UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

+ + + + +

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

CONSUMER ADVISORY COMMITTEE

+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

Friday, July 11, 2003

+ + + + +

The Committee came to order at 9:00 a.m. in Room TW-C305 of 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C., Shirley L. Rooker, Chair, presiding.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

JEFFREY KRAMER AARP

BRENDA KELLY-FREY National Association of State

Relay

Administration

LARRY GOLDBERG Media Access Group, WGBH

SHIRLEY ROOKER Call for Action

SCOTT MARSHALL FDIC, CAC-Designated Federal

Officer

RICHARD ELLIS Verizon Communications

JOY RAGSDALE National Association of State

Utility

Consumer Advocates

VERNON R. JAMES San Carlos Apache

Telecommunications Utility,

Inc.

SUSAN GRANT National Consumers League

DAVID HOROWITZ Fight Back Foundation for Consumer

Education

DIXIE ZIEGLER Hamilton Telephone Company, d/b/a

Hamilton Relay Service

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 DONALD SNOOP Hometown Online

MEMBERS PRESENT:

LINDA WEST The Native American Community and

others concerned with

telecommunications service in

rural America

MICHAEL DelCASINO AT&T Corp.

MIKE DUKE blind or visually impaired

persons, licensed radio amateur operators, and management of audio information services for

the blind

KAREN KIRSCH National Association of

Broadcasters

RON BARNES Cellular Telecommunication &

Internet Association

RICHARD MALLARD National Association of Consumer

Agency Administrators

JOSEPH GORDON League for the Hard of Hearing

CLAUDE STOUT Deaf and Hard of Hearing Consumer

Action Network

MATT BENNETT Alliance for Public Technology

CHERYL JOHNSON Affiliated Tribes of N.W. Indians

Economic Development Corp.

MILTON LITTLE National Urban League

DIANE BURSTEIN National Cable Telecommunications

Association

JIM CONRAN Consumers First, Inc.

SUSAN PALMER MAZRUI Cingular Wireless

DAVID BRUGGER Brugger Consulting

REBECCA LADEW users of speech-to-speech

technology

BYRON ST. CLAIR National Translator Association

DEBRA BERLYN Consumer Policy Consulting

MARK PRANGER academia and consumers concerned

with telecommunications service

in rural America

ANNETTE CLECKNER MCI

THOMAS ALLIBONE LTC Consulting/Teletruth

MARY HENZE BellSouth

EUGENE SEAGRIFF Telecommunications Industry

NEAL R. GROSS

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

Association

PRESENT:

MICHAEL COPPS Commissioner, FCC Commissioner, FCC KEVIN MARTIN KATHLEEN ABERNATHY Commissioner, FCC K. DANE SNOWDEN Chief, Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau RICHARD SMITH Acting Chief, Policy Division, CGB Attorney Advisor, Policy Division, GREG GUICE, ESQ. THOMAS CHANDLER Chief, Disability Rights Office, CGB KRIS MONTEITH Deputy Bureau Chief, CGB Vice President for Governmental PAUL SCHROEDER Relations, American Foundation for the Blind Chief, Enforcement Bureau DAVID SOLOMON NICHOLAS MILLER Miller & Van Eaton, P.L.L.C. SCOTT RANDOLPH Director, Federal Regulatory Advocacy, Verizon Senior Vice President, Law and DAN BRENNER Regulatory Policy, National Cable Telecommunications Association President, Association of Local JOHN WINDHAUSEN Telecommunications Services Michigan Public Service Commission COMM. DAVID SVANDA and President, National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners JARED CARLSON Acting Chief, Policy Division, WTB

AGENDA

WELCOME AND CALL TO ORDER
Shirley L. Rooker, Chair,
Consumer Advisory Committee (CAC)

MEETING LOGISTICS
Scott Marshall, CAC Designated Federal Officer,
Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau (CGB)

INTRODUCTION OF THE CHAIRMAN AND COMMISSIONERS
K. Dane Snowden, Chief,
Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau

UPDATE ON THE CONSUMER & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS BUREAU K. Dane Snowden, Chief, CGB

UPDATE ON THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT Richard Smith, Acting Chief, Policy Division, CGB

ISSUES RELATING TO E-911 SERVICE Greg Guice, Attorney Advisor, Policy Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau (WTB)

SUMMARY OF ORDER REGARDING HEARING AID COMPATIBILITY Greg Guice, WTB

UPDATE ON TRS ORDER AND FURTHER NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING
Thomas Chandler, Chief,
Disability Rights Office, CGB

OUTREACH TO INDIAN COUNTRY
Kris Monteith, Deputy Bureau Chief, CGB

HOMELAND SECURITY AND PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES Kris Monteith, Deputy Bureau Chief, CGB

LUNCH PRESENTATION: ACCESSIBLE WIRELESS
PHONES FOR THE BLIND
Paul W. Schroeder, Vice President for Governmental
Relations, American Foundation for the Blind

CONSUMER PROTECTION: THE ROLE OF THE ENFORCEMENT BUREAU David Solomon, Chief, Enforcement Bureau

PANEL: STATE OF BROADBAND REGULATION
Moderator: Larry Goldberg, Chair, CAC Broadband
Working Group

Scott Randolph, Director - Federal Regulatory Advocacy Verizon (representing ILECs)

Daniel L. Brenner, Senior Vice President, Law and Regulatory Policy, National Cable Telecommunications Association (representing cable companies)

John Windhausen, President, Association of Local Telecommunications Services (representing CLECs)

Nicholas Miller, Esq., Miller & Van Eaton, PLLC (representing local governments)

Commissioner David Svanda, Michigan Public Service Commission and President, National Association of Regulatory Utility Commission (representing state governments)

UPDATE ON WIRELESS LOCAL NUMBER PORTABILITY

Jared Carlson, Acting Chief, Policy Division, WTB

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC; WRAP-UP; FUTURE MEETINGS

ADJOURNMENT

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(9:03 a.m.)

CHAIR ROOKER: Could everyone take their seats, please. Scott, my little stool is wonderful. Okay, everyone. The time to be nice is over. Take your chairs, please. I have some announcements I need to make. Number one, Cindy Cox who is with BellSouth, unfortunately could not get out of Atlanta last night because of the thunderstorms, so consequently, she's being replaced today by Mary Henze, who's with the Washington Office of BellSouth. Mary, thank you very much for being here to pinch hit for Cindy.

Also, we have a new member, who is Diane Burstein, who was an alternate last time, and now she's a member. She's with the National Cable Telecommunications Association. And, Diane, welcome. We're pleased to have you here.

I think the first order of business, why don't we just go around the table and briefly just state your name and your organization. I want this to be very fast, but I think it would be useful for us to put faces with names. So let's just start down here

1	at the end with Jeff.
2	MR. KRAMER: Thank you, Shirley. I'm Jeff
3	Kramer with AARP.
4	MR. GOLDBERG: Larry Goldberg, WGBH Media
5	Access Group.
6	CHAIR ROOKER: And I forgot to tell you
7	that I'm Shirley Rooker with Call for Action.
8	MR. MARSHALL: I'm Scott Marshall with the
9	FCC.
10	MR. ELLIS: Rich Ellis from Verizon.
11	MR. JAMES: Good morning. Vernon James
12	with the San Carlos Apache Telecommunications Utility,
13	Incorporated. We call it SCATCOM for short, and I'd
14	like to introduce my alternate that has come with me,
15	Yolanda Jo Lazo. She's here this morning.
16	CHAIR ROOKER: Thank you.
17	MS. GRANT: Hi. I'm Susan Grant from the
18	National Consumers League. I'm sorry I missed the
19	first meeting, but it was a choice between being here
20	or being in Australia, and Australia won out.
21	MR. HOROWITZ: I'm David Horowitz with the
22	Fight Back Foundation for Consumer Education.

MS. ZIEGLER: I'm Dixie Ziegler with
Hamilton Relay Services. We're at TRS provider.
MR. SNOOP: I'm Don Snoop, Hometown On
Line.
MS. WEST: I'm Linda West with Native
American and rural America issues.
MR. DelCASINO: Mike DelCasino, AT&T.
MR. DUKE: Mike Duke, International
Association of Audio Information Services, and also
licensed radio amateurs.
MS. KIRSCH: Good morning. I'm Karen
Kirsch from the National Association of Broadcasters.
MR. MALLARD: Good morning. I'm Ron
Mallard with the National Association of Consumer
Agency Administrators.
MR. GORDON: Good morning. I'm Joe Gordon
with the League for Hard of Hearing.
MR. BENNETT: Hi. I'm Matt Bennett with
the Alliance for Public Technology.
MS. JOHNSON: Good morning. I'm Cheryl
Johnson, Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians.
MS. BURSTEIN: Good morning. I'm Diane

Burstein with the National Cable Telecommunications
Association.

MR. CONRAN: I'm Jim Conran, Consumers First.

MS. MAZRUI: I'm Susan Mazrui, Cingular Wireless.

MR. BRUGGER: David Brugger, Brugger Consulting.

MS. LADEW: Rebecca Ladew. I'm here to represent the speech relay users on the committee, and I have a comment. Bob Siegelman has prepared a suggested procedure for recruiting people with speech disabilities as members of State Relay Advisory Committees. If anyone wants a copy, please write Bob at Bob@DOR.CA.gov. Also, Bob would like to congratulate the Texas PUC for starting an extensive speech-to-speech outreach program. Bob applauds Sprint for establishing a call center in Hawaii, and using speak Hawaiian dialect; speech-to-speech CAs who whereas before, all speech-to-speech calls in Hawaii were being transferred to Virginia, and there was a communications barrier between some speech-to-speech

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

1	Cas in Virginia, who sometimes spoke with a southern
2	accent, that the Hawaiian speech-to-speech caller
3	could not sometimes understand. Likewise, the
4	Virginia speech-to-speech Cas could not understand the
5	Hawaiian dialect of the speech-to-speech caller.
6	Thank you.
7	MR. ST. CLAIR: I'm Byron St. Clair from
8	the National Translator Association. I guess I should
9	just explain it's not anything to do with languages.
10	Translators repeat TV and FM stations into rural areas
11	that don't get direct reception.
12	MS. BERLYN: Good morning. I'm Debra
13	Berlyn with Consumer Policy Consulting.
14	MR. PRANGER: Good morning. I'm Mark
15	Pranger from Rogers State University in Oklahoma.
16	MS. CLECKNER: Annette Cleckner with MCI
17	Consumer Affairs.
18	MR. ALLIBONE: Tom Allibone with LTC
19	Consulting.
20	MS. HENZE: Mary Henze with BellSouth,
21	sitting in for Cindy Cox.
22	MR. SEAGRIFF: I'm Eugene Seagriff of

1	Panasonic, representing the Telecommunications
2	Industry Association.
3	CHAIR ROOKER: Okay. Well, thank you. We
4	have some other people who joined the panel.
5	MR. BARNES: Ron Barnes, CTIA.
6	CHAIR ROOKER: Thank you, Ron. Joy.
7	MS. RAGSDALE: Joy Ragsdale with NASUCA.
8	MS. FREY: Susan Kelly Frey representing
9	the National Association of State Relay
10	Administration.
11	CHAIR ROOKER: Did we get everyone? Okay.
12	Well, thank you very much for being here.
13	I think the next order of business
14	Scott's going to give us the logistics. Those are the
15	really important things that you need to know.
16	MR. MARSHALL: Good morning. Just a word.
17	The rest rooms are right out the doors that you came
18	in down the short corridor and to your left, and
19	telephones are out in that corridor, as well. And
20	this afternoon, I'll be talking about transportation
21	to the airport and such that for those people who need
22	that this afternoon during our break. Thanks for

coming. Great attendance today.

CHAIR ROOKER: Yes, it is. It's very impressive. I also would like to thank Verizon for our breakfast and lunch. Also, MCI and Verizon have generously made possible teleconferencing services for some of our working groups, and I'd like to thank them.

Also, the group chairs and the team leaders have been working hard, and they've given us a great deal of input on today's agenda, and we appreciate that, especially since their last meeting was only in April, which is not the three months we usually have, but it was only two.

I also like to give particular thanks to Betty Thompson for making so many of the logistical arrangements. And, of course, the person who does all the work, the real work is Scott Marshall. And he just said to me, "Don't say that, Shirley". Well, it's the truth. Exactly.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you very much.

CHAIR ROOKER: I tell him he does all the work so I can look good, because believe me, he puts a

lot of time in this.

2.1

Our next order of business, I'm very happy to welcome Dane Snowden, who's the Chief of Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau. He really doesn't need an introduction since he's spoken to us, I think at every meeting of CAC. And I would just like to personally also thank him for the wonderful support that he's given our group. Things like this group couldn't happen without the support of Dane, so thank you, Dane. Welcome.

MR. SNOWDEN: Well, good morning and welcome back to the FCC. I must also thank someone who makes me look good all the time, and that's my legal advisor, Amelia Brown, who's over here in the green, who supports CAC, as well. So thank you very much, Amy, and thank you, Shirley, and all of you for coming back.

I'm not sure how many were here actually last night. I assume most of you were, and you were awakened like I was, and I had a hard time getting back to sleep with the storm that went through Washington, D.C., so I would like to say that I'm glad

you're here. I got a little worried when I woke up this morning, I guess around 1:00, and didn't really fall back to sleep, or I guess have a sound sleep. And I thought is anybody going to show up for the meeting today, because I thought I was going to oversleep, let alone the rest of you. So we braved the storm. I know there's another one coming which, of course, ruins my golf day, but I will survive.

Well, welcome back. It is a pleasure to have you all back here this fine summer day. At least the heat is not as bad as it usually is here in Washington since we're on a swamp.

I want to say a few things to you all this morning. And particularly, I want to say I'm happy to see that the working groups have really gotten a great start. We've seen a lot of advisory groups here at the Commission, and one of the things in particular that we always look to see is how quickly they actually mobilize and start working. And this particular advisory committee wasted no time to get things started.

We will have some of the commissioners

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

coming down to speak with you, as well. Because of the storm last night, some folks are stuck in traffic. Washington, D.C. in a disaster area right now with trees everywhere, but when commissioners come in, I will pause from my remarks, as I just see one coming in now, and I will turn it over to that particular commissioner.

But before I do that, I would like to embarrass Shirley for a second, and that's something I tend to do. But last month, Shirley was given the Betty Furness Media Service Award presented to Call for Action by the Consumer Federation of America at, what I understand, a fabulous gala event held here in Washington, so congratulations to you, Shirley, and Call for Action for your good work for helping out consumers.

I see that Commissioner Copps has arrived, so I'm going to pause, and ask Commissioner Copps to please join me at the podium here and make some remarks.

COMMISSIONER COPPS: Good morning. Welcome to the FCC on this nice Friday morning. We're

NEAL R. GROSS

delighted to see you here. I see a lot of old friends around the table, and hope we can make some new ones today too. I'll just a minute or two of your time, because I know you have a very, very busy agenda today, but I just wanted to primarily thank you all for the commitment you make in serving on this committee.

When I was over at the Commerce Department with the previous Administration, I was responsible for administering all of our industry sector advisory committees at Commerce, and we had I guess 16 or 17 sector-specific ones, and then functional some committees too. And I was always impressed by the level of commitment that people serving on those committees made. And I know it's harder and harder to do that, and we're in an era when a lot of offices and organizations are downsized, and it's more and more difficult to get done what you need to get done just to survive on a day-to-day basis, and finding time to serve on a committee like this I know is not easy, but it's merely essential really. We couldn't get along without the kind of input that you give us.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

When I was at Commerce -- well, before that when I was out in the private sector, I served on an industry advisory committee on International Trade, and I almost thought when we were negotiating the North American Free Trade Agreement, I wondered what that agreement would look like without the input of outside sources, and just let it to the government to do it by itself would not have been a pretty affair.

So want to thank you for your commitment, thank you for your help, and the help you give us makes the work we do a lot more productive and a lot better, I think, than it otherwise would be. This is the first time I've had a chance to meet, I think, with the reconstituted committee. I looked at your agenda today. It's an impressive agenda. we no longer have the word "disabilities" in the committee's name, but I trust that that signals no less a priority. And from talking to the people here at the Commission, I believe it does not, so I'm delighted to see us working on that.

We had just yesterday at this table right up here on one of the disability issues on hearing aid

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

compatibility and cell telephones, and I was glad to see us move ahead unanimously on that. And I think we had very productive discussions with a lot of input over the last week especially from outside, and I think that that helped to enhance the quality of the product that we came up with.

As I told some of you before, the first speech I made when I came to the FCC was to the deaf and the hard of hearing out in South Dakota, and I really appreciated the feel that they gave me for both the challenges that are faced by the disabilities communities, and the opportunities that we through all of these new technologies to afford productive opportunity for folks to really become members of society. There was so much human talent, and still is, that's going unused, and we've just got to find a way to correct that situation.

And one of the secrets, well, obviously, you have to have good policy, but we always have to have that outreach. And I think of that in terms of the disabilities communities, I think of it in terms of our Native American citizens. So much of what we

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

do here affects all of these groups. It's not just the issues that are entitled, you know, something Native Americans, or something for the hard of hearing. What we do on broadband, what we do on all of these things affects everybody. And resources are stretched thin in these communities. It's hard to cover, so the duty for outreach that we have at the Commission, and that you have as members of this committee to go back and make sure that everybody in these communities knows what's before us is really a pressing one.

I don't think there's anything much more important now than this broadband that you're going to be talking about today. And I think you have to really step back and look. I'm a little bit troubled, as some of you know, about where we may be going on broadband, on the reclassification of broadband transmission and what it can mean to the disabilities community, what it can mean to rural America. We've really got to take a good close look at this. We have all of these wonderful liberating, dynamic, open technologies, broadband, the Internet and all that.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

If we're heading in the direction of closing that off, then we're messing with something very fundamental to the future of America, and we've got to be awfully darned careful of how we do that, so we need your input on that. I'm glad you have a section on broadband coming up today. Spend a lot of time looking at that.

I could go on, but I'd rather just sit here and listen a little bit as you get started this morning. But again, thank you all for your willingness to serve. Thank you for coming, and my office door is always open. I look forward to seeing all of you when you're in town, those from out of town, and seeing those who live here even on a more regular basis. So thank you very much for coming.

CHAIR ROOKER: Thank you.

MR. SNOWDEN: It's always hard to follow Commissioner Copps. He's such a great speaker.

Touching on some of the things that Commissioner Copps said, I would like to give you all an update on some things that have happened since your last meeting here in April, particularly as it relates

2.1

to outreach.

2.1

One of the things that we're planning to do actually next week is host a summer consumer forum in Reno, Nevada on July 16th, touching on issues such as telemarketing, telephone scams, understanding your phone bills, cell phone service, and the role of the FCC. And this is an example of something we're trying to do, as Commissioner Copps mentioned. It's important that we get out more so that consumers are aware of what we all do here at the FCC, and that we are a resource here at the FCC. And it's not by mistake that we're on the other coast.

One of my personal frustrations is that I have several friends and family over on the west coast, and they always say we pay out taxes, Dane. How come the federal government is not open when we need it to be open, so what we're doing is trying to bring the federal government to them as much as we can.

In addition and in conjunction with that summer consumer forum, we will also be hosting an FCC Indian Telecommunications Initiative in Reno with the

Washo Tribe. It's a regional workshop so that we can services and bring more work our government-to-government relationship, and the responsibility that we have with our Native American colleagues and friends across the country. My Deputy Bureau Chief, Kris Monteith, will be here later today to talk about that and other issues, so you'll hear more about that as the day goes on.

I want to point out that it is our goal with all of these forums, particularly with the Indian-related forums that we're going to have, designed to make sure that essential telecom issues are covered in the Indian community.

In addition, we are going to have a very busy next couple of months looking at our calendar. We have the National Conference of State Legislators. Of course, also the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners. Their meetings are coming up, and again, what we're doing is working with our state counterparts, our local counterparts, and our consumer counterparts across the country.

We will also be making a trip up to the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

northwest to meet with the Affiliate Tribes of Northwest Indians, and we're planning to make a trip to Alaska. That's one of the things that we have noticed that, particularly on the tribal area, that our Alaska natives are more short shrift than our west coast consumers. And because it's not often that the federal governments gets out there, so we're going to do that, and make that effort some time later this summer.

Our goal, as you can imagine, is to cast as wide a net as possible as we go forward so that we can reach out to consumers, and they can have access to the Commission.

This has also been a very busy regulatory season for the Commission, as I'm sure you've read and heard, and seen debated. One of the items that we're very proud of - actually, we're proud of all of our items I should say - but one in particular that I'm personally proud of is our recent action on the Telephone Consumer Protection Act or telemarketing rules. This is, by all estimates, the most comprehensive consumer protection item the Commission

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

has ever done.

2.1

In a short sense, what we have done is we have given the power of managing your telephone calls to you, to the consumer, not to the telemarketer. This is a major change in our country. And as you might imagine, with the Do Not Call Registry going into effect as of October 1st - of course, you can register now. This has gotten a lot of attention. I'm not sure if any paper did not cover this particular issue. Richard Smith, my Acting Chief of the Policy Division in my Bureau will be here to discuss that with you.

On the disabilities front, as many of you, I'm sure, are aware, we have taken some steps for telecommunications relay services order and further notice, and our goal is quite simple. We amended and added new rules that will improve the overall effectiveness of TRS to ensure that persons with hearing and speech disabilities have access to the telecom network, that it's consistent with the goal of functional equivalency, so we are moving forward. And Tom Chandler from my bureau will be here later today

to talk about that and many other things, as well.

And, of course, as Commissioner Copps said, just yesterday we took a major step forward, we like to think, positive, proactive step forward to ensure that more consumers have access to the network by lifting the exemption on our hearing aid compatibility rules. So we are moving forward and making sure more consumers have access to this very, very important network.

Another issue that, of course, was debated between your last meeting and now was our media ownership or broadcast ownership rules. And I do not plan to go into details about that. It was very hotly debated on both sides. It was probably the most — the one issue that we got the most comments on anything we've ever gotten at the Commission. At one point, I think we received over 1 million postcards, 1 million plus postcards from consumers alone on this particular issue, so this is something that was very much debated throughout the country, throughout Washington, D.C., and definitely throughout this Commission.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

As Commissioner Copps mentioned, outreach is very important. Of course, our regulatory policy is very important, but one of the things I also wanted to mention is important is that we have information for consumers. That is very important. And one of the pieces that we are focusing on is our website, and we're making it, of course, compliant, and we're also making sure it's chock full of information for consumers.

launched, We in connection with Commissioner Abernathy, who I saw has just arrived, we launched Parents Place which our page, we intentionally did it for the summer months because, of course, that's when students or kids are usually home. They have more idle time. I think we all remember being a child when we didn't have these fancy-dancy computers like the kids have today, but we wanted to make sure that parents had a resource that they could They would know exactly what's available out for them, for example, when students are making phone calls, or going on the web. How they can do that in a safe and productive manner, and I was happy that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

Commissioner Abernathy led that charge for the Commission. And we've gotten a lot of good feedback from consumers as we go forward.

