delivery of more accurate location information to emergency personnel.[[42]](#footnote-44)
9. *Response to Additional Concerns Raised in Comments*. Consistent with the Bureau’s prior orders granting conditional certification for the provision of IP CTS without any reliance on CAs,[[43]](#footnote-45) we decline AARO’s request that we require Rogervoice to provide CA-assisted captioning as an option for users.[[44]](#footnote-46) We are bound by the Commission’s determination that the capabilities of ASR are sufficient to warrant its recognition as a TRS Fund-supported alternative to CA-assisted IP CTS.[[45]](#footnote-47) Whether to impose a requirement to offer both ASR-only and CA-assisted captioning modes is a policy determination for the Commission to make.
10. *Conditional Certification*. We grant Rogervoice certification on a conditional basis, to provide IP CTS for a period not to exceed two years from the effective date of this order, pending further verification based on actual performance that its service complies with the Commission’s minimum TRS standards. Because Rogervoice is a new applicant with no previous experience in the provision of TRS, and will rely solely on fully automatic captioning, we believe the best course is to collect additional information, through observing Rogervoice’s service in operation, to confirm that this service will meet or exceed the minimum TRS standards.[[46]](#footnote-48)
11. To assist the Bureau in its final determination of Rogervoice’s qualifications to provide IP CTS, we require Rogervoice to provide quarterly reports of consumer complaints, filed with the Commission in the same format and with the same degree of detail required in the log of consumer complaints that providers must file annually with the Commission.[[47]](#footnote-49) The first report shall be due May 1, 2024, and shall cover the period from the commencement of service through March 30, 2024.[[48]](#footnote-50) Each subsequent report shall be filed on the first day of the second month of each calendar quarter and shall cover the preceding calendar quarter. For example, the second report shall be due August 1, 2024, and shall cover the period from April 1 through June 30, 2024. Rogervoice shall continue to file reports on a quarterly schedule until the expiration of this conditional certification, or until Commission action granting or denying full certification, whichever occurs earlier.
12. Pending a decision on full certification, the Bureau may request additional information in order to complete our review of Rogervoice’s application, such as the results and protocols for performance tests conducted by Rogervoice or independent third parties.[[49]](#footnote-51) We also require Rogervoice to report promptly any changes in the information previously provided to the Commission in its application and supplemental filings, including, for example, any changes in service agreements and suppliers, procedures for registering and screening prospective users, or the manner in which Rogervoice provides service.
13. Pursuant to this grant of conditional certification, Rogervoice may provide Fund-supported IP CTS in the manner described in its application, for a period not to exceed two years from the effective date of this order, pending a final determination of its qualifications. This conditional certification is issued without prejudice to such final determination, which is dependent on verification of the information provided in Rogervoice’s application and supplemental filings, as well as the additional information provided pursuant to this order, and on the veracity of the applicant’s representations that it will provide service in compliance with all pertinent Commission requirements. To assist in reaching a final determination, the Bureau may conduct one or more unannounced site visits to Rogervoice’s premises and may request additional documentation relating to Rogervoice’s provision of IP CTS. Conversion to full certification will be granted if, based on a review of the applicant’s documentation and other relevant information, the Commission finds that Rogervoice is in compliance with applicable Commission rules and orders and is qualified to receive compensation from the Fund for the provision of IP CTS. If, at any time during the period in which Rogervoice is operating pursuant to this conditional certification, the Commission determines that Rogervoice has failed to provide sufficient supporting documentation for any of the assertions in its application, determines that any of those assertions cannot be supported, or finds evidence of any apparent rule violation, fraud, waste, or abuse, the Commission will take appropriate action, which may include the denial of Rogervoice’s application. In the event of such denial, Rogervoice’s conditional certification will automatically terminate thirty-five (35) days after such denial.[[50]](#footnote-52)
14. *Preventing Misuse*. We remind Rogervoice and all other TRS providers that IP CTS is intended to provide a service functionally equivalent to voice telephone service, and must not be provided as a substitute for transcription of in-person meetings or conversations.[[51]](#footnote-53) Further, although our rules do not prohibit Rogervoice from enabling its registered users to save the captions as they appear on a device, they do prohibit an IP CTS provider itself from retaining call transcripts or subsequently providing transcripts to IP CTS users beyond the duration of the call.[[52]](#footnote-54) We also remind Rogervoice that its marketing of this service must conform with the Commission’s rules.[[53]](#footnote-55)
15. *Compensation.* Providers of IP CTS are currently compensated under a single formula, in the amount of $1.30 per minute. The Commission has sought comment on modifying this formula and is expected to adopt a revised compensation plan by June 30, 2024.[[54]](#footnote-56) Newly certified IP CTS providers should not assume or expect that the current compensation formula will remain applicable or that any revised formula(s) will necessarily allow them to recover their cost of service, even if they serve a special population or use a new, more expensive method of providing service.[[55]](#footnote-57)

# Request for waiver

1. *Waiver standard*. A Commission rule may be waived for “good cause shown.”[[56]](#footnote-58) In particular, a waiver is appropriate where the particular facts make strict compliance inconsistent with the public interest.[[57]](#footnote-59) In addition, we may take into account considerations of hardship, equity, or more effective implementation of overall policy on an individual basis.[[58]](#footnote-60) Such a waiver is appropriate if special circumstances warrant a deviation from the general rule and such deviation will serve the public interest.[[59]](#footnote-61)
2. *Discussion*. We grant Rogervoice’s request for partial waiver of section 64.611(j)(1)(v) of the Commission’s rules, which requires a consumer’s written self-certification to state that “[t]he consumer understands that the captioning on captioned telephone service is provided by a live communications assistant who listens to the other party on the line and provides the text on the captioned phone.”[[60]](#footnote-62) As the Bureau has previously explained*,* the required statement is incorrect as applied to fully automatic IP CTS and would misinform consumers if they never actually connect to a live CA.[[61]](#footnote-63) As the Commission has observed in the context of potentially analogous professional attestations, that “portion of the attestation is only required to the extent that captions are produced [with CA assistance] and not exclusively through a non-CA assisted automatic speech recognition engine.”[[62]](#footnote-64)

# Procedural Matters

1. *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) or 202-418-0432 (TTY).
2. *Additional Information.* For further information regarding this item, please contact William Wallace, Disability Rights Office, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, at 202-418-2716 or by e-mail to [William.Wallace@fcc.gov](mailto:William.Wallace@fcc.gov).

# Ordering Clauses

1. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that, pursuant to sections 1, 2, 4(i), 4(j), and 225 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 152, 154(i), 154(j), 225, sections 0.141, 0.361, 1.3, and 64.606(b)(2) of the Commission’s rules, 47 CFR §§ 0.141, 0.361, 1.3, 64.606(b)(2), and the authority delegated by paragraph 60 of the Commission’s *2018 ASR Declaratory Ruling*, the application of Rogervoice for certification to provide IP CTS is GRANTED as conditioned in this Order.
2. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, that Rogervoice’s Request for Waiver is GRANTED.
3. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to section 1.102(b)(1) of the Commission’s rules, 47 CFR § 1.102(b)(1), this Order SHALL BE EFFECTIVE upon release.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Alejandro Roark, Chief

Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau
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