In addition, we launched a National Environmental Policy Act, or Historic Preservation page on our website. And this is important because it contains information about the Commission's responsibility to manage the expansion communications infrastructure in a way that preserve the country's environmental and historic resources. And this is important not just when we beautiful sites the country, it's across but particularly important on our tribal lands as we go forward.

We, of course, added lots of publications to all of our work, meaning that every time we do a major item, such as the hearing aid compatibility revision that we just did yesterday, or the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, we're creating consumer alerts. We're also creating information for consumers and fact sheets so they can read and understand exactly how the new rules apply to them, and the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

positive steps that the Commission is taking.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

We are close to finalizing a broadband booklet, or a fact sheet on that particular subject. And this is very important for us. I know you have it on your agenda today. The reason I say this is very important is because this is the new technology. is the new cool thing, as the kids say today, that many of you, I'm sure, have already, but not enough Americans have taken advantage of this opportunity. And we want to make sure that we do our part, not only in our regulatory world, but also in the outreach world, that thev understand, can consumers can understand what's important, and why this is so critical.

And, of course, we've been busy in our enforcement area, and we're creating more information so consumers understand how our enforcement bureau works, and how the Commission -- how we treat enforcement issues.

I know you have a full agenda, and I see Commissioner Abernathy is here. And I would like to ask Commissioner Abernathy to please join me up here.

And while she's coming, I'd like to extend apologies from Commissioner Adelstein and Chairman Powell, who both had conflicts with today's meeting, but they do send their best wishes to each of you. It's my pleasure now to introduce Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy.

It's good to see everybody here again. It's been a while since I've had a chance to come down and say hi, and I don't want to take up too much of your time, because I was looking over your agenda, and you have real work to do. But I did want to tell you once again how important and how much we value the work that you do, how we're very, very pleased that you're willing to take the time and the effort on a Friday in July to come here and help us with so many of these issues that are very, very important.

I think as Dane mentioned, and I believe Commissioner Copps also mentioned, just the other day we did our order on hearing aid compatibility and what we do with wireless phones, and trying to ensure that there are more wireless phones out there that work

2.1

with all of the different kinds of hearing aids, so that all of the population gets to tap into the vast benefits of wireless phones. Which because very clear to me yesterday, when I had to attend my daughter's parent's day at camp, dressed in a full FCC meeting agenda day outfit, and I'm outside watching tennis, and I get three urgent calls. But the point is, I had to be in touch. I knew that I had to be in touch that day. We're working on some important items, but it also was very important to me personally that I be able to attend her summer camp. And if I hadn't been able to use a wireless phone, that would have been a huge problem for me, and so that's just illustration of one day, of why it is important that everyone have access to wireless technology.

I'm pleased that the technology now allows us to push out more phones to more people. I'm anxious to see how that works out. I'm glad we're bringing in a report. I think it's in about three years when we're going to get an update and see do we have the right balance here. Are we getting enough

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

phones out in the market? Is there enough information?

It's a joint effort, and I want to make that clear too, that this wasn't done in isolation. We worked closely with the industry, with both the wireless industry, and the manufacturing industry, as well as the consumer groups. Because, again, this was in an area where we certainly -- we didn't have the expertise here in-house about what decisions to make, and so we relied very heavily on input from so many different parties to figure out how we could move that process forward. So I'm very, very pleased about that proceeding.

As you know, we've been working on a number of other issues, all in many way, shape or forms related to how do we make consumer lives a little better. The National Do Not Call List, I think we knew there was a lot of consumer frustration out there. I don't think we at all anticipated the level of consumer frustration, which became evident as people were signing up for the Do Not Call List. And, frankly, I've been badgered about this for over a year

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

by my husband, so it is -- again, it goes to the benefits of technology, and then there are some downsides associated with technology. And I think it really was a reaction to all of the numerous calls, the hang-up calls, and the frustrations with not being able to control in our own home what we listen to. So I think those are just a couple of examples of the items that we've been working on.

We're rolling out E-911, another very, very critical safety and security feature that will make a difference for many, many people including -- I once there's location, I seriously start mean, thinking about how do I use it for the rest of my family? You know, it's not that I think that my daughter needs to talk on the phone because, frankly, she doesn't. But I do think that there are times when I will want to be able to locate her, so to the extent that devices come on the market that allow her -- one devices they're talking about are emergency phones where basically I can call her. can make three outgoing calls I've pre-programmed to, you know, like me, her dad and somebody else, and then

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

I can locate her any time.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

Once those devices are on the market, it's important to me. I think it will yeah, important to a lot of other people at certain price points, so these are all ways in which we can tap into the new technology. At the same time that we're tapping into it, and accessing it in a way to better our lives we, as an agency, have to rely on you to tell us when is it not working right. When are consumers being abused? When are you getting too many unwanted calls? When are you being slammed or crammed on your phone bill? When is it so complex out there far as figuring out appropriate programming for your children that you throw up your hands in defeat, and we need to do something like the Parents Place on our website.

So again, thank you for coming today. I'm very, very happy that you were able to take the time, and willing to take the time. I want to sit around for a few minutes and listen, but at the end of the day, it's really going to be up to you and Dane to bring to the Commissioners action items that you think

we need to pursue. So thank you again.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

And I am just at my end. MR. SNOWDEN: Ι did want to make a few comments about your agenda. Ι think this is a very comprehensive agenda, and I applaud those who put it together. Particularly, as I talking know you're going to be about the Telemarketing Rules, the TRS item, the E-911, and of course, your broadband panel.

I did want to highlight David Solomon's presentation, who is the Chief of our Enforcement might imagine, this Bureau. And you in environment, the Enforcement Bureau plays a very, very vital role to what we do here at the Commission. Without the Commission's strong commitment and his good work to enforcement, the rules that we create are meaningless. So I encourage you to enjoy what David Solomon has to say when he comes down here later this afternoon.

I should also say that the fact sheets and other things that I was mentioning a moment ago, we have a disk, and some of the fact sheets are in your packet, so all that information is there. And, of

1	course, all this information is available on our
2	website. So with that, I want to thank Commissioners
3	Copps and Abernathy for joining us. And, of course, I
4	believe Commissioner Martin will be joining us at some
5	point during the day. And again, extend apologies for
6	Commissioner Adelstein and Chairman Powell.
7	I see that Richard Smith is here, who will
8	be talking more about some of our consumer policy
9	issues, which is telemarketing. But, Shirley, if
10	you'd like, I could take a few questions, if there are
11	any.
12	CHAIR ROOKER: Yes. We would like that,
13	please.
14	MR. SNOWDEN: Sure.
15	CHAIR ROOKER: Do we have questions for
16	Dane about any of the things that he's discussed? I
17	can't believe this group. They're still asleep.
18	MR. SNOWDEN: I will take that as a
19	positive thing, that you don't have any questions for
20	me. Not that you're asleep, the positive thing to
21	have yes, sir.
22	MR. CONRAN: I won't let you get away.

1	I'm Jim Conran from California. Recently, I attended
2	a seminar, and there was a presentation by some high
3	tech companies on how to bypass the telephone network
4	by using the Internet. And I was very concerned -
5	one, I thought it was kind of interesting, but I was
6	concerned that many of the funds that rate payers pay
7	into, Universal Service, in my state the relay system
8	for the deal consumers, 911. All these are going to
9	be bypassed if people use the Internet rather than
10	using traditional telephone services. Is the
11	Commission looking at this issue?
12	MR. SNOWDEN: We have - as many of you
13	know, we have created or allowed for IP Relay to
14	occur, and that is the first I guess, that's
15	probably the first part of our toe that's going into
16	the water to see how it works. We are looking into
17	it. We have not made a decision one way or the other
18	just yet on that particular issue.
19	MR. CONRAN: All right. Thank you.
20	MR. SNOWDEN: Thank you.
21	CHAIR ROOKER: Any other questions? Well,
22	Dane, thank you so much. I need to do a couple of

items of business before I introduce Richard, if 1 2 that's okay, if you don't mind. 3 MR. SNOWDEN: You're the Chair. 4 CHAIR ROOKER: All right. 5 MR. SNOWDEN: I will follow your lead. 6 CHAIR ROOKER: Thank you. 7 MR. SNOWDEN: Thank and you, congratulations again on your award. 8 9 CHAIR ROOKER: Thank you very much, Dane. We really enjoy having you here. 10 11 We have -- you've been sent the minutes of 12 the last meeting. And as the Chair, I can certify the 13 correctness of the minutes, but before I do that, I 14 would like to make certain that they are correct, 15 which I think would be a smart thing to do. So does 16 anyone have any changes or corrections that we need to 17 make, or additions to the minutes of the last meeting? 18 Are they okay? All right. Okay. Well, thank you 19 very much. 20 Also, I would like to mention a couple of 21 things about developing the agenda. As I indicated,

there are quite a bit of -- there was quite a bit of

input from group leaders into the agenda that we have today. But what you need to know is that we really -- our goal -- and today's presentation, I realize, is really jam-packed with people talking to us. And the reason we're doing that is because we want to provide you with background on the issues that we're going to be dealing with. And we feel that today's agenda will give you a lot of the knowledge to help us deal with some of these issues.

For the next meeting, we are going to set up time for working groups to meet, which has been one of your requests. But this means that you are going to have to do some work prior to the next meeting, and you have been very busy working. I want to thank everyone.

If you have ideas for the agenda, we welcome them. You can contact either Scott or me about your ideas, but we really need about six weeks lead-time before the next meeting. The reason for that is so that we can see if the agenda items can be fit in. We can contact the people necessary to make presentations or whatever needs to be done for those

2.1

agenda items. And in addition, the agenda has to be posted in the Federal Register 15 days before the meeting, so we have to have all this put together. So that's why we need a lead-time for new ideas. We yesterday that we're going decide do cannot something today and add it to the agenda. That just doesn't work, because it has to be posted in the Federal Register. So unfortunately, we have to work within the rules in doing that. So if you have issues for the Committee, there are two things that could be You can set up a working group, or you can take the issue to an existing working group, so we want to come out of this with a lot of productive work.

And by the way, the prior committee in our last -- before we were reincarnated as CAC, we did recommend to the FCC that they establish a Do Not Call Registry. I hope they listened and took our comments into consideration. We're very happy at the action that the FCC has taken. And I think from that, unless any of you have comments about agenda we'll just anything else, move into our presentation. Is that okay? Any questions

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

comments?

All right. I just learned that I think there's now over 20 million people signed up for the Do Not Call Registry, which I think is just astonishing since it was only put in place what, two weeks ago? So at any rate, the Do Not Call Registry has really hit a nerve with consumers.

Richard Smith, who is the Acting Chief of the Policy Division within the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, is going to give us a briefing, and then he will take questions about the TCPA. Richard, welcome. We're glad to have you here with us.

MR. SMITH: Thank you very much. I' here to discuss what I think is a very popular topic with this group, and that is the Commission's recent order on telemarketing, which Chairman Powell called the most sweeping consumer protection measure ever adopted by the Commission. And my task this morning is to try to summarize what is approximately a 200 page order for you hopefully in the next five to ten minutes, so please bear with me, and I'll try to do that. And I

NEAL R. GROSS

would like to take questions primarily this morning, rather than just going through all the rules and regulations.

Our goal in this proceeding all along has been to provide consumers with options for managing telemarketing calls. And, of course, the primary tool for that is the National Do Not Call Registry. Beginning October the 1st, telemarketers will be prohibited from contacting those consumers who have registered their telephone number on the National Registry by August 31st.

It's also important to note that there will only be one National Registry. I know there was some confusion initially because the Federal Trade Commission and the FCC had sort of dual rulemakings going on at the same time, and there was a concern that maybe there would be two National Registries, but there will only be one. And that registry will be administered by the FTC. They have acquired the funding for that, and they've hired an entity called AT&T Governmental Solutions to actually handle the administration of the list.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

Consumers may register on the list by two means, either over the Internet or from the telephone that they're attempting to register on the list. You have to actually call from the telephone that they want to register. The registrations are limited to residential telephone subscribes, and those do include wireless numbers.

As was indicated, since the registry was up and running two weeks ago, my understanding is approximately 23 million numbers have now been registered on the list. And the FTC estimates that approximately 60 million numbers will ultimately be on the list. The registrations are valid for five years, and anyone who has registered on the list may, if they so choose, revoke their registration.

Consumers that have registered on the list will automatically be included in any state administered list. That's a requirement of the TCPA. The list cannot be used for any purpose other than federal and state enforcement of the rules, and will include only the telephone numbers of those who have registered. It will not include names, addresses, or

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

any other types of information. I know that's a concern for many people.

Telemarketers will be able to purchase the list beginning in September. They can do so either by area code, or they can purchase the entire list. The FTC proposed initially, I believe, a \$29 fee per area code, and approximately \$7,200 to purchase the entire national list. And the telemarketers are required to check that list at least once every three months.

It's also very important to note that there are, of course, exemptions to the National Do Not Call requirements. These include calls from non-profit organizations, calls from companies that have established business relationships with a consumer who is on the list. One important new caveat on that is that there is a time limitation now on the EBR, and that is 18 months from any purchase or transaction, and 3 months from any inquiry.

There is also a prior expressed permission that can be acquired from the consumer who is on the list. That must be in writing and signed by the consumer, and include the telephone number to which

2.1

they are providing permission.

2.1

One other new exemption is something called the personal relationship exemption, and that allows the telemarketer that is making the call to call family, friends and acquaintances who may otherwise be on the list. It is important to note that consumers can revoke all of these exemptions except for the non-profit exemption by requesting to be placed on the company-specific list.

One of the last and more important pieces of this puzzle that's still being sort of put together is the role of the federal agencies and the state governments, and how this is going to work. The FTC and the FCC are currently in the process of putting together a Memorandum of Understanding that will clarify how enforcement will work between the two federal agencies.

The FCC has much broader authority to regulate telemarketing than the FTC. For example, the FTC has jurisdiction over common carriers, banks, insurance companies, intrastate telemarketing, which all fall outside of the FTC's authority.

NEAL R. GROSS

The other piece of this, of course, are the numerous state lists. Nothing that we have done in our order would prohibit the states from continuing to administer their own list. We do, however, encourage them to download the numbers that are on their list into the federal list. And ultimately, the goal would be to have one national list.

One of the more complex and controversial pieces of this are exactly how the state regulations work in conjunction with the federal rules. And in the order - and I'll try to go through this very carefully - what we have said is that any less restrictive state requirements are preempted by the federal rules. For the most part, these include exemptions that are not recognized under the federal rules. Some of the common ones are for insurance companies, real estate agents, newspapers, those types of things, none of which are recognized under the federal rules. Those are all preempted.

States may continue to enforce consistent regulations in state proceedings. This is where it gets a little more complicated. The TCPA specifically

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

allows states to adopt more restrictive requirements for intrastate and state calls, both which originate and terminate within the state, so those are still permissible.

In terms of more restrictive requirements being placed on interstate, we have not specifically preempted that, but what we have said is that we will look at that very carefully on a case-by-case basis as it's presented to us.

In addition to the National Do Not Call List, there are a couple of other measures that were taken in the order that may be of interest. The first relates to abandoned calls, and new rules will limit to 3 percent the number of abandoned calls that telemarketers may make to consumers. Within the permissible 3 percent of abandoned calls, the required telemarketer will be to provide pre-recorded message that indicates who they, a number you can call to be placed on their Do Not Call List, and that the call is for a telemarketing purpose. be allowed to provide will not any other information other than that.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

The abandoned call rules will become effective October the 1st. In addition, we have adopted rules on Caller ID that will require telemarketers to transmit Caller ID. It will also prohibit them from blocking Caller ID information that is sent.

The Caller ID rules are effective January 29th. And last but not least, we have made some important changes to the rules on unsolicited faxes. Most importantly, it is now required to obtain the prior express permission in writing from the recipient before sending an unsolicited fax. They may no longer rely on an established business relationship in the fax context.

And I think that's plenty to absorb, so if you have any questions, let's start this way.

MR. KRAMER: Thank you, Richard. On behalf of AARP, I just want to thank the Commission for the great work you've done on this TCPA. It's clear to everyone in the room that unless the Commission acted as it did, the FTC's Do Not Call Registry wouldn't have nearly the impact that it's

2.1

going to have down the road for consumers.

2.1

With that though, certainly our members who are calling in record numbers on this, are excited about it, have high expectations too that their calls -- excuse me, that they're not going to get calls after this goes into effect. How are you guys going to work the enforcement angle on this?

MR. SMITH: That is a very important concern to us. We realize that consumer expectations are high, and one of the things we'd like to do is certainly to educate them, that they will continue to receive some calls, the EBR, the non-profit organizations, et cetera. I think that's important to make them understand.

As I said, we are engaging with the Federal Trade Commission and coming up with a Memorandum of Understanding exactly how that will work, and David Solomon can probably talk to you a little more this afternoon about the enforcement process here and how it works.

I know that we have made it a priority to increase enforcement of the TCPA complaints once the

NEAL R. GROSS

National Do Not Call List becomes effective in October, and David could probably talk a little more about that.

CHAIR ROOKER: We'll work our way around the table.

MS. RAGSDALE: Good morning. Joy Ragsdale of the Office of the People's Council for D.C., representing NASUCA. We're also very pleased, we've received a lot of calls from our constituents about the Do Not Call Registry. I wanted to ask a few questions for clarification.

In regards to the enforcement, we are not sure who has access to the customer's information. And we were also informed that there was an interagency education task force that was being created with the FTC and FCC. We wanted to know if that process was indeed taking place. And also, NASUCA has spoken with David Torok, who is the Staff Attorney at the FTC, and also Kris Monteith spoke with us at our mid-year conference in Portland, Oregon this past June, in regards to establishing a partnership with NASUCA and other consumer advocate offices to assist

2.1

the FCC and the FTC in the educational process.

There are a number of our constituents who cannot or do not access the Internet, so relying on those fact sheets and consumer information alerts on the Internet does not reach all of our population, so we wanted to know how we can get the brochures, and to use them to help the organizations disseminate the information.

In terms of access to the list, it will be limited to the state and federal law enforcement agencies. In terms of the educational aspect of this, I know that efforts will be made, and I keep kicking these questions to people who are coming up later. Kris will be here, and she probably knows more about what the outreach efforts are than I do at this point.

MS. RAGSDALE: With regards to the inter-agency consumer education, that's happening. Are you are you aware of that? I believe it's with the Attorney General's Association.

MR. SMITH: Yes. We consult -- we have been consulting with the Attorney Generals. In fact, we talked to them yesterday at a conference call, and

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

we had a conference call with them today, along with the FTC, and so that is all in the works.

I'm Susan Grant from the MS. **GRANT:** Consumers National League. The different FTC and the FCC jurisdictions of the are confusing to consumers. Is there going to be one central place where people can complain about Do Not Call violations, where the complaints can then be parceled out to the appropriate agencies?

MR. SMITH: That is a very important issue, and it's something that we are working on. Currently, they can file complaints pursuant to the FCC website. And I believe the FTC website will also take complaints. And what I assume will ultimately happen is the complaints will come in, and they will be sort of doled out to the appropriate agency.

MR. HOROWITZ: Richard, David Horowitz. I have a real concern, and that concern is about the privacy and the security of these lists. Because we're talking about lists that will have 60 million anticipated users who are using the program, and for \$7,200 you can buy a complete list.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

Now we know there are such things as reverse telephone books that people can get numbers from, take numbers and get addresses, and names, and all that other kind of information. How is this going to be secured in a way that if telemarketers buy the list, that it doesn't become no longer a telemarketing list, but a mail order list. or that other groups just pick up these lists. Are these lists going to be available to anyone who wants to pay the \$7,200?

MR. SMITH: They will only be available, my understanding is, to people who are engaged in telemarketing. And it's also, as I said, it's important to note that the only information on the lists are telephone numbers. There are no names and addresses. And most of those telephone numbers are available in telephone books, which include a lot more information than the National Do Not Call List is going to contain.

MR. HOROWITZ: But what I'm saying, Richard, that my concern is that yes, you will only have telephone numbers. But in my experience in working with telemarketing companies, which is a long

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

time, working I should say against them, rather than with them, is that they have all sorts of means to be able to translate phone numbers or anything else into actual addresses and names. And it's like saying to a pregnant shark, don't have baby sharks, you know, because to have lists like this that are so complete out there with 60 million, or I'm trying to think of the figure, 60 million people on these lists, that somewhere along the line either some widow hacker or some other person who wants to do something really negative gets a hold of these lists, and just uses it basically as a rocket of some kind. And I'm just saying that there ought to be some stipulations about what kind of contracts people have to sign that take these lists, because it's like buying a registry that could be worth literally millions and millions of dollars for marketers.

MR. SMITH: Well, your concern is noted. Of course, the difficulty is that in creating the Do Not Call List, there has to be a way to make the telemarketers aware of which numbers that they can't call. And that's the only means that we could think

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

of.

MR. HOROWITZ: I'm aware of that. I'm
aware of that, but I say that's the real weakness in
the program, because by making these lists available
to telemarketers, you're making these lists available
to anyone basically who wants to use them, no matter
what they sign on paper. And I think the enforcement
has to, in some legal way, nail these people for
taking these lists, and also have some kind of a list
for them - a contract to sign - making them aware of
the fact if they ever use any of these names, or
numbers, or whatever is there, that the penalties
could be really too high to mess around with. Because
in talking to some telemarketing groups, not to
mention any names, to find out how they feel about it,
most of them are just, you know, you're taking our
jobs away. You're doing this. We'll find another way
to get back.

Well, I'm not saying they will, but having this information around sure makes it tempting for somebody who maybe isn't even a telemarketer to use them maybe for finding website addresses for spamming.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	I mean, I'd love to have a list if I was a spammer of
2	60 million people to turn out onto the Internet, and
3	that's just my concern. I'm wondering if anyone has
4	really looked at that from a legal standpoint.
5	MR. SMITH: That is certainly something
6	that we will keep track of. And to the extent that
7	there are abuses, we'll try to take action as
8	necessary.
9	MR. HOROWITZ: Well, I'm saying is it
10	going to be done, or isn't it going to be done?
11	That's my question to you.
12	MR. SMITH: Well, one of the difficulties
13	with this, of course, is that the Federal Trade
14	Commission is administering the list, so I don't want
15	to speak exactly in terms of what they're doing. But
16	we are aware of that concern, and we certainly will
17	raise it with them.
18	MR. HOROWITZ: One other thing, brief.
19	And that is, that in looking at the public's reaction,
20	because we have somewhat of a gauge on what people
21	react to things - like on our website, we've had tens

of thousands of requests for people who really want to

know about the program, which is easy. We just send everyone over to .gov and to the website. But there has to be something that is distributed either state by state, or in some way personally to the person who signs up that really outlines in a simple way how it's used, what the exemptions are, and where they can get more information, you know, not instantly, but at least without -- if they don't have a computer they can't go to the website. There has to be a number available.

And I think it's really important to sit down and do this before the program goes into effect, so that there is everything written out in simple language, and also bilingually. I don't know how many different languages are concerned here but, you know, nowadays, it's good to have bilingual booklets and pamphlets so that people of other ethnic persuasions can use them. Is there anything going to be done to notify these people, the ones that sign up, some way where they'll be getting a booklet, or one sheet or something that will explain it to them in their language, as well as English.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

MR. SMITH: I'm not sure about the languages, but I know if you sign up on the Internet, there's a certain amount of information available to the consumer at the time that they sign up. And also, when they call in, there's a sort of a pre-recorded message that provides some information.

In the short time that we've had since this has been up and running, we have made every effort to put fact sheets and material on the Internet. And Kris Monteith, who is in charge of some of the outreach will be here shortly, and perhaps you can talk to her a little bit more about some of your ideas.

MR. HOROWITZ: One final thing; and that is, that the all the phone companies we have here, I was wondering if there might be some commitment that we can get from the major phone companies to have some kind of a slip-in with their bills, or in some way to let the people who are customers, users of the phone system, to give them also hints on how to use the new system, and where they can get information and things like that, because that would really be helpful,

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

because you have a draw of an enormous audience also.

I hate to be looking at you when I'm doing this,

Richard, but --

MR. SMITH: Let me just add one thing. That is actually in the order. There's a requirement in the TCPA that, I believe it's common carriers that provide local exchange service must notify their customers of the availability of this list. And beginning January the 1st, they will be required to provide an annual notification to their customers how to get on the list.

CHAIR ROOKER: I have a couple of questions for you. Increasingly, telemarketing is moving off-shore. What about the companies - for example, I just received a telemarketing call recently from India. The reason I knew it was from India is because I asked for a number so I could call them back, and this seems to be occurring. How does this rule impact on companies outside the United States?

MR. SMITH: We consider that to be a violation of the federal rules, they're actually violating the Do Not Call rules, regardless of where

2.1

1	the call is originating. In terms of practically how
2	we could enforce that if they are truly an
3	international-based company, and perhaps it would not
4	be possible to enforce, but we do consider it to be a
5	violation.
6	CHAIR ROOKER: So if it's a U.S. based
7	company using off-shore telemarketers, then they will
8	definitely have to follow the rules.
9	MR. SMITH: Yes, I don't think we
10	certainly don't want to allow them to circumvent the
11	rules by simply setting up some off-shore calling.
12	CHAIR ROOKER: Okay. And then the other
13	question has to do with the charities. I know that
14	the charities are allowed to continue soliciting.
15	However, there are a lot of organizations that take
16	most of the money, but solicit on behalf of a charity.
17	Will they be able to continue doing that?
18	MR. SMITH: I didn't catch what you can
19	you repeat it?
20	CHAIR ROOKER: There are a lot of
21	organizations that solicit on behalf of a charity that
22	are for-profit companies. Will these for-profit

1	companies be allowed to continue soliciting for
2	charities, even though they take most of the money?
3	MR. SMITH: That is addressed in the
4	order, and it's a little bit complicated. There are a
5	couple of different scenarios. There is a scenario
6	where a non-profit hires a for-profit telemarketer to
7	telemarket on their behalf. And in that case, they
8	are exempt. If it is a for-profit commercial entity
9	that's providing some of its revenue to a non-profit
10	organization, that would not be an exemption.
11	CHAIR ROOKER: Wait a minute. Say that
12	again. It would not be?
13	MR. SMITH: It would not be characterized
14	as a non-profit organization subject to the exemption.
15	They will be subject to the rules.
16	CHAIR ROOKER: So I mean, like some of the
17	they recruit I mean, they solicit on behalf of
18	the firemen, for example, and we know that most of
19	that money goes into the pockets of the people doing
20	the recruiting, so they would have to abide by the
21	telemarketing rule?
22	MR. SMITH: If they are soliciting on

behalf of the non-profit organization, they will fall within the exemption.

CHAIR ROOKER: Oh, they'll be exempt.

MR. SMITH: If they are selling something, for example, and giving a certain portion of that to a non-profit, they will not.

CHAIR ROOKER: Okay. Thank you.

My name is Don Snoop, and one MR. SNOOP: question I do have to follow-up on what Shirley was speaking about, was that elderly people, my parents, my in- laws have this challenge when somebody calls up from the local state police. I'm representing the local state police and I'm doing a fund raiser. are they to know? Is there anything that we incorporate into those rules that will allow seniors specifically, because they seem to be the most qullible, and I'm approaching that age also, so I'm not speaking out of turn. But the fact is that, how are they to know that, in fact -- is there going to be some form of credentials required or something of that nature?

MR. SMITH: I believe, and I'm not an

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

1	expert on this, that there was recently a case in the
2	Supreme Courts that derived - and maybe somebody here
3	knows more about it than I do - from Illinois, from a
4	company that was soliciting on behalf of Viet Nam Vets
5	and keeping most of the money. And that is really
6	more a case of fraud than it is a case of violation of
7	the Do Not Call Rules, and it would fall within the
8	FTC's jurisdiction.
9	MR. GOLDBERG: A lot has been made of the
10	exemption for political candidates. Does that fall
11	under the non-profit exemption?
12	MR. SMITH: Yes.
13	MS. BERLYN: Good morning. Debra Berlyn.
14	I have a question about removing your name from the
15	Do Not Call List. Could you discuss how that happens,
16	and is there some concern that names could be removed
17	without the consumer's permission?
18	MR. SMITH: I don't think anyone has done
19	that yet, but the process would be exactly the same.
20	You can do it by the website or the same telephone
21	number you would call to register.
	II

MS. BERLYN: As a follow-up, is there

concern that it is easy enough so that others could remove consumers' names?

MR. SMITH: That is a possibility. It certainly is not fool-proof. You do have to call from the telephone number that you're either registering or revoking, so there's some safety in that.

CHAIR ROOKER: Susan.

MS. GRANT: Can I just clarify the question about charities. And this is concerning the FTC's rules. I thought I understood that if it was a for- profit concern soliciting on behalf of a charity, that the for-profit concern would have to abide by the Do Not Call Registry. Is that incorrect?

MR. SMITH: That is correct in part. If a for-profit is soliciting on behalf of a charity under the FTC's rules, they're not subject to the National Do Not Call List requirements, but they are subject to the company-specific requirements. In other words, if they call someone and the person asked to be placed on their Do Not Call List, they have to honor that. That is not the case under the FCC's rules.

MS. GRANT: Okay. Thanks.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

CHAIR ROOKER: Joy.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

MS. RAGSDALE: I had a question on Yes. the consumer complaint process. It appears that the FCC requires a little bit more information for the consumer to supply in filing a complaint. Not only do they have to give name, telephone number company that's called them, but the names attempted persons whom they've to resolve issues, and all the steps that they have gone through. And it does not appear that the FTC requires the consumer to supply an extensive amount of information, like a log that identifies all the steps that they've gone through to resolve the issue. And I'm concerned about the confusion that will cause to the consumer.

MR. SMITH: One of the major problems in enforcing the telemarketing rules is that there's often very sketchy information about the calls, and so we are certainly encouraging people to provide as much information as possible, but we will certainly operate on what we can get from them.

MS. RAGSDALE: So if they don't supply all of that information, you will still proceed in trying

NEAL R. GROSS

1	to resolve their complaint?
2	MR. SMITH: We will certainly take every
3	effort to investigate it, but certain critical pieces
4	of information have to be provided to us before we can
5	for example, who called you, you know, those types
6	of information we just have to have.
7	MS. RAGSDALE: But they don't need the
8	name of the representative that they have spoken with.
9	MR. SMITH: No, I don't believe that's
10	necessary.
11	MS. RAGSDALE: Okay. And from what I
12	understand, David indicated that - and I'm speaking of
13	David Torok from the FTC - not all of the consumer
14	complaints will be investigated. And how will the
15	consumer know whether their complaint is one of the
16	ones that will be resolved?
17	MR. SMITH: Well, that again is a very
18	good question, and is of concern to us because, of
19	course, we have only a certain number of staff who
20	look into these, and resolve them. With the adoption
21	of the National Do Not Call List, and this is perhaps
22	a question for David Solomon, I think that efforts

will be made to increase that staff and investigate 1 2 those. It certainly is unlikely that every single 3 complaint will be investigated and acted upon. 4 What 5 is more likely to happen is that we will look for 6 patterns and practices, and abuses on sort of a 7 general level and act on those. RAGSDALE: Okav. 8 MS. And since the 9 complaint process is handled through an IBR system, is there opportunity for the complainant to hit zero if 10 11 they need to speak to an operator? 12 MR. SMITH: That I'm not sure of it, and 13 it might be -- Dane is saying yes, so I assume the 14 answer is yes. 15 MS. RAGSDALE: Okay. Thank you. 16 MR. SNOOP: A short question, and that is, 17 with the registration, you know, most people have more 18 than one phone number. I mean, it's just kind of a way of life. We have two phones or three phones, or a 19 20 fax phone, or whatever numbers you have in your home. 2.1 Are you asking people who register to register all 22

the numbers, or just the numbers that are the basic

numbers that they use in their household? 1 2 That is up to the consumer. MR. SMITH: 3 The only sort of limitations on this are that if you are registering by phone, you have to call from the 4 5 phone number that you're registering. So if you have three lines, you're going to have to call from each 6 7 one of those. My understanding is if you register on the Internet, you can register as many as 8 9 numbers. 10 MR. SNOOP: Okay. At a time. 11 MR. SMITH: Yes. 12 CHAIR ROOKER: Okav. Do we have other 13 questions for Richard? Okay. Well, thank you so 14 really appreciate, Richard, for much. We 15 excellent presentation. 16 CHAIR ROOKER: Dane. 17 MR. SNOWDEN: I know you all are about to 18 take a break, but we're trying to work on the schedule for Commissioner Martin, so he may be down in a 19 20 second, but if he doesn't come down, actually he will 2.1 be down a little later. But I do want to touch on a

couple of things that Richard was bringing up, and I

think Richard did a fantastic job with explaining, as he pointed out, this order that has over 200 pages. And it was a lot of hard work from a very small staff, Richard being one of them, that put this together.

First, there's a lot of debate about the non-profit issue, and the political calls and things of that nature. We are prohibited by Congress to change that. We cannot touch that, and that is not something that we can say arbitrarily we want to do, or we can't do. What Congress told us to do is to leave it exactly like it is. And for those of us who have to go to the Hill a lot, we do exactly as Congress tells us to do, and I being one of those people. So we will continue to follow that, unless Congress tells us otherwise.

In terms of the outreach issues that came up, we are - and again, Kris Monteith will be down here a little later, who's my Deputy for Consumer Affairs and Outreach in addition to governmental affairs, but we will continue to make sure that consumers can call the 188-CALL-FCC or 188-TEL-FCC for TTY, and get any information they need on the

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

telemarketing rules, all the exemptions, all They can get that no matter if they have facts. access to a computer or they have access Hopefully, you have access to both. Ιf telephone. you don't, you only have access to a telephone, you can call and get that information sent directly to And that is true for not only our telemarketing you. rules, but all of -- everything we do here at the FCC. So that was directly to you, Mr. Horowitz, so please tell your listeners that they can call 188-CALL-FCC if they don't have access to a telephone.

In terms of the complaint information, the more information, obviously - and David Solomon will be here, and I'm sure he would echo this - the more information we have in terms of a complaint the better. That's the nature of the beast. If we only have a telephone number or a time, it makes it harder for us to go out and do enforcement action. So we are encouraging, strongly encouraging consumers to provide as much information as they can when they file a complaint because it makes it a lot easier to actually go after the person that you are complaining against.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

And it's important to note that the FCC has the prerogative to act against a telemarketer or any other violator of our rule, no matter if it's on one complaint or a trend of complaints. So depending on how egregious the violation is, we can act, or if it's a trend that we're seeing we can act, so it's not just limited to one thing that we receive from one particular consumer.

But I wanted to clarify some of those things. And we are, as Richard pointed out, and I'll say, the poor guy hasn't gotten any sleep since this thing went into effect on July -- since it went out on July 26th when we made our decision here at the Commission.

This is brand new. We are still getting through this, and we have -- and I want to pat ourselves on the back a little bit, and I don't usually do this, but Congress gave us until September to get this done, and we are ahead of schedule. We did that intentionally so that we could work on some of the other details before October 1st, so that we could answer some of these questions, we can get the

2.1

enforcement issues worked out. And we are well underway to do that, so I am very proud of Richard, and Erica, and Margaret, and all the members of my staff who have put this together to make sure that we got this done for the American consumer. And so we have a lot more work to do.

This will be a very busy summer for our policy folks, but I know this is an important issue for the American consumer, so I hope that everyone looks at this issue as a giant step forward for the American consumer regarding managing the telephone calls that come to their homes each and every day. So with that, I will turn it back over to you, but I wanted to just bring those few points out.

CHAIR ROOKER: Thank you, Dane. Thank you very, very much for an excellent presentation.

We're going to take a 15 minute break, be back just a little bit before 10:30 because we're a little bit early. I can't believe it. Everybody is running on great schedule here. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the proceedings in the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:15

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	a.m. and went back on the record at 10:33 a.m.)
2	CHAIR ROOKER: Back to work, folks. Oh,
3	good, Richard. You're doing so good. You all are
4	getting to be so obedient. By the time this term of
5	office is over, you're going to be right in your
6	chairs at the minute. It's wonderful.
7	Oh, yes. Scott is not back yet. He had
8	to go pick up something for us, but you're absolutely
9	right. That was nice of him, wasn't it. And boy, was
10	it ever.
11	One person did join us after we made the
12	introductions this morning, so Milton is right there.
13	Would you just introduce yourself so that we'll know
14	who you are?
15	MR. LITTLE: Sure. Good morning,
16	everyone. Sorry I'm late. Milton Little, Chief
17	Operating Officer of the National Urban League.
18	CHAIR ROOKER: He actually was here right
19	after we did the round of introductions, so you're not
20	that late, Milton. We're glad to have you here.
21	Thank you very, very much.
22	Now I think Greg Guice is here. There you

are. Yes, that's absolutely great. Our next subject is -- actually, Greg is going to cover two subjects. He is an Attorney Advisor with the Policy Division in the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau. He's going to talk about the E-911 Service and, of course, much of the interest in this service grew out of the terrorist attacks, which pointed up some needs for change.

And then the second thing that he's going to address is the order that was passed yesterday regarding the hearing aid compatibility issue. And this is an issue in which the committee has been very interested. And Greg will continue with information about that after the E-911 discussion. Thank you, Greg. Welcome.

MR. GUICE: Thank you. Good morning, Yeah. I'm here to talk to you about the everyone. dealing E - 911issues that we're with the at Commission. As some of you may know, at the end of last year we actually began a new proceeding looking at expanding the scope of the E-911 requirements. Currently, wired line services and wireless services comply with those requirements. And there

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

are a number of services that came about after that, or just sort of got overlooked in the process, and so we're revisiting those issues at this time.

Just for everybody's benefit, Enhanced 911
Service allows Public Safety answering points to
automatically receive caller's phone numbers and
location information. Enhanced 911 provides critical
information to the PSAP that they may not otherwise be
able to get.

In the item that we adopted at the end of last year, the Commission proposed using specific criteria to determine whether a particular service or device should be required to provide consumers with Enhanced 911 capabilities. Those criteria sought to base the decision on whether the service or device offered real time two-way voice services interconnected to the public switch network on either stand-alone basis, or packaged with other telecommunication services, whether the consumers of those services or devices had a reasonable expectation of having access to 911 service, whether the service competed with traditional CMRS service or with the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

wireline local exchange services, and whether or not it was technologically or operationally feasible for those services to provide 911 service.

What I'll do now is just run through a list of those services and sort of what we thought we would ask about them. Mobile Satellite Services was the first issue teed up. The Commission has been considering Mobile Satellite Service and the need to comply with 911 for some time now.

Mobile Satellite systems, by their nature, fewer local interconnection points have than terrestrial wireless systems. This technological difference affects the ability of Mobile Satellite Service providers to both locate callers, and to route their emergency calls to the appropriate PSAP. The item, therefore, sought comment on whether or maybe these services would be better served by using call centers that could then find the local PSAP and route the call there. The item also sought additional information on other enhancements to E-911, that maybe Mobile Satellites could benefit from in their implementation.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

The next issue we sought comment on was Telematic Service. Some Telematic Service providers offer their customers the ability to place a 911 call directly if they subscribe to a resold CMRS service, or they offer it through a hot button which is - for those of you who may not know, this is sort of like an On-Star or ATX is another provider of these services, and you sort of hit a button and it goes to an emergency call center.

If the hot button is used, the request is sent first to an advisor at the Telematics Call Center, who then forwards the call to the appropriate PSAP. The hot button approach may actually have certain benefits, as well as draw-backs, and the item, therefore, sought comment on whether we should craft our rules to take account of this option.

The item next looked at multi-line telephone systems which have been around for a long time. Multi-line systems include things such as PBXs. Multi-line systems present a challenge in delivering accurate call-back and location information, because the systems may not assign a unique telephone number

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

to the outbound call, and because the system itself may not be located at the same physical location as the caller.

Some states have adopted rules to address these issues, so the further notice sought comment on whether -- on what the appropriate role for the Commission is in this matter in light of such state action.

Next the item looked at resellers, prepaid calling, and disposable phones. There we are looking at more of an explicit obligation issue. Currently, the underlying facilities-based licensee has a requirement to comply with our rules. And what we sought comment on there is whether we should put a more explicit obligation on the resellers.

There's also a service known as Automated Maritime Telecommunication Systems. These have traditionally been ship-to-ship and ship-to-shore systems. The Commission relaxed its rules and allows those folks to now offer voice services that connect with the public switch network, so we sought comment on whether, to the extent that they do connect to the

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

public switch network, if they should have an E-911 obligation.

And then finally, sort of the catchall category, we looked at emerging services and devices. Among these, you know, you can think of things such as voice-over IP. And there we sought, you know, information on -- really it's more like information on what the potential for any of these such devices or services were to provide 911 service, and also what the expectation of consumers might be in using these services. And so that's sort of where we are in the E-911 proceeding. Comments have been filed, so unfortunately we can't say too much at this point. We are reviewing it, and we hope to do something soon in those regards.

What I'd like to do is maybe take questions on both of these things at the end; that way, it kind of gets me out of this position that I don't like. So next, the hearing aid compatibility proceeding that we did yesterday.

Yesterday the Commission adopted a report and order requiring wireless manufacturers and service

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

providers to make digital wireless phones accessible to the more than 6 million individuals with hearing disabilities that use hearing aids.

Approximately one in ten Americans, about 28 million, have some level of hearing loss, and this proportion increases to one in three among the population over age 65. As the median age of the population continues to rise, the proportion of Americans with hearing loss will likely increase.

As many of you probably know, hearing aids operate in two modes, acoustic coupling which allows the microphone to receive and amplify sound, and then there's telecoil coupling, which allows the user to avoid unwanted ambient noise by turning off microphone and receiving only magnetic fields generated by telecoil compatible phones. In the U.S., approximately 25 to 30 percent of all hearing aids contain telecoils, which generally are used individuals with most profound hearing loss.

In 1998, Congress passed the Hearing Aid Compatibility Act, and required the Commission to make all essential phones hearing aid compatible. However,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the statute exempted certain categories of telephones from these requirements; one of those was wireless phones.

The Commission, based on a petition and the statute itself, began its review of the exemption for wireless phones, and through the record that we developed there, we found that the statutory requirements for lifting the exemption on wireless phones has been met.

Specifically, the Commission found that continuing the exemption would have an adverse effect on individuals with hearing disabilities, and removing the exemption is in the public interest. In addition, it found that it was both technologically feasible to require compliance, and that the compliance would not increase cost to such an extent that phones could not be successfully marketed. As a result, the order modifies the exemption to impose certain requirements on digital wireless phone manufacturers and service providers.

The item requires digital phone manufacturers and service providers to take steps to

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

reduce the amount of interference emitted from the digital wireless phones, and to provide the internal capability for telecoil coupling.

Specifically, phones subject to the rules must comply with certain performance levels specified in a technical standard established by the American National Standards Institute, known as ANSI C-6319. Under that standard, covered phones must provide reduced radio frequency or RF emissions, sufficient to meet a U-3 rating, and telecoil coupling sufficient to meeting a U-3T rating.

These requirements do not go into effect immediately, recognizing that manufacturers have design cycles that they need to work through, and so what we've required is that within two years, each digital wireless phone manufacturer and service provider must make available at least two handsets that comply with the ANSI standard for interference. That's the U-3 rating, with a carve-out on the tier one or nationwide carriers, Sprint, Verizon, those folks. They will be required to provide two models or 25 percent of the total number of models offered in a

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

given market. I know this is a little bit confusing.

It will be clear in the order.

Within three years, each manufacturer and service provider must make available at least two phones for each air interface that it offers, that provides telecoil coupling at the U-3T rating under the ANSI standard.

To ensure consumers' continued accessibility and a range of product options, the item does three other things. First, by February 18th, 2008, which is when the Analog Sunset Order takes effect, 50 percent of all digital wireless phone models offered by manufacturers or carriers must be compliant with the acoustic coupling or the u-3 rating.

Second, the item encourages manufacturers and providers to offer at least one compliant handset that's lowered price, and one that has sort of the higher end features, that are becoming available.

And third, the item applies the requirement across all air interfaces offered in order to further expand the service options available to

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

individuals with hearing disabilities.

2.1

The order also adopts what's called a notice requirement, which is a carve- out to try to address the concerns of smaller providers and smaller manufacturers, or those with just a smaller presence in the U.S. market. There, if you're a manufacturer or service provider offering two or fewer handsets in a given market, you will be exempt from the requirements that we have adopted. Those who offer three models, they'll have to offer at least one compliant handset. And those who offer four or more will be required to meet the requirements.

So the consumers will get the information that they need to make an informed decision, manufacturers will be required to label both the packages that the phones come in, as well as put an explanation in the manual, or through a product insert. And to facilitate the matching, the item encourages hearing aid manufacturers to label their products, their pre-customized products according to the ANSI standard for hearing aids.

Finally, the Commission will engage in a

NEAL R. GROSS

comprehensive targeted outreach campaign in coordination with the FDA to ensure that individuals with hearing disabilities are informed of the actions taken in this order, and the availability of hearing aid compatible digital wireless phones.

And so with that, I'll open up the floor to any questions anyone might have.

CHAIR ROOKER: All right. Joe. Be sure that you put your hand up again when Joe is about finished so that the people with the microphone - and identify yourself when you start to speak, if you would, please.

Hi. I'm Joe MR. GORDON: Gordon, for Hard of Hearing. League And Ι quess Ι congratulate you on this big first step of many steps. You just mentioned that dissemination of information about the accessibility of the hearing aid compatible phones will be made to medical community and to schools, and you also say to groups and associations representing individuals with hearing disabilities, and to audiologists. Can you briefly tell me how you -- do you have any -- what your plans are in informing

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

the organizations that represent hard of hearing people that wear hearing aids and audiologists. Thank you.

MR. GUICE: Yes. What we've done is, our Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau is actually going to do a targeted mailing, where they have information that they're going to disseminate to those groups so that they can get it to their members.

In addition, I'd mention that CTIA has posted on its website an area where folks could go to see some of these phones that are going to be compliant with the requirement. Also, the Consumer and Governmental Affair Bureau is doing a consumer fact sheet that should be available shortly, detailing sort of these requirements, and we'll be posting that on our website, as well.

The FDA, as we understand, has a list of audiologists, and so we'll be working with them to get a mailing out to those folks, so that when they meet with their customers, they can explain to them that this is something new that's coming about. I'll be a couple of years. And in talking through the

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

proceeding, and talking with the Hearing Aid Industry Association, they indicated that what they would be doing is working with the audiologists, as well, to put questions on the questionnaire so that this question comes up when you're doing your pre-screening.

MR. GORDON: Just one follow-up question.

You mention in the order release that 25 percent of hearing aids in the United States have telecoils.

And, hopefully, this order will increase that 25 percent number, which is extremely low.

MR. GUICE: Right. I know from this proceeding that telecoils are a lot more popular in Europe as far as use, and hopefully, this item will help that. In addition, what we're also encouraged by is wireless manufacturers have indicated to us that there may be better ways of doing telecoil coupling, so the item is actually going to make an allowance for some of that, with the understanding that telecoil is sort of a standard that they need to go to.

MR. GORDON: Thank you.

CHAIR ROOKER: Eugene.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

MR. SEAGRIFF: Hi. Eugene Seagriff representing TIA. Greg, thanks very much for your taking the time to speak with us today, and your informative presentation. And actually, your comments cleared up my question, but my question was generated by the HAC press release.

MR. GUICE: Sure.

MR. SEAGRIFF: And in the bulleted points

MR. SEAGRIFF: And in the bulleted points labeled under "Specifics of Adopted Report and Order", it says that it's required that within two years, at least two HAC compliant handsets with reduced RF emissions - okay. The concept of "HAC compliant" means, has a telecoil and has volume control based on the HAC Act. So by saying "HAC compliant" there, and then just saying with the reduced emissions, implies that you need to have a telecoil at that point, to your point, when in reality it's the three-year point.

MR. GUICE: Right. Yeah, actually --

MR. SEAGRIFF: So when you're looking at that wording --

MR. GUICE: I guess actually what we're using -- there we're using "HAC compliant" to mean

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	something different than our Part-68 requirements,
2	where we're
3	MR. SEAGRIFF: Yeah. And that's going to
4	confuse a lot of people.
5	MR. GUICE: Well, that's a great point.
6	Then we should definitely clear that up.
7	What we're actually doing is the phrase
8	"HAC compliant" in the wireless context is going to
9	refer to a different set of requirements, and that
10	will be the U-3 RF Emission Standard, and the U-3T for
11	telecoil. And as you pointed out, the RF standard
12	comes in in two years, telecoil in three. And I would
13	mention that ANSI's telecoil standard is a little bit
14	higher than the Part-68 requirement, so yeah, that
15	will be thank you for bringing that up.
16	MR. SEAGRIFF: Perhaps a new term is in
17	order than "HAC compliant".
18	MR. GUICE: Yeah. Perhaps we should say
19	WAC or something, wireless
20	CHAIR ROOKER: We have a question here
21	from Susan Mazrui.
22	MS. MAZRUI: Hi. I was wondering how you

came up with the figure for the telecoil, the number of telecoil compatible phones?

Well, in dealing with the MR. GUICE: various interests in the proceeding, the wireless manufacturers, as well as the Consumer Advocacy Groups, I think everybody understood that telecoil is a difficult issue to address. And the HAC specifically requires the Commission to take into account that difficulty through a cost necessarily a cost benefit analysis, but having recognition of the fact that technologies may require us to delay or wait, or lessen a burden. so in looking at the way that the various interests came to us and put information on the record, we felt that two was certainly a requirement that was well And so, I think a number of the within reach. manufacturers should be pleased with that. I know that -- I believe that SHHH, in particular, in an ex the Commission, mentioned parte filing to telecoil was going to be a difficult issue. realize that it would probably need to different glide path than the RF Emission issue.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

so what we tried to do in the order is recognize that, so that we can ensure choice.

And, you know, what may get lost -- two sounds to some like a small number, but if you're a service provider and you offer four different manufacturer's handsets, potentially you would have eight offerings that you could make to the individuals with hearing disabilities. So this is real choice, even though the number itself my seem a little low to other folks.

MS. MAZRUI: If I can comment back, I would say from the number of users -- I mean, certainly we want to serve our customers, including customers with hearing loss, but I would say the number would seem high when you look at the actual number of users compared to the total population. Although we certainly understand the need and the desire to provide choices.

MR. GUICE: And I would say to that, I think that in the wireline context, every single phone is telecoil compatible. There's nothing necessarily that the telecoil compatibility does that would affect

2.1

1	a person who doesn't use the telecoil, or just regular
2	hearing individuals from using that exact same phone.
3	And granted, there are some technological challenges
4	in putting this into such a small device and one that
5	operates in sort of an environment that's very
6	different than a wireline environment. But what I
7	would say is that while 25 to 30 percent of hearing
8	aids are equipped with telecoil and a smaller number
9	of those people actually use the telecoil, I think
10	what we're striving at is really getting customer
11	choice. And, you know, for hearing individuals, we
12	have one manufacturer that offers us 45 choices, so
13	I'm not sure that two is necessarily a bad benchmark.
14	CHAIR ROOKER: Do we have any other
15	questions for Greg? If not, Greg, thank you so much
16	for your time. We really appreciate your being here.
17	MR. GUICE: Thank you.
18	CHAIR ROOKER: Scott Marshall would like
19	to make an announcement.
20	MR. MARSHALL: Very quickly, you have a
21	lot of material in your packets, some of which was

mentioned by Dane this morning. We have that material

available on floppy, as well as CD disks, so we want to be sure we get that to the people that need the electronic versions.

In addition, the press release on the Hearing Aid Compatibility issue, as well the Consumer Alert are in your packet, as well as off-the-press fresh, just newly minted handout on And finally, as you probably know, broadband. invite people from the public to submit comments to the committee on issues on our agenda. from the includes some material National packet Emergency Numbering Association regarding the E-911 And we have a version of that on disk, as well. Thanks.

CHAIR ROOKER: Thank you very much, Scott.

This next subject, the Telephone Relay Service update we're going to be talking about next, should provide excellent background for the working group on this subject. And in fact, it's important that you realize that the Commission has asked this committee for recommendations on TRS. And what we'd like to see happen is that the group, the working

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

group, which is headed by Brenda Kelly Frey, make recommendations for action by the Full Committee at our November meeting.

We've been asked to provide comments regarding the outreach provisions of the order; that is publicizing the order to users of the service, making the public aware of it and, of course, how to pay for it. That's a big question.

Joining us this morning to discuss this important issue is Tom Chandler. He's the Chief of the Disability Rights Office with the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau. Tom, welcome to CAC.

MR. CHANDLER: Well, good morning. It's a pleasure to be invited here again to give you update on our recent TRS orders. I see a lot of familiar faces here, even though I've sort of run in a little late. In the almost one year that I've been working in the Disability Rights Office, it's certainly been a great pleasure to get to know many of you, and talk to many of you, and discuss all the issues that are relevant to the important work that we do.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

I think as you can tell, we've had a very busy several months. Hopefully, some of you don't think we've been too busy in the last month or so. And this morning, I'd like to briefly talk about two of the TRS items that we have released in the last and that would be the second improved TRS month, Report and Order, and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking that was released on June 17th, and the TRS Cost Recovery Order setting forth these permanent reimbursement rates for TRS that was released on June 30th.

By way of a little bit of background, which may be unnecessary, but I'll say it anyway. Obviously, one of the major regulatory activities with which the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau and the Disability Rights Office is involved is TRS. I know most of you -- many of you are very knowledgeable about the subject, some of you that might be new to the committee may be less so, so let me just make a few brief pointers.

TRS, or the Telecommunications Relay Services allows persons with hearing and speech

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

disabilities to communicate by telephone with persons without such disabilities. This is done through a communications assistant or CA, who is in a sense a middle person, who's in the middle of the call between the two parties. And on a typical call, the CA receives text typed, for example, by a person with hearing disabilities on a TTY. The CA in the middle voices that text to the hearing person, and listens to what the hearing person says, and types that back to the person with the hearing disability. And that way, you have a two-way conversation with the CA in the middle.

TRS was enacted as part of Title IV of the Americans with Disabilities Act in 1990. Pursuant to the Act, the Commission issued regulations that provided for the nationwide roll-out of TRS in July of 1993. And you don't have to be a math major to figure out that that means we're coming up on the 10th anniversary of TRS which is, in fact, later this month - or at least the 10th anniversary of its availability on a uniform nationwide basis under our regulations. So I think that's a milestone that we can all be proud

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

about.

2.1

In enacting Title IV, Congress obviously recognized that persons with speech and hearing disabilities have long experienced various barriers to telecommunication services. And, therefore, the intent of the Act was to further the broader goal of universal service by providing to persons with hearing and speech disabilities functionally equivalent telephone service. And that's sort of the mantra throughout the Act, and the regulations.

And I always, at this point, digress a little bit just to emphasize, because maybe given my background as a Civil Rights attorney, broader-based, the Title IV and the whole TRS program is part of the Americans with Disabilities Act, which is really a very broad act to end discrimination based on disability generally throughout the country. So you have Title I, that covers employment situations. Title II, which covers discrimination by states and local governments in terms of access. And Title III, which covers public accommodations, which ironically are private entities, such as hotels, restaurants,

NEAL R. GROSS

movie theaters, stores and things like that. And then Title IV is the Telecommunications Relay Services, and the Telecom. So I think it's always important to step back every once in a while and realize that Section 225, and what we do in TRS is really part of this much broader Act.

If you read the legislative history, they talk about the importance of access and barriers to telecommunications in the same breath that they talk about the barriers to employment, access to facilities, access to businesses, movie theaters, et cetera.

Since 1990 or 1983 - I see I have a typo in my own speech - no, 1993. I don't have a typo in my own speech. I have a typo in my brain. TRS obviously originally started out what we now call traditional TRS, which was a TTY or similar device, typing it through the phone lines, going to the other party. Now we obviously have expanded that, and we have other types of TRS, including IP Relay, Internet Protocol, and Video Relay Service. And, of course, all of the action of late has really been in these

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

other Internet-based services, IP Relay and BRS. That has made our work both exciting and a challenge, and has raised a lot of interesting issues for a lot of reasons; in part, because you don't necessarily know the geographic location of one leg of the call when it's through the Internet, so it makes the whole intrastate/interstate paradigm on which much of the TRS program is based difficult to figure out. So that's an ongoing challenge.

How wide-spread has the use of TRS been? Well, my number crunchers tell me that for 2002 and 2003, throughout the various forms of TRS, consumers have used almost 40 million minutes of interstate TRS alone, which equals again if you're a math major, which I obviously am not, given I can't even read my own numbers earlier, 27,550 days or over 75 years worth of communication.

With that background, let me turn to these orders. On June 17th, of course as you now know, we released the Second Improved TRS Order, and the NPRM that went along with it. To briefly summarize the meat of this order, we first required several new

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

types of TRS calls, that they be provided on intrastate and interstate basis, including things that a year ago I didn't know what they were, like two-line voice carryover, two-line hearing carryover, HCO-to-HCO, VCO-to-VCO, and various other permutations. That's all set forth in the order. Most of these things were being provided already, but there are a lot of different forms and spin-offs on sort of the traditional TRS type of call.

Second of all, we clarified that providers may use any preferred technology that complies or facilitates meeting our mandatory minimum standards, including SS-7 technology, which is sort of this parallel network out there that's used for transmitting call data, and billing information, and ties into providing Caller ID and other services. There was some ambiguity out of our previous orders as to the ability to use SS-7 and things like that.

In addition, we clarified that in the important area of Emergency TRS Calls, that they be routed to the appropriate Public Safety Answering Point, PSAP, instead of the nearest PSAP, because the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

appropriate one is not always geographically the nearest. And we also concluded that 711, the sort of universal three digit dialing access to get to a TRS Center would also be the access number for speech-to-speech, so we would keep having one number that everyone could remember, that could get them access to any of the types of TRS services.

And finally, we required a bunch of new features, again sort of like the other types of TRS. Most of these have already been provided, things like call release where you can through a CA to connect what actually ends up being a TTY-to-TTY call. But if you're trying to reach somebody and you have to go through a hotel switchboard or something like that, the CA can set up the call and then drop out of the call. Also, other features like three-way calling, and a speed dialing type of functionality.

Turning to the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, which may or may not seem a little more exciting than the notice itself, first, of major importance is the proposal that TRS facilities be treated like LEC for purposes of the National Security

2.1

Emergency Preparedness Priority Status under Telecommunications Service Priority System, that gobbledy-gook which I can barely read here, really making the very important point that currently LEC facilities are covered by our rules and programs to restore communication services in the event of an emergency, but TRS facilities are not. So in the post-911 world that we are unfortunately stuck with, it seems to us extremely important that those who use TRS have the same access to have their telecommunications service restored that the hearing world does in terms of the LEC facilities, so we put the TRS facilities on the same footing as the LEC facilities.

We also seek comment on a bunch of other matters, such as the encryption of IP Relay calls for security purposes, how 711 emergency calls should be handled over wireless devices. There's obviously a big difference between making wireline versus wireless calls. With the wireless call, there's obviously no necessary correlation between where the person is making the call, and what the phone number is on the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

phone that may suggest where it is. So if I take my Virginia cell phone and make a call from California, and it's a 911 call, they may think I'm in Virginia, when really I'm in California, so that presents additional challenges.

Also, we asked about our Call Setup Rules, and whether they should be sort of specified for the various types of non-traditional TRS calls, such as two-line, HCO, speech-to-speech. Instead of having one rule that applies to all the various types of TRS, whether they should be made more specific.

And finally, asked about other we important matter, which is eligibility of providers to from receive payment the Interstate TRS Fund. Currently under the rules, the rules certify state programs, but there's nothing to certify providers, so especially with the advent of VRS and new companies coming out and wanting to offer VRS, there's some confusion about how they can do that, and be eligible to be reimbursed for their cost from the Interstate TRS Fund, so we have raised an issue regarding that.

I think that is one of those issues,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

obviously, where the regs have not kept pace with the technology. And as new things like VRS has come out, I think the regulations just didn't contemplate that, and there might be non-telephone companies coming out wanting to offer the service, and they really have no place to go in terms of being "certified", because there's nothing in the regs about us doing that.

And finally, in the NPRM is the matter of outreach. And I know that was mentioned earlier, and as was noted earlier, outreach is a matter that we specifically are seeking your assistance on that. And we also realize it's an issue of great importance.

Stepping back for a minute in the report and order itself, also addresses outreach because that issue was raised in the 2000 TRS order. But we concluded in the report and order that given that the record contained conflicting views about matters relating to outreach, that we really needed to seek additional comments on that. And, therefore, we pushed the issue to the NPRM.

And so in the order, in the NPRM, we asked for data and other information on what types of

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

outreach mechanisms may work, who can play what role in outreach? For example, you have the states, you have the providers, you have the Commission. And then, of course you also have the important point of who would fund the outreach, and what should the role of the federal funding be for that.

should note and remind us all about outreach, that the rules do already require that the providers take outreach steps to inform and educate the public about TRS, and that some of these costs are submitted by the providers in taking into account and determining the reimbursement rates, the permanent reimbursement rates. But I think we're all aware that there's been some consensus for several years now, that whatever outreach is out there has not been enough, and there's been some interest in really beefing that up, and even having some kind of national So that is back on the table, and again, we program. note that we're specifically asking you guys, the committee, to address this issue and make recommendations the Commission. to ΜV understanding, of course, now that there's already a

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

working group on this, and that's going to happen. So we're happy about that, and excited about that, and really do look forward to hearing your recommendations on this very important issue, and a difficult one in terms of legal and other matters in terms of the role of the FCC, and the Interstate TRS Fund, et cetera.

Let me note also with regard to this order that shortly it's going to be published in the Federal Register, and then the public will be able to file comments within 30 days, and then there'll be a reply comment period, so we're anxious to obviously have all interested parties weigh-in on all of these issues. again of these issues, like the emergency situation and the status of TRS centers, as well as outreach, as well as the certification process for providers seeking money from the Interstate Fund. They're really very important issues, are new issues, and we're anxious and interested to hear what people have to say about those.

Very briefly, let me turn to the June 30th order on the TRS Cost Recovery. And although that order, like all of our orders, really speaks for

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

itself, what I really thought I'd mention is the process that goes into coming up with these reimbursement rates for payments out of the Interstate TRS Fund.

On May 1st of each year, NECA, which is the Interstate TRS Fund Administrator, they file a proposal with the Commission, which sets forth their proposed reimbursement rates for the various services.

These rates are based on cost and usage data that they get from the providers. They basically crunch the numbers, and come up with proposed rates.

Our rules require that by June 30th, which is, again if you're a math major, which I really should go back to school probably, on that is only about a 60 day window for the Commission to approve or modify these proposed rates. And the regs specifically say that the Commission is to approve or modify these rates, and our rules also make clear that the rates are intended to compensate the providers for the reasonable and fair costs of providing TRS. accordingly, we review the submission and other data that we may obtain from providers, and also the same

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

data used by NECA. And in this case, we found that some adjustments were in order, so we adjusted the proposed rate, at least with regard to VRS.

And I think with regard to these rates, it's important to remember that this is really an annual exercise, that setting these rates is a process, that the rates necessarily do and have changed from year to year. And that the end gain in this for all of us is to arrive at rates that obviously reflect the reasonable and fair cost of providing these important services.

So in closing, I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to bring you up-to- date on these orders, and thank you for all your good works, both past, present and future on behalf of all consumers, and particularly, on behalf of those who rely on our TRS services. So with that, thank you, and I don't know if there's time for --

CHAIR ROOKER: We only have a couple of minutes, but I can tell you, you will definitely be hearing from us. Do we have questions? Does anyone have questions for him? Yes, Claude.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

MR. STOUT: (Off mic.) Okay. I'll go back and repeat. I'll go back in reverse now. Now I'll hit the play button. Hello, Tom. We, as consumers, want to thank you for the June 17th decision. We applaud the FCC for moving the TRS functionality ahead for us.

as consumers though, do have some We, concerns with the June 30th decision; specifically on the VRS rates. We, as consumers, don't have all of facts together, and we haven't made decision ourselves. Am I right in saying that the FCC did receive recommendations from NECA to approve the VRS reimbursement at like \$14, but the FCC decided against that and decided on \$7.75. But you made that decision based on NECA and other data. You mentioned other data, and so I'm curious what the other data is that you're referring to, other than the recommendations from NECA that you based your decisions on for reimbursement rates for the VRS system.

MR. CHANDLER: Right. You're correct that NECA's May 1st submission, based on their calculations

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

had a rate of 14 some odd dollars, 14 dollars and change for VRS. The information we looked at was not really different information. We got the same underlying cost data that they did, and also, it requested some other supplemental cost data from the various providers.

We looked at that cost data, and made some adjustments to various parts of it because we - this is all spelled out in the order - because we thought that there were some numbers either that didn't make sense, or that might have been improper, so we excluded certain numbers. But we did the same kind of math starting with the same data. We just adjusted it because we thought various parts, it wasn't correct or wasn't clear. And as we've noted, set out an interim rate at this point because we do plan to keep revisiting the data, and look at it further.

Part of it was, of course, the 60-day window didn't give us a lot of time. NECA was very helpful in trying to get us the data, as were the providers. It just was a very short window. And I think as a footnote, and the order makes clear, we

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

invited -- since the providers were understandably interested in keeping their cost data confidential, we had to address the data and the numbers in the aggregate in the order. And as the footnote says, have invited the providers to come in and talk to us individually if they want to see what adjustments we've made on an interim to their cost data. Some of them have taken us up on that, and we're in the process of having those meetings over the next week or two.

CHAIR ROOKER: Tom, thank you so much for giving us -- this subject is, of course, something that we're going to be discussing and working on, so thank you ever so much for being here.

MR. CHANDLER: Thank you.

CHAIR ROOKER: Our next speaker responding to a request by the consumer and outreach working group. They wanted more information on the different kinds of outreach to under-served populations by the FCC. And, of course, what we're going to talk about today, Kris Monteith is the Deputy Bureau Chief of the CGB, and she's going to talk about

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

outreach to Indian Country, but that's only one aspect that this committee is interested in in terms of outreach to under-served populations.

And then following that, while we don't have a working group on addressing Homeland Security and people with disabilities, it is a subject that was discussed with the prior committee just after 9/11, and it may be an area where we want to make recommendations. I think we'll have to see about that, so Kris will follow -- that will be her second discussion.

Please join me in welcoming Kris Monteith. Kris, thank you.

MS. MONTEITH: Good morning. It's nice to see some old friends, and to meet new ones. And I realize -- thank you very much for that introduction, Shirley. I realize that I am the last speaker between you and lunch, so I will try and be brief, but hopefully informative.

On the Tribal Outreach, this is an activity that the Commission has had underway for a number of years. And we are involved in a very

NEAL R. GROSS

wide-ranging, comprehensive effort aimed at fulfilling the mandate that all Americans have access to quality affordable telecommunications services, including Americans that live on reservations, American Indians and Alaska Native Communities.

This effort which we have called our "Indian Telecommunications Initiative", takes several different forms. First, we sponsor regional workshops to provide How-To information on telecommunications services and infrastructure development.

In the past, we have had several big annual conferences to deal with telecommunications issues affecting Native Americans, and what we're doing with our regional workshops is trying to hold on a more frequent basis, a workshop that's smaller, in scope, and specifically aimed perhaps, attracting folks within a particular region of the But hopefully, hands-on country. more and interactive, so we can really get down nitty-gritty of how to do this stuff.

Our regional workshops acknowledge that tribes are at different stages of economic

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

development, and their experience is different and varies. One workshop that we're holding in the very near future, in fact, next Thursday and Friday, will be held in Reno, Nevada, and we're working in cooperation with the Washo Tribe of Nevada and California, to make sure that we address issues that are of concern in that region of the country.

We have a number of folks that will be coming in and speaking, and one of them is here today, Mr. Vernon James; we're delighted to have participating in that workshop, and I hope it will be very successful.

The second kind of activity that we engage in is attending and participating in conferences that are sponsored by other organizations, whether it be the National Congress of American Indians, Tribal Tech Workshops that are held by universities, on occasion. We have participated and look forward to participating with the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians, really getting out there and going conferences of others to try and interact, establish relationships, and get the message out.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

We participated also in the National Summit that was held last September in Phoenix, Arizona, which was a very large conference sponsored by the Department of Interior. And DOI had a number of federal agencies that came, and worked with folks that were in attendance at that conference to address different programs that the federal agencies had underway.

We also meet individually with tribes on a very, you know, one-on-one, person-to-person type of basis. Recently, we met with members of the Tribal Council of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, to discuss that tribe's efforts to increase the quality of service on their reservation. We also toured the San Carlos Apache Telecommunications facilities, and the Gila River Telecommunications facilities to learn more about the challenges that tribally-owned telcos face. And those kinds of tours are just incredible for us to take part in. They're such a valuable learning experience for us, and we very much appreciate the hospitality that was offered to us on those tours, very much.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	The fourth kind of activity that we engage
2	in is distributing educational materials to Native
3	American tribes and organizations. For example, we've
4	done direct mailings on our enhanced lifeline and
5	linkup programs. We put together publications that
6	are very specifically targeted at the Native American
7	population. One we have called, "Expanding
8	Telecommunications Access in Indian Country." Those
9	kinds of direct outreach types of activities are
10	another activity that we have ongoing.
11	So in a nutshell, that just describes some
12	of the types of activities that we engage in as part
13	of our outreach plans and strategy in this particular
14	area. And I'm happy to answer any questions folks may
15	have, or wrap it up and
16	CHAIR ROOKER: Do you want to just go
17	ahead and talk about Homeland Security?
18	MS. MONTEITH: Sure.
19	CHAIR ROOKER: And then we can leave the
20	questions for the end, if that's okay with you.
21	MS. MONTEITH: That's just fine.
22	CHAIR ROOKER: Okay.

MS. MONTEITH: I'll change hats and put on my Homeland Security hat. The Commission's Homeland Security Policy Council was established in November of 2001 in the aftermath of the September 11th events. The Council's mission is three-fold, it's to protect, it's to restore, and to ensure effective communications during a national emergency, whether it a national disaster type of emergency, terrorist attack, or other threat.

Policy The Homeland Security comprises senior staff from the Commission's bureaus and offices. The Director is the FCC Chief of Staff, Each of the bureaus has a senior Marsha McBride. staff representative, and I'm the representative from the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau. The HSPC's work complements the work of the Commission's offices, bureaus and and the Federal Advisorv Committees that the FCC oversees. With respect to Federal Advisory Committees that are sort specifically targeted at homeland security-related matters, have two that we have we recharted in recent years. Two principal Federal

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

Advisory Committees. The first is the Network Reliability and Interoperability Council, NRIC, and the second is the Media Security and Reliability Council. And these committees work to ensure the sustainability of public telecommunications networks, and to sustain and secure broadcast and multi-channel video programming distribution facilities and services respectively. NREC is focused on Network Security, and MSREC is focused on Media Security.

The HSPC also works to coordinate federal policy, the FCC's Policy Initiatives. We worked on a broad range of issues, such as promoting E-911, promoting wireless priority access, promoting telecommunications service priority programs, developing sound spectrum policy, promoting public safety interoperability, and promoting the security of satellites and international telecommunication systems.

Yesterday, Marsha McBride announced that the Commission has undertaken a couple of new programs with respect to Homeland Security. Specifically, we announced the creation of an Office of Homeland

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

Security within the Commission's Enforcement Bureau. The new office will provide consolidated support for the Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness responsibilities, and coordinate again with our two federal advisory committees that are devoted to Homeland Security types of issues, and coordinate with the offices and bureaus, as well as the Homeland Security Policy Council. Jim Daley was named as the Director of that new office.

The second thing that Marsha did yesterday and which has been released now publicly, it's available on our web, is she released, or the Commission released a Homeland Security Action Plan. And as part of that action plan, the Commission identified a number of key objectives or priorities that together the new office and the Homeland Security Policy Council will focus on.

The action items were broadly classified under two main objectives. The first objective is to strengthen measures for protecting the nation's communications infrastructure, and facilitate rapid service restoration after disruption. And the second

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

objective is to promote access to effective communication services by Public Safety, Public Health, and Emergency Personnel.

That second objective included an action item that specifically involves this committee, and I'd like to just briefly, if I could, read the action item to you. It states that, "The Commission shall convene а summit of stakeholders, including Disabilities representatives from the Rights organizations, telecommunications relay centers, the Commission's Consumer Advisory Committee, and local and state government advisory committee, and other governmental entities to identify specific communications issues that confront individuals with disabilities, particularly the hard of hearing and individuals during national emergencies deaf terrorist attacks, and develop a strategy for resolving these issues where possible."

This is an issue that was brought to the Commission's attention, or has been brought to the Commission's attention on a number of occasions by different groups really. You know, Claude has come in

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

and talked to us about this issue. Folks from the Maryland Relay Center and the Virginia Relay Center have come in and talked to us, and so it was something that we thought was very appropriate for inclusion in the newly released action plan.

We look forward to discussing with you, Shirley, and hopefully you can bring it to the committee's attention, just how we might go about working on this action item and bringing it to a successful resolution. I think it's a very important issue, and I might note that it was the first action item listed under that second objective, so I think in the eyes of the Commission it's a very important issue, as well.

Then I think a couple of other sort of Homeland Security related items you've already been briefed on. Tom Chandler just spoke to you about the TRS, NPRM and how that tees up the issue of TRS Centers inclusion in the TSP Program, how we might address that issue. And then yesterday, I just would note too that we adopted the wireless HAC report and order, which takes steps to make sure that there's

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	compatibility between digital wireless phones and
2	those wearing hearing aids, so I think that was an
3	important step too in making sure that during times of
4	national emergencies, we don't forget those that have
5	disabilities.
6	So with that said, I'll make myself
7	available for questions on these issues, or any
8	others. I hear my name was mentioned earlier this
9	morning.
10	CHAIR ROOKER: Yes, we have questions.
11	Joy.
12	MS. RAGSDALE: Good morning. Joy Ragsdale
13	representing NASUCA.
14	MS. MONTEITH: Hi, Joy.
15	MS. RAGSDALE: How are you? Just a few
16	questions in regards to your outreach activities and
17	your personal visits. Do you have any reports that
18	detail the specific concerns of the various tribal
19	members you met with that you can disseminate? We
20	felt we could not make recommendations without knowing
21	the efforts the FCC had already made.

MS. MONTEITH: We have not put together a

comprehensive report per se, but we do have a number of outreach types of materials that talk about, you know, the various activities that we have undertaken. I know our website, we're trying to include materials on our website too, about either past or future outreach activities. But I like the idea of trying to do something perhaps a little bit more detailed.

Sometimes we're talking to individual tribes on, you know, a very specific basis, and I do think that we would want to talk to them about sharing information. Not that it's, you know, a secret, but it's not -- they aren't open to the public types of meetings sometimes. But I think it's a great idea of trying to cross-pollenize and share what activities we're undertaking, what the experiences are so we can all benefit from them.

MS. RAGSDALE: Would it be possible for the individual members of the Consumer Organization - I believe also Susan Mazrui wanted to -- in modernizing the FCC's sub-working group that we've developed to address the Internet access that public the tribal groups have in terms of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

participation. Is it possible that we can meet on an individual basis?

MS. MONTEITH: Yeah. We'd be delighted to sit down with you and brief you. And as I said, I do think it's a good idea. We can look at going back into documents and things that we have done in the past, to the extent they're not fully documented in a public way, and make that information available to you.

CHAIR ROOKER: Vernon.

MR. JAMES: Good morning. Vernon James with the San Carlos Apache Telecommunications Utility, Incorporated. A mouthful, like I said before, we call it SCATCOM.

Just to comment, not specifically questions, but comments. During -- well, since the last meeting, I've thought about the working groups and some of the questions that were going back and forth, and some of the comments being made. I saw the need to address those issues and concerns specifically as it relates to the Native American communities, those entities that have special concerns, special

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

conditions that need to be addressed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

working group with broadband, for example, could not really focus in on conditions that affect Native Americans, as well as rural America, of geographical concerns, because because geo-political jurisdictions, because of the high cost of infrastructure build-out, just a number of factors relate to providing basic telecommunication services in those areas. And as a result, I would like to recommend to this group that a working group specifically on rural America and Native Americans be formulated to address these concerns. Or if that is impossible because there is an existing committee, that a subcommittee be formulated to address this issue.

CHAIR ROOKER: Excellent comment, Vernon.

I'll have to check and see what we have in terms of

-- we have a lot of working groups, and we'll talk

about that. We'll discuss it with you. Thank you

very much, very pertinent comments.

Do we have other questions? Yes, Joy.

Joy chairs the Consumer Outreach Complaints, Education

NEAL R. GROSS

and Participation Working Group.

2.1

MS. RAGSDALE: Thank you. Just a question on the Homeland Security. Are there consumer fact sheets available that indicates what telephone or telecommunications services will not be available to the consumer on an emergency basis. The day of the 9/11 tragedy, of course, all cell phones were inactive, and families were trying to reach -- and we only new our cell phone would not be available because of people with military experience. But on a general background, is that information known to the public?

MS. MONTEITH: We do have a fact sheet that's called "Communicating During Emergencies", and it does cover really very general, but very important information about how to communicate during an emergency, and what some of the reliability issues are during an emergency. So it's very tip-oriented, you know, trying to give consumers tips on what to do in an emergency, and I'm happy to make that available to you.

CHAIR ROOKER: Maybe we can make that available to the entire committee.

NEAL R. GROSS

1 MS. MONTEITH: Yes. 2 CHAIR ROOKER: We could do that if we're 3 doing a mailing, or is it on-line? Can we transmit it electronically? 4 5 MS. MONTEITH: It is on-line. Yes. 6 CHAIR ROOKER: Okay. 7 We also put together a MS. MONTEITH: package of information, and it -- we just did a, 8 9 unfortunately, somewhat of a limited publication for yesterday's meeting, but we have put together 10 11 package of Homeland Security related materials that we 12 also are happy to make available to this committee. 13 CHAIR ROOKER: Do we have other questions 14 for Kris? Yes, Brenda. 15 MS. FREY: Brenda Kelly Frey, representing the Relay. Kris, first of all, I want to thank you 16 17 very much for taking your time to meet with both 18 Clayton Vellen and myself, and Pam Stewart on this very important issue regarding Homeland Security and 19 20 how it applies to TRS. I just wanted to assure you 2.1 that we're there ready, willing and able to roll up

our sleeves and assist in any way we possibly can, and

that our working group will be addressing this issue 1 2 shortly with you additionally. Okay? 3 MS. MONTEITH: That's great. Thank you so 4 much. 5 MS. FREY: Thank you. 6 CHAIR ROOKER: Do we have any other 7 Well, Kris, thank you so much for being questions? with us and bringing us a very informative discussion 8 9 this morning. It's very important subjects for us. 10 Thank you very, very much. 11 MS. MONTEITH: Absolutely. Thank you. 12 CHAIR ROOKER: We are very pleased that 13 Commissioner Martin has joined us. Commissioner 14 Martin, welcome. It's nice to see you. The 15 Commission has been so busy that we're honored to have so many people coming in and visiting with us this 16 17 morning. You all have been really working. 18 COMMISSIONER MARTIN: Yes, we have been 19 very busy, and I just wanted to come by and thank you 20 all for all of your work, and say I'm sorry that I 2.1 missed getting the chance to come by and see you all

at your first meeting, your last meeting, and wanted

to make sure I had the chance to introduce myself, although most of you, or a lot of you at least I've met before. And tell you that how important I think the work is, and how I hope that we'll be able to continue to work together, and I'm anxious to get to spend a little more time with you at some time in the future at some of your other meetings. So I just wanted to make sure I had the chance to come by and say hi.

CHAIR ROOKER: Well, thank you so much. We appreciate that. You'll be hearing from all of us, I'm sure.

COMMISSIONER MARTIN: I'm sure. I'm confident. Okay. I mean, I'm happy to actually also — if anybody has any particular questions about anything, I'm happy to try to answer, but I'm sure you'll get better answers from some of the other folks who are here with some of the other expertise. But I'happy to engage in a dialogue, and you guys were getting ready to take a break, as well, so I was going to try to interact with you, and see if you guys wanted to talk about a few issues that way, as well.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	CHAIR ROOKER: Okay. Well, does anyone
2	have any questions? We have a few minutes. Anyone
3	have questions for Commissioner Martin? They're
4	hungry.
5	COMMISSIONER MARTIN: I don't blame them.
6	Okay.
7	CHAIR ROOKER: Well, thank you very, very
8	much. We really appreciate your taking the time to
9	come in. We'll be looking forward to talk with you
10	again. Thank you.
1	COMMISSIONER MARTIN: Thank you.
L2	CHAIR ROOKER: You're welcome to join us
13	for lunch. It promises to be delicious.
L 4	Just a couple of things that I have to say
15	to you. I really would like to say that this has been
16	a really extraordinary morning. And thank you again,
L7	Scott, for all the work in putting this together, and
18	for all the people here who have given their time to
19	us this morning.
20	We're going to just have until noon. I
21	want you back at the table. You can pick up your
22	lunch, because we're going to have a former committee

1	member here to make a presentation on accessible
2	wireless phones for the blind. Paul Schroeder, who's
3	really been on the cutting edge of this technology is
4	going to be here at 12:00. I don't think you're going
5	to want to miss this presentation, so I encourage you
6	very strongly be back at the table, or you'll have me
7	yelling at you. So anyway, let's take our lunch.
8	For those of you who are members of the
9	public and not a member of the committee, I'll have to
10	let Scott tell you where you can go to find lunch.
11	MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Shirley. We
12	have food service available on the courtyard level of
13	our building, which is one level up from this floor.
14	Enjoy.
15	CHAIR ROOKER: Okay. Thank you. We'll
16	see you back here at noon.
17	(Whereupon, the proceedings in the
18	above-entitled matter went off the record at 11:44
19	a.m. and went back on the record at 12:10 p.m.)
20	CHAIR ROOKER: Paul Schroeder is with the
21	American Foundation for the Blind, and he was a valued
22	member of our committee for two years, and we're so

pleased to welcome him back. Paul, thank you for being here.

MR. SCHROEDER: Hi. Thanks so much for the invitation to come back. It's nice to be back here and have even less to do than I did when I was here before as a member of the committee. Thank you very much, nice to be able to present to you.

I want to talk a little bit about the issue of cell phones for people who are blind or visually impaired. I actually do have something I want to demonstrate. It's essential when you demonstrate technology that it be relatively unstable and relatively new in your hands, and so you're not really familiar with it, so it makes the demonstration kind of fun because you never know what's going to happen. It's a lot like getting married or something. And this is my first time with the cell phone, and I've only been married once, so there you go.

I'm not sure what that says, but in short, we have from the blindness community been very frustrated at a couple of things. And I'm not going to spend a lot of time - in fact, I won't spend any

2.1

time doing any finger pointing, but I do want you to understand the level of frustration among people who are blind or visually impaired with the lack of discernible. And I'm somewhat careful in saying discernible progress, because people -- you know, there are things happening below the surface and scenes, but the lack of discernible behind the progress in accessible cell phones that meet the needs of people who are blind or visually impaired.

I would argue that if one were to go to almost any -- well, any service provider store and any other consumer product store to buy a cell phone, and ask about something basic like can I gain access independently to the menu systems, can I gain access independently to setting up my own phone book, you would be told no if you are blind or visually impaired, because all of those things depend to one degree or another on being able to see the screen of the phone.

I'm going to assume that virtually everyone, if not everyone here has a cell phone. I'm going to assume that with a couple of exceptions of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

folks in the audience, you have never operated your cell phone without the screen working, or never just for fun covered up your screen to see what you could do with the cell phone. So tell you what, after the presentation, why don't you try that, maybe duct tape over the screen of your phone, but put something under the duct tape so you don't tear your screen off when you take the tape off.

I know you just talked about Homeland Security, so duct tape seems like an appropriate segue. Duct tape a business card over the screen of your phone and then trying running it and see how you do. That's the mode in which people who are blind or visually impaired are now operating.

What Ι often tell my friends and colleagues is the words that we've gotten to know the best when it comes to the cell phone world are the three words "with sighted assistance", because almost always the case that except for the simple act of turning on and off, and maybe dialing a phone number, virtually nothing can be performed on a cell phone by a blind person, except with

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

assistance.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

To try to figure out what's going on in this situation and why we haven't seen the progress that we thought we might since the rules came out in late `99, and became effective, I gather, of January 2000, so we've had three and a half years. We decided to take a look at cell phones in more detail, try to look at the platforms that are used, try to discover the chip sets that are used, to look at things like battery capacity to the extent that we could understand all of these items. Now you have to be aware of the fact that we are not cell phone engineers at the American Foundation for the Blind, and we are not individuals who are particularly expert in the operating systems of cell phones, so I don't want to even pretend out the outset that this is an expertise that we have.

We did employ a consultant who's with us today, and if I run into trouble, it's the job of the consultants to bail me out, among other things. So Caesar Equisadi, who is with us today, has done a marvelous job of trying to help us understand better

NEAL R. GROSS

what's happening inside of a cell phone, and why we maybe haven't seen particular progress in accessibility. Or turn it around, to understand where, in fact, we might be able to help influence and drive accessibility forward by working more closely with the cell phone industry.

began this effort last fall with And again, I would say that this really came out of frustration, because what we heard a lot from phone manufacturers, and to one degree another, from many cell phone service providers, is that the kinds of things that you need as blind or visually impaired people simply can't be done yet. And we didn't think that sat very well with the good old, you know, efforts of industry that usually like to solve problems rather than throw them out. So we decided maybe we ought to try to learn a little bit more ourselves so that we can have a more intelligent conversation about exactly what can be done, or why it can't be done.

What is it that blind folks want? I have brought copies of an article with me. I've asked if

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

we could make a couple of additional print copies, because the committee got a little larger than I thought it was, and so we're going to have those copies available afterward.

This is an article that appeared in this current issue of "Access World", a magazine published by the American Foundation for the Blind. And it is a review of three cell phones. It's not critical why we picked those particular three cell phones. But what is interesting, I think, is to look through the article and get a sense of the kinds of needs that we were reviewing these cell phones for, whether they met particular needs of blind users. And also, to get a sense of where the problems seem to be. We also include in that article a bit of summary from a previous article on another cell phone from a previous edition of "Access World."

The kinds of things that people who are blind want, I think are not particularly unique. They're exactly what, of course, anyone would want. The ability to be able to actually use the phone. Well, that seems somewhat elemental, but that is, in

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

fact, what we want. Well, how do we spec out what that actually means?

First of all, of course, that means we have to be able to discern principally by touch, but also for those of us with some useable vision, it's helpful to have visual cues. We have to discern what key is which, is which key is what. In other words, we have to be able to find the keys on the phone. We have to be able to distinguish them from each other, and have some idea of their function.

And as you all know, if you reviewed at all the rules that implement Section 255, and the Accessibility Requirements that were incorporated in those rules from the Access Board, there is a requirement that keys be tactfully identifiable.

Unfortunately, we have found that the state-of-the-art is mixed in that regard. And to some degree, the state-of-the-art has actually gotten worse in terms of keys being identifiable. So along with duct taping a card over your screen, the other thing I'd suggest is that you hold your phone behind your back and try to find which key is which, and see if

2.1

you can distinguish them. I suspect that -- now for the blind folks you might actually do this because you've already probably optimized your choices of cell phones. But I'm guessing you sighted folks are going to be kind of lost with many of your phones because the keys have gotten to be very close together. They've gotten to be very flat. Somebody described them almost like terra cotta tiles or something. I imagine they look good, but the functionality has declined some.

The second principal thing, of course, is we need to be able to get the information off of the screen. Cell phones are obviously very screen dependent, very visual display dependent in terms of their functions, and so it's important for people who are blind to be able to know what's on the screen.

Obviously, there are two things that are important to do. The first and principal one is to make sure that that visual information is available in another mode, the most obvious and really the only workable one for the moment is an auditory mode. In other words, the information on the screen has to be

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

able to be spoken by the phone, as well, so that a blind person can navigate it.

The other access point to cover, of course, with the screen is that the visual display be as customizable as possible for somebody with some usable vision so that, in fact they can rearrange information on the screen, make certain words and icons larger so that they can, in fact, have the most opportunity to see that screen with its limited space. And we recognize that cell phone screens are very limited. Those would be the principal items.

Now those sound simple enough, but they have proven to be extraordinarily difficult. I've already gone on a little bit about the key design, and it seems to me that we're -- what we thought was relatively straightforward apparently is not as straightforward as we thought, or we have not been able to have the right kind of dialogue with industry on key design. So hopefully, that's something that can happen.

One of the elements, as you know, is to have a nib on the center of the five key. It's a nice

2.1

orientation device to the key middle of your phone dial, if you will. And even that has proven to be somewhat challenging as we find phones. I bet if you look at your phone, many of you will have nibs around the key. Some of you will have a nib on the key but it's on the corner of the key, so it might even be hard to tell which key it actually is associated with. And then in a couple of instances, we're actually familiar with companies that have painted nibs on their key, which I have to at least give an award for creativity, if not for functionality. So hopefully, we'll start to see some improvement in those areas, as well.

And it is interesting, because as I start to talk to sighted people about this, many times sighted folks have the same gripes, but they don't recognize that they have any opportunity to really do anything about it. They don't like their key design that much either, because they find it very difficult to dial their phone when they can't look at it, even though they are in instances where they're not supposed to be looking at their phone.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

Okay. As for the screen information, how
to get that out in audio form has proven to be a bit
of a challenge, as well. We've had some discussions
with folks in the industry about the right approach to
do that, and for us, from our standpoint, the only way
to really do that for the foreseeable future is
through synthetic text to speech. Now this is a type
of access that's been operating in the computer that
blind people have been using to access computers for a
long time. And I think for a while, the cell phone
industry argued - it may be right, it may be wrong, I
don't know - that, in fact, the phones the phones,
of course, are not computers. That's true, but they
do function in many ways, and in fact are beginning to
look increasingly inside like computers in the way the
chipsets are structured, and the way there's operating
systems on the phone. So for a while, the industry
argued that text speech simply couldn't be
accommodated, both for battery strength reasons and
for memory capacity reasons, and for reasons having to
do with the way the phone interface is actually
designed.

NEAL R. GROSS

That may or may not be true, but certainly
over the last year what we have discovered is that's
become less true, as we've begun to examine phones and
realize a couple of three things really that are
key. One is that the memory has expanded greatly, so
there's a lot more capacity on even the lower end cell
phones. The second thing is, phones are incorporating
operating systems, so there's much more management
capability within the phone for the software that
needs to run. And, obviously, one of the reasons for
this is that there's a strong interest in having
downloadable applications on phones. The third thing
is that the text-to-speech engines that we would need
in order to provide access through synthetic speech to
the text on a screen have gotten to be smaller in
terms of their footprint and their demands on memory.
And so all of those things combined have led us to
the conclusion that certainly we now should be able to
have a much better dialogue with industry about how to
bring accessibility into the marketplace.

In the process of doing some of this research, we discovered a couple of things. One is,

NEAL R. GROSS

we discovered that there is a phone in Japan that actually has text-to-speech, interestingly enough available, but the Japanese do not have a law that requires accessibility, so we thought this was kind of an interesting thing to discover.

We then found shortly thereafter, that there was a couple of things happening in Europe with respect to text-to-speech. One is in the high end PDA and cell phone area where software has now been successfully loaded, and is now being sold and distributed, in fact, here in the U.S., as well as in Europe on a high end PDA-type cell phone with software that makes the phone talk.

We also discovered though that there was a company in Europe making software available on lower capacity phones, or phones that are not PDA and cell phones together. And that, in fact, they were taking advantage of exactly the things I talked about, the increased memory on the phone, the operating systems of the phone, and loading this relatively small footprint from text-to-speech software.

That's the phone that we actually have

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

here. This is a Nokia 3650 phone. I'm not commending this phone, certainly not for blind folks. It has a really funky dial. The buttons are in a circle rather than in the old three by four grid that we've all gotten kind of used to. It's sort of harkening -- I guess it's sort of techno retro in that it's going back to the old dial phones, I quess, but it is cute, and it certainly does get attention when you pull this phone out and show it to people. This phone has a talking feature built in. I will acknowledge to you early-on that this is a demo that I have in my hand, and it's one that I managed to screw up last week, and have spent most of the last ten days trying to figure out how to get it reinvoked.

We apparently were able to get this back to working this morning, and so -- and it was in somebody else's hand who actually knows, you know, what they're doing as opposed to me, so now I've managed to blow it up again, so while we're talking I'm going to switch it off and bring it back up again. I think it went into rest mode while we were chatting.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

The point of this phone is not to say that this is the answer. I'm assuming it's off now. The point of this phone is to suggest that, in fact, simply this; that we have found what we thought to be true is in fact true, that phones can now accommodate text-to-speech. They can, in fact, give access to a fairly robust range of functions with that text-to-speech.

Not everything is available on this phone in text-to-speech, but the majority of functions are.

The main menu is available, setting up contacts is available. Even Caller ID is available through text-to-speech on this phone.

The other point that I want to make is that this company, actually it's a combination of three entities in Europe that did this work, Code Factory, S- Vox and was funded in large part by the Spanish Organization of the Blind which owns the lottery in Spain so they're really rich. Yeah, it's a cool thing. I don't know how we missed out on that in this country. We kind of screwed up.

They funded Code Factory and S-Vox to sort

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

of do this work, and it is relatively limited in the sense that there are only a few phones that it currently works on. This particular phone, for example, runs on the Symbion Platform. And it's, as I said, a Nokia phone. They do make this available on a Siemen's phone, and on I believe a Sony Erickson phone, as well.

The other point that I wanted to make though, was that this may have had this implementation may or may not have had cooperation from Nokia, for example. Obviously, they're aware of it, and it's not really important for todav's discussion to talk about how much cooperation. point really is to talk about the fact that there hasn't been enough cooperation in making sure that if this third party even we qo route accessibility, even if the right answer is to have third-party downloads for accessibility, that essentially reshape the phone - I'm going to hand this over to Jason to see if he can figure out why we're not coming up. Even if we hand that over to a third party there's got to be much more involvement from

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

industry in ensuring that the software is stable, and ensuring that there is a sufficient level of quality for the interaction of the phone and the network.

It's, of course, in the industry's interest, service provider and manufacturers alike to make sure that that's the case, because obviously you don't want a phone, and industry doesn't want a phone in a customer's hands that is working only part of the time, or that is suspect to this level of instability that we found on this phone.

I will admit, or at least take responsibility for a lot of it. I tend to blow up any piece of technology that gets in my hands for very long so, you know, likely as not, I'm at least 90 percent of the problem. But it is, in fact, true that we have found some instability within this software. It is also a fairly early piece of software.

I'm going to stop here, I think, and take some questions, and if there are any technical questions, I can certainly refer those over to Caesar.

I should also say that we are not aware yet of the full breadth of capabilities for other platforms and

2.1

operating systems in the cell phone industry for adding text-to-speech. And then I want to reserve just a couple of minutes for closing comment.

CHAIR ROOKER: We have one question here.

This is Mike Duke. MR. DUKE: Okay. saw your presentation on Wednesday in Pittsburgh, and for the rest of you, he said pretty much the same thing there he's saying here. And we are, indeed, very frustrated as folks who do not have access to the I'd like to And point out that more than just blindness, encompasses looking at - for those of you in the industry - you're looking at additional markets beyond blindness when you make these things work.

Paul, has anything been done - given voice feedback is the best, and also the most complex, and most desirable option - but has anything been done with trying to have the menus emit beeps, different tones, different pitches from circuitry that's already in the phone. If I could get a menu to beep when I cross through its default mode, much as is done on some amateur radio equipment, that would greatly

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

1	improve my access. It wouldn't necessarily let me
2	know who was in memory channel 47, but it would still
3	let me know where I am on the phone. Has anything
4	been done in those regards?
5	MR. SCHROEDER: Thanks, Mike, for the
6	questions, and we're trying to get the audio up on the
7	phone so I can at least demonstrate a couple of the
8	features, and walk it through.
9	MR. DUKE: And I have another when you
10	deal with that.
11	MR. SCHROEDER: Okay. We have suggested
12	that, as well; that, in fact, there could be a lot
13	more done with creative use of auditory alerts than is
14	currently the case. For the most part, auditory
15	alerts now are used as a compliment to what's on the
16	screen visually, so they're essentially a hey, look at
17	the screen kind of an alert.
18	Now there are a couple of exceptions to
19	that. For example, most companies have given you at
20	least some different tones for power on and off, for
21	example. And obviously, you can set some of those

alerts to be more constructive from a blind person's

standpoint, to give you some of what you're suggesting.

companies have gone the route of Some having the menus be stable so that, in fact, you know where you are in those menus, or give you that option to set them stable so that you can count functions. But, obviously, I would say that none of those are -those are helpful as sort of interim step. the last three years that might be fine, but it seems to me, if I can, you know, be a little -- express a little frustration for the moment here. Three years passage of a rule that said, after vou information on the display should be available in another form, it seems to me we ought to have achieved something more than maybe trying to guess at what a tone might mean.

I'm going to hold this up to the microphone and see if I can get anything out of this phone. The audio connection isn't working to the PA.

(Phone demonstration.)

MR. SCHROEDER: Okay. I'm just kind of going through the menu system. I'm going to go into

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

calls. Now this is the missed calls.

(Phone demonstration.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

MR. SCHROEDER: That's now starting to give you the numbers of the calls, and I haven't taught it to say my name right either. Ιt is Schroeder and not Schroeder. I'm going to come out of the calls menu. Now it is actually possible to set up a contact. I did set up my own on here. However, as any of you know who've done this on your phone, it's extraordinarily tedious to enter, and I'm certain that I could not do it and talk to you at the same time, but I just want to go through. That's just a contact list.

Let me try a quick call on here to see if the ID - you want to get your phone up. I'm going to do a quick call to see if the ID feature is working. Actually, what was happening before is I couldn't get it to ring so, you know, that's a small problem with a phone, probably one that shouldn't be unstable. If it does ring, we should be able to get this to ID either the number or the contact information, if you set up a contact for that person.

NEAL R. GROSS

Now this gives you the choice to do what a
blind person never gets to do, which is to blow off a
call intentionally, knowing full well that it's not a
number to have interrupt you. And again, I think all
of us these are pretty basic kinds of functions
that any cell phone user would want to be able to have
access to. This is why we carry these things after
all, of course, is they give us a connection to the
world, and they give a world of connection to us,
which is almost as good and as bad. And so, if you
don't have the ability to manage your incoming calls,
for example, and to be able to make some smart choices
about what it's going to cost you, it's going to cost
you money for one thing in terms of minutes used that
you might not have wanted to. But it's also going to
cost you time and frustration if you miss a call that
you really needed in an important setting, or if you
interrupt an important meeting for a call that you
thought was coming and it's the wrong one. And so all
of these things that I think folks who are sighted
pretty much take for granted are things that blind
people simply can't do on today's cell phones with

NEAL R. GROSS

limited exceptions, and always with sighted 1 2 assistance. Other questions? 3 CHAIR ROOKER: We have several questions 4 over here, Paul. Susan Grant. 5 Susan Grant from the MS. GRANT: Hi. 6 National Consumer's League. Paul, I agree with you 7 that the kinds of things that you need and want are things that we all could use. And you're also not 8 9 alone in blowing things up, because I think that a lot of us are technically challenged, and things need to 10 11 be built to deal with that. 12 I guess my question is, if the rules 13 aren't being followed, has anybody mounted a legal challenge to try to hold industry's feet to the fire 14 here? 15 16 There is. I won't say MR. SCHROEDER: 17 anything more about it other than to say there's a 18 formal complaint pending here with the Commission on access to cell phones. And that's -- and actually, 19 20 I'm glad you asked this question because I won't speak 2.1 about the formal complaint, but I do want to address the fact that not only do we feel like industry has

not met our needs, but in fact, we feel like the Commission has not met our needs, as well.

Prior to this formal complaint, several informal complaints were filed. Now I should tell you that not enough informal complaints have been filed. I don't know what it is, but blind people, or maybe people with disabilities are all just way too complacent, and we have allowed for far too companies, and heard companies tell us well, it can't be done, and we haven't challenged it, and so because we simply said oh, well, they're smart enough They must be right. They wouldn't lie to me And I'm not saying they're lying, but about that. what I am saying is you have to challenge these things in order to find out where the truth really is. obviously, Section 255 gives us only access to the Commission in terms of a complaint structure. the Commission isn't going to vigorously follow-up on informal complaints, obviously, that leaves us in two One is to have to file formal complaints, places. which I don't think is a good idea. And is never something that we have counseled individuals to do.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

One individual, as I said, has filed one because she finally got fed up. The other option is, of course, for us to come to the Commission and really start making a major push to say take this more seriously. You guys have not -- this is something I think we are at a point of needing to say to the Commission, that you guys have not faced up to your responsibilities in addressing this issue.

Industry may well be correct in saying that none of this is achievable today, other than what I just showed you, in terms of what a third-party is able to do. I find that a little interesting, at I mean, so at least something is achievable today if a couple of little companies in Europe funded by a blindness organization in Spain, which may be rich, but it ain't as rich as some of the cell phone manufacturers, I don't think. If they can figure out a way to do it, it strikes me that there ought to be some answers that could be forthcoming from industry. would hope that if And we don't see some satisfaction fairly soon, that the Commission can and will take a much stronger action, at least in trying

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

get down to the bottom of answering it achievable, what can be done today, and what can be near future in the plans for to achieve accessibility? And one of the things I'd love to see this Committee come out with is an action statement to that effect, urging the Commission to take seriously this situation, and at least investigate the informal complaints that come in with some rigor and vigor to determine whether, in fact, there is more that industry can be doing to achieve accessibility.

CHAIR ROOKER: We have time for one brief question.

MR. HOROWITZ: Paul, I'm just wondering with all the things that have happened against getting this done. Let me get my microphone here. My name is David Horowitz. I'm with the Fight Back Foundation for Consumer Education.

I have always been of the thought, if there is a need for something, that the need can be met by the people sometimes who have that need. And have any of the groups that are supportive of you in the blind area come forward and said well, let's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

1	develop our own phone. Let's get a company and
2	develop our own phone.
3	MR. SCHROEDER: Yeah. I mean, we did
4	develop our own phone in Europe. We didn't do it
5	here, but the folks in Europe developed I mean,
6	this is a Nokia phone.
7	MR. HOROWITZ: I know.
8	MR. SCHROEDER: It had very little to do
9	with Nokia.
10	MR. HOROWITZ: But why can't and I'm
11	saying the
12	MR. SCHROEDER: And those two companies
13	developed it.
14	MR. HOROWITZ: Proceeding in the courts or
15	proceeding with complaints can take years, and years,
16	and years. You have there something that has started
17	already, where some technology is existing. Maybe the
18	institute for the blind or some other groups that are
19	involved I mean, you seem to be a very well spoken
20	person on this issue, about starting a company that
21	develops your own phones.
22	Now how big is this market? If you were

to sell cell phones to the blind community in the United States, how many people do you think would want to have a cell phone? I don't even know how large the market is.

CHAIR ROOKER: We've got a very brief answer here, Paul.

MR. SCHROEDER: I'll give you a very brief answer. I don't know how large the market is either. We estimate about 10 million people are blind or visually impaired. But let me answer the question this way and say I don't believe that it's our responsibility to meet the requirements of Section 255. I believe it's industry's responsibility. I don't believe that any other consumer has to come up with their own accessible cell phone that they can use.

No sighted person in this room had to design their own cell phone. They were sold to them over the counter by companies. That's what Section 255 is intending to do for people with disabilities, and it seems to me that that's where the responsibilities lies. It lies with industry to

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

provide us a product that we can use.

2.1

Having said that, we want to help. We want to have a dialogue. We want to help. If it's this third-party process that makes the most sense, let's help work through how to make this the most stable and useful, and accessible environment it can be, and make sure that it works well for blind customers, and that it works well for industry, as well.

MR. HOROWITZ: Yeah, but you have 10 million people. And my feeling is, I think you're right about the government's responsibility here, but while the government -- while they're trying to find out where their responsibility takes them in terms of getting this done, in the meantime, you should go on and try to find the way it can be done so you have something to present to them, and they don't come back and say well, we have to start from scratch.

MR. SCHROEDER: Point noted, but we do want to have dialogue, and that's the key.

CHAIR ROOKER: I'm sorry. Paul, thank you so much. You have given us a lot to think about.

NEAL R. GROSS

We're very honored to have David Solomon as our next speaker. He's the Chief of the Enforcement Bureau, and he's a key person in helping us understand the complaint process, the different levels of complaint, and so on. Please join me in welcoming David Solomon.

MR. SOLOMON: Good afternoon. Well, I can tell you that I'm really pleased to be here, because we spend a lot of effort and attention on Consumer Protection Enforcement in the Enforcement Bureau, so it's a pleasure to talk with all of you today, and hear some of your ideas, and get hopefully some helpful input.

Since the creation of the Enforcement Bureau almost four years ago, and particularly under the leadership of Chairman Powell, the FCC has made strong enforcement a very high priority. The statutes and rules that we have only work if we have the commitment and the will to enforce them, and through a variety of actions and in a variety of areas, we think the FCC has made clear that we do have that will and commitment to enforce the relevant statutes and rules.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

I like to collect quotes from the Chairman that are helpful for what I do. And one of the quotes that I like the best from Chairman Powell is, he said, "If you cheat, we will hurt you, and hurt you hard", so we use that as one of our informal approaches to things, when it's warranted. Also, I'd just note that the Chairman has suggested various statutory changes that would enhance our enforcement authority even more.

We've made consumer protection mentioned, enforcement, as Ι one of enforcement priorities, along with competition enforcement and public safety enforcement, which also, although they don't the "consumer", use word ultimately are still about helping consumers.

We have one division that's devoted entirely to telephone, telecommunications consumer protection enforcement. That's our Telecommunications Consumer's Division. It's headed by Colleen Heitkamp, who's sitting in the back with her Deputy, Kurt Schroeder.

Now while as I said, only one -- we have

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

one division devoted entirely to consumer protection, you think about public safety enforcement, or competition enforcement, that also directly benefits consumers.

The basic idea of strong enforcement and, you know, this is not particularly subtle, but it's important to emphasize it, is that you punish people, both in some level because it's deserving, but also to deter future violations, because ultimately, what you want to do is push people into compliance with the law so that consumers will get the benefit that either the statute or the rules were designed to do.

So what I'm going to try to do today is give you an overview of our process, and some of the things we've done in the consumer protection area, and also talk briefly about out competition and public safety enforcement, and how that relates to consumers.

We have broad authority in the consumer protection area. In addition to the general statutory requirement that carriers have that practices be just and reasonable, there are a number of specific provisions in the Communications Act relating to

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

consumer protection. And just to kind of rattle them off, to give you a sense of the breadth of what we do, there's the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, Telephone Operator Consumer Services Improvement Act of 1990, the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, the Telephone Disclosure and Dispute Resolution Act of 1992, Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992. Of course, the '96 Telecommunications Act, and the recent Do Not Call Implementation Act earlier this year.

The basic process we use in the consumer protection area is that we track very closely the informal complaints that the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau gets from consumers. We look at it from a statistical perspective. We go through their complaint data, and we analyze it in various ways, looking for new trend areas, if we seen problems areas, types of complaints from consumers that we haven't seen in the past, as well as just high volume areas, what are the areas where there are major problems with consumers. Then we start looking at some of the complaints, and basically use the

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

information we get from CGB's informal complaint database and those complaints, as well as information we get from the FTC Sentinel database, and the National Consumer Fraud Center database. We use all of that data to sort of target our investigations and look for areas that we want to focus on, and specific companies that we want to focus on.

Once we've gone through that process, we then begin investigations. Typically, we begin them by issuing a letter of inquiry to the company that's the target, in which we direct them to provide to us various information and often documents to find out more about what's going on.

In some cases, we start investigations. Through that process, we might have tips from people inside the company, confidential informants, that sort of thing. But typically, we will first get the company's input into what we think is going on. And then if it looks like there is a problem, what we then do is, in a typical case, is start a monetary forfeiture proceeding, which is basically, we issue something called a Notice of Apparent Liability, which

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

says it looks like you've done something wrong, violated the law in the following way, and we propose to fine you a certain amount.

In very egregious cases, we may move in the first instance, in the case of common carriers, to a revocation proceeding. Recently we did that in a couple of cases with long distance carriers where we have hearings before administrative law judges pending.

Another way that we get information to start our investigations is we work closely with the State Public Utility Commissions and State Attorney Generals to share information, to share priorities. We have monthly calls with each of those groups to share information on consumer protection.

As I said, we will typically start a forfeiture proceeding, which may end in a forfeiture. It also, in many cases, may end in a consent decree, which basically in those cases, the company agrees to make voluntary payment to the government, essentially in lieu of a penalty, and will agree to variance compliance measures that, from our

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

perspective, show that they've got to demonstrate a commitment to clean up their act, and basically are going to take steps not just to comply with the law, which they're required to do anyway, but to do something more, and to ensure that they're really providing benefits that the various rules and statutes are designed to provide the consumers. So let me give you some examples of the areas we focused on, and some of the things we've done.

In the slamming area, since the Enforcement Bureau began in 1999, we've taken actions against 17 carriers totaling over \$17 million. The most recent one was a \$1.2 million forfeiture against a company where we had worked closely with 14 different State PUCs building a case against this company.

In the marketing and advertising area, two years ago we had some joint guidelines that the FCC and the FTC issued in this area. Most recently, we had a revocation hearing just initiated against a carrier that seemed to be basically misleading or fraudulently misleading consumers in the context of a

2.1

Win Back Campaign, so we're now trying that case before an FCC Administrative Law Judge.

We also fairly recently had a \$1 million consent decree with a company involving issues of misleading advertising in the long distance area. also have had actions in the operator service provider This is a requirement that basically operator area. information services provide to consumers, particularly from locations like pay phones about who the carrier is, and make rate information available. We've had a couple of large proposed forfeitures that we did several months ago. And prior to that, we had several consent decrees with some carriers based on basically a field audit that we did, where we sent people out from our field offices and went to pay phones to see if they were getting the correct kinds of notice.

In the telemarketing area, we've been aggressively enforcing the Junk Fax Prohibition and other telemarketing rules. One of the major actions we took was a \$5.38 million proposed fine against basically the biggest Junk Fax company in the country.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

That was complicated by the fact that a district that Junk judge held the Fax Statute was unconstitutional under the First Amendment, and conjoined us from continuing with this enforcement That district judge's action was overturned, and the Circuit Court recently denied rehearing. We're hopeful that the technical legal steps that need to be taken to basically allow us to pursue our enforcement will occur very soon.

Another area that we've been involved in involves common carrier discontinuance of service. You're required to get FCC approval in most instance before you discontinue common carrier service. And in particular, we have requirements about notification to consumers. In a recent case where we also worked with two states, Vermont and Maine, we designated for hearing a carrier that basically seems to have lied in connection with its application to discontinue service, and questions about whether it did, in fact, provide the right kind of disclosure to consumers. And also, appears to have lied to us or lacked candor in connection with an investigation we were doing

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

about slamming.

2.1

Another important area is the disabilities area. We've designated one carrier for again a revocation hearing, a company that seems to have defrauded the Telecommunications Relay Service Fund. In fact, we worked closely with the U.S. Attorney's Office, and they indicted that company for fraud.

Also, we have pending before us - I can't talk about the details because it's a pending case - but we do have pending before us the first formal disabilities complaint involving Section 255, with access to communication services and equipment for persons with disabilities.

To touch briefly on the broadcast area we also do consumer protection- related activity in that area, as well. We're responsible for Broadcasting Decency Enforcement, and also such requirements as there are statutory provisions about the amount of advertising that can be on children's television programming.

The main consume -- I want to mention a couple of consumer protection priorities that we're

NEAL R. GROSS

going to be devoting a lot of our attention to in the coming months. Obviously, one is implementation of the new National Do Not Call List. The FCC recently adopted rules that compliment the Federal Trade Commission's rules in this area, and that's really going to be a major enforcement priority for us.

We're going focus to to avoid duplication, we're going to focus certainly in the first instance on those entities that are not within Federal Trade Commission's jurisdiction. those of you who don't know, the FTC doesn't have jurisdiction over telemarketing practices of certain kinds of companies. Those companies include telecommunications carriers, which obviously is area of our expertise. And also, banks, insurance companies, and airlines, also they don't intrastate telemarketing. And so those are the areas that we're going to focus on in the first instance.

Enforcement will start October 1st. One of the things that we're happy about is the way the FTC has set up their database, which our rules use their database, as well. We will hopefully avoid some

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

of the problems of proof we've had in the past with our own company-specific Do Not Call Lists.

One of the things about the FTC database is that there will be evidence about the fact that somebody is registered, and when they registered, so you won't get factual issues where somebody says to us I registered on this company's list. I don't remember when it was, but I'm sure I did it, and the company has no record of it.

process matter, we'll follow kind of approach I was saying basically the same before that we use generally, that we're going to track the complaints carefully. We're going to look, particularly in these areas where we're going to focus on, we're going to look for those companies that we see a lot of complaints, or spiking complaints over To the extent there are common time, whatever. carriers involved, we can move right to a forfeiture proceeding. In those instances, our authority is we could fine them up to \$120,000 per violation. others, it's generally up to \$11,000 per violation; although, if a broadcaster or cable operator were

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

doing telemarketing - I don't know whether they would be, but if they were, the violation there would be higher. It would be \$27,500 would be the maximum for a single violation.

We're going to be looking carefully at people's use of some of the exceptions, established business relationship and the like to make sure that those exceptions aren't being abused. And we're working with the Federal Trade Commission on a Memorandum of Understanding on Enforcement, to coordinate with them to share information to avoid duplication.

One other major priority that's a new area we're going to be moving into later this year, the Commission's rules on wireless local number portability will take effect in late November, assuming -- there's discussion in Congress potentially delaying them, but assuming those aren't delayed, that's another area where we're working now on setting up an enforcement plan, and being ready to move seriously into that area.

Another area I would mention that may be

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

of interest is that we're working on a compliance review of the requirements for carriers to publicize the availability of life line and link-up programs in under-served areas, such as tribal lands.

Let me touch briefly on competition enforcement and public safety enforcement, and then open things up for questions. Basically, competition is a good thing for consumers. It helps consumers get better services at lower prices. Obviously, there are sometimes market failures, which is why we have aggressive consumer protection enforcement. But it also helps consumers that we're aggressively enforcing the competition rules so that, in fact, there is competition.

So we just -- in the last couple of months, for example, we had a six and a half million dollar consent decree with one of the Bell operating companies, and a consent decree of \$5.7 million with another one dealing with premature marketing of long distance service; again, violation of the competition rules, or issues of violation of competition rules that are designed to benefit consumers.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

The Commission also recently decided two formal complaint in important cases the local competition area, which confirmed that the Commission has authority sharing it with the states to adjudicate disputes about compliance with the local competition And in one of the cases, the Commission found that the BOC involved had not been providing interconnection service in an appropriate manner. in the other case, it found that it had failed to provide what's called shared transport service that's important to local competition, in violation of the conditions of its merger order.

In the public safety area, probably the area with the most direct consumer benefits, that it's gotten a lot of attention, is E-911 Enforcement. We've had several recent enforcement actions in that area. We had \$675,000 consent decree with one carrier, a \$2 million consent decree with another carrier, a \$1.2 million forfeiture for one carrier. Last year we had a \$2 million consent decree with a different carrier. And again as I mentioned before in the context of the consumer protection-type issues,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

1	consent decrees can get you a very serious compliance
2	plan. In these cases where we have consent decrees,
3	there are industry issues about compliance. And now
4	we have specific carriers having agreed to automatic
5	penalties if they don't meet certain benchmarks. And
6	hopefully, that's doing a lot to further stimulate
7	compliance and getting E-911 Service rolled out.
8	Some of the other areas where we've been
9	active in public safety enforcement, again in ways
10	that I think give direct benefits to consumers,
11	interference resolution, pirate radio enforcement,
12	lighting of communications towers, enforcement of the
13	Emergency Alert System rules.
14	So to sum up, consumer protection is and
15	is going to remain a top priority of the FCC, and of
16	the Enforcement Bureau. And I look forward to
17	answering your questions, and continuing to work with
18	many of you in the future.
19	CHAIR ROOKER: I think you're going to
20	have a lot of questions.
21	MR. SOLOMON: That's fine.

CHAIR ROOKER: We're so pleased to have

you with us. Why don't we just start and work our way 1 2 around the table. That's probably the fairest way to 3 do it. 4 MR. SOLOMON: Okay. 5 CHAIR ROOKER: We'll start with Susan. Susan Grant, National 6 MS. GRANT: Hi. 7 What percentage of the fines and Consumers League. other kinds of penalties that you seek do you actually 8 9 What are the impediments to your ability to 10 collect? And are there any circumstances where you 11 actually return money to consumers? 12 MR. SOLOMON: Starting with your last 13 point, the way our statute is set up, if we take 14 forfeiture action, we don't have authority to give the 15 money to consumers. Through a formal complaint 16 proceeding, consumers can get damages, so unlike the 17 Federal Trade Commission, we're really not in a 18 position to get money directed back to consumers, unless people file formal complaints for damages. 19 20 As to collectability, I don't have 21 Certainly, in the consent decrees when exact percent.

people have agreed to pay money and take various

2	whether we collect in other situations sort of depends
3	on the area.
4	I think in the consumer protection area,
5	one of the things that happens in a lot of cases, and
6	I don't think this is necessarily a bad result, is
7	that the issuance of the forfeiture forces the company
8	out of business, so we don't, in fact, collect. But
9	if they're out of business, and if they're not
10	immediately restarting with sort of the same people
11	under different names, that's a good result, even if
12	we don't get the money. But we do work closely with
13	U.S. Attorney's Offices, and there are some pending
14	cases. Colleen, I think, recently testified in one of
15	those cases, so we do actively work with DOJ to
16	collect the amounts.
17	CHAIR ROOKER: Linda, I believe you were
18	next.
19	MS. WEST: Linda West.
20	CHAIR ROOKER: Stick your hand up so they
21	can find you. Oh, right here.
22	MS. WEST: I'm a member of the

steps, we get all of that money. It depends --

Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes in Montana.

And I've been in contact with other reservations, and did I understand you to say that there are penalties, or there will be penalties in place for the companies that are not doing outreach on the lifeline link-up program to Indian reservations?

SOLOMON: It's an area we've been MR. working on right now with -- in fact, we've been in touch with some of the Indian groups to identify who are the telephone companies in those areas, so we're not at the stage of being able to say yes, imposing penalties. But it is an area where we've definitely decided to look into, and see what's going collecting on, and we're in the process of information.

MS. WEST: Okay. Because I can testify to the fact that these phone companies are not getting that information out to the Indian people.

MR. SOLOMON: Well, if when we're done you want to see Colleen or Kurt in the back and tell them the areas and the names of the companies, that would be helpful.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

MS. WEST: I'll be glad to. Thank you, sir.

MR. SOLOMON: And I'm serious. I mean, we want to know that information.

CHAIR ROOKER: Okay. Mike, I think you're next. Stick your hand up so they can find you for the microphone.

MR. DUKE: Okay. We have it. I'm Mike Duke from Jackson, Mississippi, and I have to wear my amateur radio hat on this one, just an observation to you. You didn't mention it, but I know it's there.

About five years ago, you or a predecessor - I'm not sure how long you've been where you are in that division - designated a gentleman named Raleigh Hollingsworth to handle amateur radio rules and regulations enforcement. And I just want to say publicly it has made a tremendous difference in the ability of those of us who tried in the first place to abide by the things we're supposed to, to enjoy the hobby. I hope it continues, and it's really been wonderful to have the enforcement working on our behalf.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

MR. SOLOMON: Well, good. I'm pleased to hear that. Raleigh is our special counsel for amateur enforcement, and he does a great job, so I'm glad to hear that.

CHAIR ROOKER: Joe.

MR. GORDON: Hi. Joe Gordon, League for the Hard of Hearing. Can you share some violations that you've encountered with the cable industry, whether it's captioning or other type of violation, and the penalties involved? I'd like to hear some encounters you've had with the cable industry.

MR. SOLMON: Sure. Most of our work in the cable area has been in the technical area. So we've had, for example, we've had forfeitures I know of over \$100,000 against cable companies for what's called cable signal leakage, which is basically cable companies send transmissions through their wires. If you don't have coating around the wires that are strong enough, the signals leak out and the bands they use are the aviation bands. So if signals leak from cable companies, you could have interference with aviation, so that's certainly a very serious issue.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

Cable is one area that a fair amount of the enforcement is still handled in the Media Bureau. For example, a big area of cable enforcement involves the Must Carry Rules, where there are issues about broadcast stations, rights to access to cable. I don't think we've had many complaints in the closed captioning area. We have recently been doing some investigations in closed captioning. I don't remember whether it's cable or broadcast, but at this point I don't know whether that's going to lead to a finding of any violations.

MR. GORDON: fast follow-up Just I would imagine, whether they're right or question. wrong, that there's been many, many complaints about the lack of closed captioning either to the FCC or to the caption companies, and I think that's an area that should be looked into. And also, the recent regulations of emergency captioning is also another area where there has been, and are many violations.

I was watching TV last night, and I put the volume down because I didn't want to annoy the people around me. And there was tornado warnings, and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

I didn't see any emergency scrolling. So whether it's closed captioning violations, or emergency violations, I think there are complaints out there.

MR. SOLOMON: Well, and I agree those are important areas. And we certainly, as I mentioned before, we look carefully, and disabilities is one of the areas that we've made a high priority, so I know we've been looking into some closed captioning issues. And I know also some emergency captioning. Again, sometimes, you know, the complaints don't lead to findings of violations, but that is a very high priority.

CHAIR ROOKER: David.

MR. HOROWITZ: This morning when we were listening to Richard Smith, I asked him a question about the enforcement would be of these lists, which are supposed to have as much as 60 million names on it for the people who are signing up for the program. And at this juncture he said well, you know, we'll have to think about it. And my feeling is, when you have lists like that, that are going to be sold for \$7,200 a list, that there has to be some enforcement

2.1

built into who gets the list, what do they use the list for, can they sell the list off to some spamster who'll go and look in the other phone books where you could go back and get a telephone number and find out a person's address and all that kind of stuff.

And has anything been given to how these books are going to be policed when they're sold, and how we're going to be able to know if these books are going to legitimate telemarketers, or they sell them off to others? And what kind of enforcement of that there's going to be?

MR. SOLOMON: Yeah. I think that's an important area. We do have rules, and the Federal Trade Commission has rules that you can't use the list in those sorts of ways. Having said that, you're absolutely right, that having a rule isn't the end of it. And it's something, you know, as we develop our enforcement plans, as we work with the FTC, it's certainly an important area. And again, I think that, you know, that's the kind of issue, as we track the complaints that will come into us and the FTC and others. If we start seeing complaints about misuse of

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

the list in those ways, that's something where we can go after these companies under our statute, assuming they're not telecom companies, cable operators or broadcasters, not FCC regulated entities, if the first instance, we have to give them what's called a citation. And that after that, if they violate again, you can fine them. But the citations often are effective for two reasons.

One, we've done a lot of citations in Junk directly Faxes, where again we can't move forfeiture. We've issued couple of а citations, and in a vast majority of the cases, at least in that area, where you issue the citations, people honestly didn't know they weren't allowed to use it that way. And they get the citation and, you know, it's a formal-looking document, and they seem to get scared by the prospect that the government is doing something. And then in the smaller number of cases where the companies have continued to do it, we have followed up with forfeiture proceedings. think you're absolutely right, that's an area that has to be followed carefully.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2	advance of issuing these lists and selling these lists
3	that will make it absolutely clear that if these lists
4	are used for anything other than what they're intended
5	to, that these enforcement regulations and these
6	penalties will go into effect, and that these
7	companies that buy them sign-off on knowing that
8	that's the risk they're taking by getting these lists?
9	MR. SOLOMON: It's certainly in the rules
10	that they can't do it, and I think that's you make
11	a good point. It's something we should think about,
12	about whether there should be some sort of additional
13	publicity either by us or the Federal Trade Commission
14	about people understanding that.
15	CHAIR ROOKER: Yes. We have another
16	question here. Brenda.
17	MS. FREY: Brenda Kelly Frey representing
18	the National State Relay Administration. I have a
19	question about the filing of complaints. I realize
20	that on the website of the FCC, you have an easy way
21	of filing complaints. Is there going to be any easier

MR. HOROWITZ: Will there be something in

way to file formal complaints with the FCC? It's

rather cumbersome right now for my constituents, for consumers. Have you given it any thought?

MR. SOLOMON: I mean, it's a difficult trade-off. And, I mean, we're always thinking about, you know -- to file a formal complaint, basically you do need a lawyer. It's like a lawsuit. And what the Commission has tried to do is basically kind of maximize the different kinds of avenues that are available to people. So it's very easy to file an informal complaint, and the informal complaints are dealt with in two ways.

One way, and someone from CGB may have talked to you about this this morning, but an informal complaint against a carrier, it's served on the carrier and they have to respond. And often, I think in a fairly significant number of cases, that does get somebody, you know, their refund or something like that, get them some action.

We track that information, as I mentioned before, so even if let's say a company is over-billing something and, you know, every time somebody complains they just give them \$50 and the people go away, that

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

doesn't mean we would be done with it. We would still say okay, the fact that you've resolved these informal complaints has nothing to do with whether we will initiate an enforcement action against you. And we will initiate an enforcement action if we see that kind of pattern.

The formal complaints really are designed to be like lawsuits. Under the statute, you have a choice of either filing a formal complaint in federal court, or with the FCC. And, I mean, the way it's set up is to have the kind of case that if in the end you're awarding damages, that you have a legal process that basically enables us to build a case.

But having said that, you know, we do realize that it's difficult. There have been consumer complaints. You know, we probably work somewhat more informally with some of the, you know, consumer advocates to help make sure that they comply with the various procedural rules than we necessarily would with a big carrier that's coming in. You know, there's a formal disabilities complaint. There was a complaint a couple of years in the Do Not Call area by

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

a group called Consumer Net that was, you know, litigated through and they won, so it's -- I recognize it's difficult. It's not impossible, and it's a trade-off, and we do try to keep thinking about it.

CHAIR ROOKER: I'd like to -- do you have a follow-up question, Brenda? I'm just concerned about the, you know, Joe Smith Consumer, you know, filing a formal complaint. And they have the right to do so, but they don't have the money with which to file a formal complaint, get an attorney and so forth.

MR. SOLOMON: Again, I think it, in some ways -- we try to have avenues for the Joe Smith who, you know, by doing the informal complaint route, he has that route. And under some of the statutes, you know, the TCPA, the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, you know, they have the right to go to state court, as well. But, you know, part of what we have to do, and in know some of you are government or quasi-government institutions, and part of what have to do is use very limited resources to try to figure out the best strategy. And perspective, I think a lot of attention has been that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

we can sort of get the most bang for the buck if we take, you know, certain resources we have and say we're going to look for the trend. So if there are 20 Joe Smiths, than that's more important to sort of, you know, attach staff resources. But I don't mean to at all sort of under-estimate the burden you're talking about. And it is one that, you know, in a perfect world we would figure out a way to devote more resources to that, as well, but we struggle with it.

CHAIR ROOKER: I have a question. It's not very important, but it's a little bit confusing to consumers. And that's when they call you, and they're told that they can only file an informal complaint. Well, many of them seem to think that that means that they're not really filing a complaint. Whereas, I know that it is, but they -- but in the consumer's mind, the fact that there's an informal and a formal complaint, they all want to file a formal complaint but they can't. So is there any consideration being given to renaming those processes? As I said, this is not of major importance, but in the consumer's mind, I run a consumer hotline, and we refer people to you all

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

2	complain. But they'll come to us and say well, they
3	wouldn't let me file a formal complaint. And we
4	explain to them, you know, what this really means, but
5	maybe we just need to think about making a change to
6	what we call it.
7	MR. SOLOMON: Well, that's an interesting
8	idea. We can certainly talk to the Consumer and
9	Governmental Affairs Bureau that runs that website.
10	But maybe there is a way to say, you know, you can
11	file a complaint or you can file a formal complaint or
12	something. I understand what you're saying.
13	CHAIR ROOKER: Yeah.
14	MR. SOLOMON: People think informal
15	complaints mean it's not really a complaint.
16	CHAIR ROOKER: That's exactly right. And
17	while I know that that's not the case, they feel that
18	they've been kind of put down because this is the only
19	thing that they can do. And, you know, they are
20	really angry, and they want blood, and they don't feel
21	like they're getting it, so it's just a suggestion.
22	MR. SOLOMON: Yeah. That's interesting.

the time because we feel it's very important that they

I've never heard that, so that's interesting.

2.1

CHAIR ROOKER: Well, it's been something that we've heard quite a bit, because we talk to consumers every single day. And it's kind of interesting. I mean, you know, the first time someone said that to me, I said well, wait a minute. I know you can file a complaint with them. What are you talking about? I had to find out what it was all about. So at any rate, well, I think that -- Ron. Yeah, take one more question, two more questions if they're brief, very brief.

MR. MALLARD: Ron Mallard, National Association of Consumer Agencies. Just curious as to whether or not you have an opinion, David, on how the FCC might ultimately resolve the issue of providing some kind of complaint resolution mechanism for cable modem services in light of the Commission's decision that cable modem services are information, is an information service and not a cable service.

MR. SOLOMON: Well, I mean, I think at this point, the Commission didn't impose rules on cable modem service, so there's basically -- there's

1	nothing to enforce until there are requirements.
2	MR. MALLARD: But there is a decision that
3	has to be made, because right now, local governments
4	are without any authority to act upon complaints about
5	cable modem services.
6	MR. SOLOMON: Right.
7	MR. MALLARD: So there is a void there in
8	regulatory authority at any level to act upon
9	legitimate complaints about cable modem services. And
10	I was just wondering if you had an opinion as to
11	whether or not the your division would support some
12	kind of form of authority being granted to localities
13	to enforce cable modem service complaints as they
14	currently do with cable television-related complaints.
15	MR. SOLOMON: Yeah, that's I don't want
16	to sound bureaucratic, but that's not really our
17	issue, you know. Our job is to enforce the laws that
18	apply to the FCC. I know what you're talking about,
19	but I don't really have a comment on it.
20	CHAIR ROOKER: The last question.
21	MR. ALLIBONE: Tom Allibone with LTC
22	Consulting. I've got a question on your Part 42

rules. Okay. A number of years ago, Part 42 was gutted as part of the Paperwork Reduction Act. And embedded within the Part 42 rules were some very important consumer protection rules concerning preservation of customer phone billing records.

In the old 42 rules, it used to require the common carrier to retain these records for three years. When the rule was gutted, that rule went out the window, and was modified with a -- I guess a provision that in essence allows the industry to be in charge of chicken coop. And what it basically says is that every common carrier must maintain a master index of records. And within that master index, presumably there would be some type of a, you know, customer billing-type record. And I found that to be true.

My question is that within the master index of records, which is maintained by the carriers, and is not maintained by the FCC, how do you go about enforcing your Part 42 rules if you don't have access to the information?

I have filed a number of complaints in this area with the FCC, so it's not a question of

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

nobody ever bringing it to your attention, because I can assure you, may paper trail is probably about two miles long if you check out my name. So I just would be curious, you know, what you can do or plan to do in that area. Because customer phone bills, to get to the bottom line, is that a lot of phone bills contain hidden billing errors. They can be on the phone bill for a number of years. And I've seen cases where they go back 20 years. Actually, even more, 30 years, so it's not an isolated incident. It's a very serious consumer protection issue.

MR. SOLOMON: It's certainly hardly for me to answer with the level of detail you're looking for, but all I can really say is that I know when we're doing our investigations, we have a number of tools so that, you know, we are able to get information, documents we need from carriers. I don't know if there's, you know, a specific issue in your specific case where there was a problem, but as a general matter, we're certainly -- you know, we have tools and we're able to get the information we need from the carriers to investigate.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

CHAIR ROOKER: Well, thank you so much.

As you can see, I think we can go on all afternoon.

We'll have to have you back.

MR. SOLOMON: Thank you.

CHAIR ROOKER: Thank you very much. WE have some handouts for you. Betty is going to be passing them out, and we have them on disk if you need a disk copy, so we will make those provisions available to you.

Now our afternoon, what we're calling our marathon panel is - you may think it is too - is a result of the efforts of the broadband working group. And our kudos to Larry Goldberg, who's heading up that group. And the group itself are putting together this panel on what is a very hot topic, one that's being looked at by Wall Street, the media, and a whole host of others. It should be a very lively afternoon. I hope everybody has gotten here, because I know someone was stuck in traffic.

Just for your planning purposes, we will have a break at 2:15. So don't worry, you're not going to have to sit here until 3:30. And at that

2.1

ordering time, we will be cabs for your transportation, so that you can think about if you want a cab, you'll let us know at 2:15 when we take We'll poll everybody to see who wants the break. transportation, and we'll have it outside the Commission building at 4, a little after 4:00.

Now Larry is about to get this all set up.

Again, thanks, Larry, for your hard work on this, and
go to it.

MR. GOLDBERG: Okay. While we here, let me just give a little background. originally called the facilitator of the Broadband Working Group, and all I was supposed to do was call together phone calls. That's envolved. But the important thing is that we are all very interested in There are so many issues that are of broadband. concern to so many of us that as the broadband working group began deliberating at what issues we could bring to the Full CAC, it was clear that we needed a lot more information about regulation.

The words are often used that there isn't a level playing field. We want to know what does that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

mean. It's a complex issue about broadband, and the different providers, and so we felt it would be great to pull together a panel of experts who could really help us understand this complex issue a lot better. Members of the working group suggested some potential panelists. We presented those to Shirley and Scott, and the FCC, and they were all quite enthusiastic about doing this, and so we're here now to learn.

I want to particularly thank Ron Mallard, and Debra Berlyn, and Rich Ellis and Cindy Cox for helping gather this very distinguished group, this expert group. And I certainly ant to thank the panelists in advance for taking the time to come here and enlighten us.

We're not going to get to everything that needs to be known about broadband, but I think we're representing a lot of interesting common and divergent opinions here today. And we should get to a lot of really good information. Here's how we hope to spend the next two hours or so.

Each of the panelists will have from seven to ten minutes to give an opening statement, and the

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

order of these opening presentations have been chosen at random by our Chairperson, Shirley Rooker, so you know it's an honest selection.

After the panelists have made their opening statements, two of which have Power Point presentations as part of it, we'll have some Q&A, first from a list of questions that the broadband working group has generated themselves, and then to the rest of the CAC. And then in the middle, or near the middle, as Shirley indicated, there will be a 15 minute break.

So I will give longer introductions to each of the panelists as they begin to speak, but just so we know who they are. Nick Miller, who's caught in — oh, look at that. Perfect entrance line. From the law firm of Miller & Van Eaton, representing local government, cities and counties.

MR. MILLER: I apologize.

MR. GOLDBERG: That's fine. You're just on time. Next is Scott Randolph, who's Director of Federal Regulatory Advocacy at Verizon, representing the Telcos. And Dan Brenner, Senior Vice President of

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

Law and Regulatory Policy at the National Cable and Telecommunications Association, representing the cable companies. John Windhausen, President of the Association of Local Telecommunications Services, ALTS, representing facilities-based CLECs. And to my left, Commission David Svanda of the Michigan Public Service Commission, representing state government.

The order of presentations will be Scott Randolph, and then Dan Brenner, then John Windhausen, Nick Miller, and finally David Svanda, so it actually is a nice lineup in that order, as well. So we'll start off with Scott Randolph. I'll tell you a little bit more about him as -- are we ready to go? Working on it.

I have a few words to vamp here. Scott Randolph is Director of the Federal Regulatory Advocacy for Verizon in Washington, D.C., and he's responsible for directing Verizon's involvement in regulatory proceedings and industry activities related to the broadband and local telephone competition provisions of the `96 Telecom Act.

Prior to the merger of Bell Atlantic and

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

in 2001, he served as Director of Regulatory Matters in GTE's Washington, D.C. office, and before for GTE in that worked Irvine, Texas, with tariffs, responsibility for and video and cable television-related regulatory proceedings.

Scott began his career in telecommunications with Contel Corporation in Atlanta, Georgia in 1984, and was responsible for implementing the FCC's access charge and accounting rules, and acted as a result of a divestiture of AT&T. He received his Bachelor's Degree in Economics from Georgia State University in Atlanta, Georgia.

MR. RANDOLPH: Thank you very much for having this opportunity to talk today. What I'd like to start off with first is talk a little bit about what we're doing at Verizon today with respect to broadband. Today at Verizon, we provide digital subscriber line service which many of you are familiar with. It's a high speed always-on access to the Internet over your local telephone line that you can use to access the Internet at the same time that you're talking on the telephone.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

Verizon On-Line, which is Verizon's affiliated Internet service provider markets DSL Service and combines it with it's Internet access service to market to consumers. You may have noticed that recently we've reduced some of our pricing, particularly in response to competition. We're now offering a new price for DSL of \$29.95.

Verizon also has a very viable wholesale business in DSL. We offer DSL services to Internet service providers such as AOL, Earthlink and MSN, and they take the DSL functionality and they package it with their own Internet and provide it to consumers under their own brand name, so we have both a retail and a wholesale business at Verizon.

What are we going to do in the future? Well, in March we announced a very aggressive roll-out of DSL and fiber optic facilities in our network. We hope by the end of the year to have 46 million DSL equipped lines, which means that we'll make broadband available in our serving territories to about 80 percent of all of our customers, equip about 1,000 additional local switching centers.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

We've announced aggressive plans to push fiber optic facilities deeper into neighborhoods, and eventually all the way to the home. And we recently enacted hundreds of Wi-Fi spots in New York City, which essentially allows customers to access the Internet in various downtown locations in Manhattan via their laptops. And we also have some fixed wireless trials underway in Virginia and Maryland, so we have a lot going on at Verizon.

Just to take a look at what is available 50 percent to Verizon customers, today about Verizon customers have а choice between their broadband service providers. DSL and cable modem are available to about half of Verizon customers. about 31 percent of our serving territory, customers only have a choice of cable, and 11 percent a choice of only DSL, and even in 12 percent some limited choice, even though we have satellite and wireless applications that are out there in some markets. we're trying to aggressively roll-out DSL functionality in new areas, and hopefully we'll reduce some of those numbers, and increase that number where

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

DSL and cable are both available to consumers.

2.1

If you step back and let's take a look for a second at the national market. Since the FCC has been collecting statistics on broadband since 1999, cable modem providers have outpaced DSL subscription by about two to one almost every year. Today cable modem service is provided to about 65 percent of the broadband market compared to DSL's 32 percent. So clearly you can see that Verizon and the local telephone companies are not the dominant players in the market. Cable is maintaining its advantage.

But if you kind of step back and broaden the scope a little bit of what this market looks like, and take a look at all of Internet households in the country, about 73 percent, depending upon the studies that you see, of customers today are still using dial-up to access the Internet, so what does that tell you? Well, that tells you that there's still a large market out there for companies like Verizon and companies that Dan, for example, represent, the cable companies.

A lot of customers may never want to go to

NEAL R. GROSS

broadband. They don't use the Internet that often. Maybe they use it just for e-mail and some limited applications. But increasingly we find that customers are getting dissatisfied with dial-up and want more out of their Internet experience, not only with faster speeds, but able to do more with it.

So how do we compete in this kind of market? Well, to compete in the market, customers like Verizon is going to have to continue to focus more on content, on applications, and on services, not just high speed access, although we are rolling out higher DSL access speeds. And what I mentioned a few minutes ago, the aggressive roll-out of more fiber in our network will allow us to provide Internet access at speeds that no one ever thought of in the past.

Delivery of those services are going to depend on a number of factors. One, it's going to depend on the ability of Verizon to continue to invest in broadband infrastructure. And second, it's going to be the ability for Verizon to have the flexibility to interact among all the players in what we call the Internet value chain. Let me give you an example of

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

both of those.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

using broadband Today, current technologies like DSL, cable modem, broadband brings a whole host of services into people's homes, home office applications, access to remote education material, entertainment, healthcare. But tomorrow, future bandwidth services, the bigger pipes, fiber to the home, the next generation versions of technology are going to give us much more, video conferencing, on-line interactive video games, virtual classrooms, telerobotics used for surgery, video on demand, and that's just only the beginning.

We also think when we look at the Internet that there is a value chain, and this value chain serves both companies and consumers. And it involves all the different players that are involved in the Internet. We have application software providers like Netscape or Explorer, operating systems like Apple and Windows, network technology providers like LinkSys, and you have access service providers like Comcast and the cable companies, AOL and Verizon, BellSouth, SBC and Qwest. You have web services provided by Yahoo

NEAL R. GROSS

and MSN, content provided by companies like ABC News or MSNBC. And those are just only a few examples of the many players that are involved between the actual consumer and the content, and the applications that the consumer accesses on the Internet.

If you take a look at all of those players, only one player sticks out as a little bit different, and that is the local telephone companies. They're all not regulated in this Internet space. The only regulated entity is the local telephone companies and the provision of DSL service. So what does that mean?

The regulations that we're subject to today are somewhat complex, and sometimes it's a little bit difficult to explain. But essentially, we are subject to regulations that were designed over a decade ago for a voice network, not a broadband network. If I can give you a couple of examples, the current rules today require that for every broadband service like Yahoo, we have to break apart a separate transmission service away from other enhanced services and offer those in piece parts.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

Oftentimes, that requires us to offer the piece parts under separate affiliates. It's sort of like requiring, you know, McDonald's to offer -- you know, to price the price of meat separately than a bun, regulate the price of meat, but allow them to price whatever they want to on the bun. It just doesn't make a lot of sense.

We also have to file public disclosures announcing plans in advance of where we decide to deploy new services and technologies, which essentially gives competitors advance notice of our plans.

And finally, we have to obtain approval for new broadband service offerings and prices from the FCC before we actually offer those to consumers. We're required to file tariffs with the Commission, that essentially restricts us in our ability to be able to be flexible to work with consumers. In general, it inhibits the ability to be able to introduce new services and partner with all of those entities that you just saw a few minutes ago over this Internet value chain. None of these rules apply to

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

our competitors, which puts them at a significant competitive advantage.

So what should the FCC do? Well, the FCC has a number of proceedings open looking at what is proper regulatory treatment of the telephone companies' DSL and broadband services. We think the answer is very simple. Give us the same freedoms that our competitors do, the ones that have 65 percent of the market to our 25 percent of the market. Freedom to partner with individual Internet service providers, content providers, manufacturers across that value chain a contractual basis rather than via on regulatory tariffs. Freedom to offer a wider range of service bundles and packages that consumers want without artificial regulatory constraints that we're currently subject to. And freedom to quickly introduce new services and change prices in response to our competitors without undue delay. If we do that, and if we have that freedom and flexibility, consumers are going to benefit.

We'll have greater incentives to invest in the network. We'll have greater flexibility to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

partner with other entities across that Internet value chain, to develop new and innovative services, applications, Whizbang, capabilities that consumers want. And if we're able to be a more potent competitor, then that will translate into better value to the consumer, and better prices. And maybe even we'll see the cable companies reducing their prices for cable modem service.

So lastly, a word about Verizon's commitment. We're committed to open networks and providing consumers with access to the content that they want, and access to the choice of Internet service providers. A lot of folks have said that if the regulations are lifted on the Bell companies, then we'll restrict consumers' access to certain content, and we'll restrict their choice of Internet service providers. I don't think that that's so.

It simply doesn't make sense for Verizon as the underdog in this market to block a consumer's access to content, and to restrict their choice on the Internet. We want more content provider to our end-users, whether we provide it, or AOL does, or

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

EarthLink or other providers.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

We have a viable wholesale business today. We provide dial-up access to about 400 Internet service providers, and a part of those Internet service providers buy our DSL service and repackage it with their own offerings, under their own brand name. So it's a viable wholesale business today, and want it to be viable wholesale business tomorrow. But the day that we start restricting consumer choice is the day that they leave our networks and they go over to the cable networks, and we lose a customer. think a truly competitive market, not one based on regulation, will best ensure that consumers providers have access to each other across the entire Internet. Thank you.

Dan Brenner, Senior Vice MR. GOLDBERG: and Regulatory Policy at President for Law National Cable and Telecommunications Association in Washington, D.C., where he has served since 1992. Previously, he served as Director the Communications Law Program, and a member faculty at UCLA Law School.

NEAL R. GROSS

Brenner was Senior Legal Advisor Chairman Mark Fowler of the FCC. He was also Vice Chairman of the U.S. Delegation to the ITO World Radio Conference in Geneva, Switzerland in 1984. He's been a consultant to various organizations, was a senior fellow at the Annenberg Washington Program, and serves on the faculty of Georgetown School of Law. Mr. Brenner has served as a member and Vice Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting from 1986 to 1991. He is a graduate of Stanford University and Stanford Law School and the Senior Executive Program of Stanford's School of business. Thanks for coming.

MR. BRENNER: Thank you, Larry and the group for inviting me. I think this is a great topic for you guys to talk about, and I hope -- I'll try to keep myself to my time. And, Larry, cut me off if I go long, because I think the question and answers are likely to be the most interesting part of this marathon.

It might be interesting to step back for just a moment and a lot of people don't know where

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

cable modem service came from, as if it was fore ordained as part of a great scheme as the next product for the cable industry, and that's really not what happened.

The way it's been explained to me, having lived through it at the NCTA is that cable companies in Boston, as it turned out, wanted to develop local area networks for some customers, just provide data transport as a commercial enterprise for an industrial And it was a new business for cable. developing some prowess with telecommunications, but we hardly were very -- the leader in it. We're still a pretty small player in telecommunication service, but the idea was that as long as we were going to build a LAN, maybe it made sense to have access to what was then called the World Wide Web, and be able to browse, as well as transmit data among offices in an industrial park. And Intel, at least, took the position that the cable modem would never work. network could not do this. And some very enterprising engineers working with some cable companies developed a product. And at the beginning, those of you who

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

were really adopters, if any of you were of cable modem service, know that it was not the product that you see today.

service took two engineers the better part of half a day in your home to try to install this thing. Usually have to come back the next day because it didn't work the first day. Over time it's developed so that you can go to a Circuit City, buy a cable modem, call the company, Plug N Play, and you have always-on broadband service. So it's really emerged as a very customer friendly product that's easy to install.

I think in fairness to Scott's comments about the cable industry, it's worth knowing that the DSL technology, and many of you know this, was around a lot longer than cable modem service. And it sort of sat on the shelf of the phone companies for many years until cable came along and said hey, there's a residential market for broadband. Because as you know, even today the phone companies offer T-1 circuits and other -- and ISDN was the product that

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

they thought would sell, but it cost a great deal more. And T-1, of course, is still a lot more than any cable modem service. And it was -- I think the cable industry's risked capital and ingenuity that led the -- really roused the phone companies from their slumber and got them into the residential phone service. So that's why you see the competition that's heating up in residential broadband service. And cable leads it in some ways because we were out ahead first.

Cable has spent since 1996 about \$75 billion in risk capital, not rate of return capital coming from an embedded phone base, but risk capital to improve our networks. That's about \$1,000 per customer to rebuild our networks, not just for modem service, but also to provide digital cable service so that we can compete with DDS, which in the mid-90s sort of took the lead on diversity and quality in video. They had more offerings than the typical cable company did.

And in 2002 alone, we spent about \$215 per customer upgrading our network for that customer. The

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

numbers as Scott indicated, show continued growth cable is in over 12 million homes today, but passes nearly 90 million homes. DSL is in front of around 60 million homes, and it's adopted by -- a little over six and a half million of those homes take DSL.

That service is going to grow. Morgan Stanley estimates that broadband will account for 35 percent of residential access, so that's down from the 70 plus number that Scott indicated, so it's a growing business. And cable continues and wants to complete build-out.

One of the issues, I think, for policymakers is that at some point reaching certain unserved areas is difficult. We don't -- cable doesn't serve every home, and phone companies, because of at least the current technical limitations of DSL may not be able to reach rural telephone customers, so there are some, I think, policy challenges in reaching the last 10 percent, maybe the last 7 percent of American residences with broadband. Congress has these in terms of different looked at programs.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

Let me just make a couple of policy points, and save time for questions and comments. Now cable has taken the view that while this may not be a mason service any more, it's a service that's still growing. It's hardly -- I think the first adopters have adopted it. There are lots of reasons why people don't have broadband in their homes.

Let me ask, how many people here in the room have residential broadband? It's a large number here but not everyone, and it may be that because you have broadband at your office, or you do mostly e-mail at home, and so that's satisfactory. So there is the challenge, I think, of finding products and services meeting customers, including and ways of price competition that Scott's indicated that phone companies have engaged in some very aggressive pricing try right now for their service to boost to subscription rates, to get people subscribe, to because there is a network effect, as some of you are familiar with that term, with broadband. The more people on the network, the more companies will produce programming for networks, broadband networks.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

i think that one way to think about the
next era of broadband is, in fact, terms of premium
programming. It's hard to believe because there's so
much free available on the Internet, and early efforts
at pay services on the Internet weren't all that
popular. The Wall Street Journal has been struggling
to convince people to pay for subscriptions, and I
think the restaurant review Zagot switched from a free
to a pay model, and is still trying to find its way.
But if you think about what happened with cable
television in the 70s, the cable industry convinced,
because there was good programming, convinced people
who were getting plenty of free television to start
paying for their television. And today, nearly 70
percent of more than 70 percent of Americans pay
for television, even though there's a substantial
amount of free television over the air, including
public television, non-commercial television. So
there is an ability to convince people.

And another comment I'd just like to point out, that people pay a lot for water. I see some blue bottles in here that suggests that people are

NEAL R. GROSS

convinced that something that's available at the tap, it's still worth paying \$1.25 for if presented in an attractive dark bottle.

Well, this is, after all, a consumer group, so I take it that there's some awareness of the fact that it is available just outside the door. be that as it may, I think that may happen with broadband too, that there will be services that we can't envision today that people will pay for - and just talking about pornography websites which have already demonstrated, I think, beyond anyone's -- most people's tolerance there's a demand for pay adult websites. kinds of products and services that we haven't quite been able to see developed because the number broadband subscribers isn't large enough. advice as a policy man would be to keep the government involvement at an absolute minimum. Keep government taxes, and fees, and franchises and franchise fees at a minimum to get this service out, to get a large number of people on the broadband network. see the innovative, creative programming things that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

can happen.

2.1

Today we have over 300 programming networks on cable that provide all kinds of programs, some good, some bad, some interest you and some that bore you. But the fact is, there's that fabulous choice that didn't exist in 1975 when there were no satellite delivery program networks, and I think we're all the better for it because we have more choice. So we feel that regulation is a mistake.

I think the Commission had it exactly right in declaring this an interstate information service, interstate in the sense that there really is not a need for extensive local regulation. Problems on the Internet, whether they're customer service or other kinds of issues can emanate from the local CMTS, the cable tied in, but it may just be as likely happening at some hop somewhere out in the cyberspace, so it's not the traditional local service problem that you have with cable television, where you can generally identify the technical problem somewhere in the local network.

And I think that people do view this

NEAL R. GROSS

product as something that is interstate, indeed, international. And that is, I think, why the Commission was right to declare it to be an interstate service. I look forward to talking about it with my colleagues and with all of you.

MR. GOLDBERG: Thanks, Dan. It's great to see you and Scott agreeing so much. And again, I'm also glad you asked about how many people here have broadband, because as you can see, quite a few of the members of this committee do. And I think like they say about people who own TIVO, you can pry it out of our cold dead fingers, because once you get broadband, you really want to keep it.

Again, fortuitously, our next speaker is John Windhausen. John Windhausen is President of the Association of Local Telecommunications Services with nearly 19 years of telecommunications experience in D.C., including on Capitol Hill and at the FCC. As AFCS President, Windhausen speaks on behalf of the CLECs, Competitive Local Exchange Carrier industry, on legal, regulatory and commercial issues.

From `96 to `99, Mr. Windhausen served as

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

General Counsel for the Competition Policy Institute, a non-profit consumer advocacy organization in the energy and telecommunications field. From 1987 to 1996, Mr. Windhausen was Senior Counsel and Counsel for the Communication Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate Commerce Committee, working with Senators Hollings, Inouye, and others, and he worked closely on the Telecom Act of `96.

Prior to his work in the Senate, Mr. Windhausen was a Staff Attorney in the FCC's Common Carrier Bureau from `84 to `87. Mr. Windhausen holds a JD degree from UCLA School of Law, and a Bachelor's Degree in History from Yale. Thanks for coming.

MR. WINDHAUSEN: Thank you, Larry. Let's see. I have a couple of apologies I'd like to start off with. First, an apology for not being able to present or prepare this Power Point presentation enough in advance to have it transcribed in the right presentation format for everybody. I am going to walk through it on the screen here, I believe, and will talk through each of the slides as they come up. And it has been e-mailed out, and I can make sure that

2.1

it's presented to all of you who need it in a better format.

Second apology is for my lack of preparation here today. I didn't realize in advance that I might have the chance to sit in what appears to be the FCC Chairman's Chair, and it's so unusual for a CLEC representative to have the authority or power. I don't quite know what to do with this.

So not having that preparation, I'm just going to proceed through this presentation for you. And if you would bear with me too a little bit at the beginning, because I'm not sure how many of you are familiar with ALTS and who we are, so I'm going to try to walk you through a little bit of who ALTS represents, and what we do, and the platforms that we provide service over.

But first off, ALTS, as mentioned, the Association for Local Telecommunication Services. We are the leading trade association that represents the facilities-based CLECs, so that means that we are the companies that are building our own separate broadband networks in competition with the telephone companies.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

Some of the companies are listed here. I won't read all of them, but KMC Telecom, Allegiance, Choice Focal, Covad, Time Warner, Telecom, PacWest are the kinds of companies that we represent. And these are all local companies competing for local service, so that means we represent companies who We have DSL build their own fiber optic cables. companies such as Covad, New Edge Networks, DSL Net. We have fixed wireless companies, and we provide the full suite of voice and broadband consumers.

That means that we do not represent the Bell companies, who are our main competitors. We also do not represent the main long distance companies, so AT&T, MCI and Sprint, for instance, are not members of ALTS. Our focus is on the local market.

Now a lot of you may be familiar with the fact that the CLEC industry has taken it on the chin over the last few years financially, and a lot of the stories you may have seen in the trade press reflect the fact that a lot of our companies have gone bankrupt in the last couple of years. And the overall

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

numbers of competitors has diminished quite significantly.

Having said that, we are, I think, on the cusp of a revival in the CLEC industry. In the year 2002, was the first year that the CLEC industry posted positive EBITDA. That means Earnings Before Interest, Taxes, Depreciation, and Amortization. It's a measure of our future profitability, and it basically means that for the first time in 2002, our companies brought in more revenue than we spent on running our network, it's important milestone SO very toward profitability, and very significant that we're able to achieve that.

Also, in the first six months of this year, our stock has doubled in value, at least the publicly traded CLECs. So we're very optimistic that the future is bright for our companies, the companies that have survived.

And lastly, of course, our market share continues to grow. And this is, I think, quite astounding that even though we probably lost about two-thirds of our companies in the number of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

companies, our total market share is now up to about 13 percent of the local telephone marketplace when measured in terms of revenues.

Now I'd like to spend a couple of minutes talking about the benefits that we provide to consumers because after all, this is what you all are primarily focused on, and what policymakers should be focused on first and foremost.

Our companies -- our first benefit is that we offer very significant price discounts to the services that are generally offered by the telephone companies. I used to say 10 to 30 percent discount, and in doing some more research, I found quite a number of examples of our companies offering up to 50 percent discounts off the prices that you would have to pay for the Bell Company to receive an equivalent service.

And let's face it, we don't have the name recognition that the Bell Companies do. If we're going to win market share, and compete well, we have to offer a value to the consumer. And a big part of that value are the lower prices that we can provide,

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

and we're very proud of that. We also offer new innovative technologies, which I'll talk about more in a second. And we also do our most -- the most we can to contribute to our community.

Just spending one more minute on each of those three criteria, there's a lot of text here in this slide, but the basic point is that the Yankee Group has done surveys each of the last couple of years on customer satisfaction, and they found from of those years that the CLEC industry has out-polled, out-ranked the Bell Companies with regard to their customer service. The prices are cheaper, and also the level of customer service that we provide is superior to that that you can get from the Bell Companies. And there's a big article that was written up, I recommend to you, in the Chicago Tribune last month, which detailed the consumer benefits that we provide.

In terms of broadband innovation, CLECs are often at the forefront of bringing new broadband technologies to the market. We were the first to innovate and provide what's called frame relay

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

services, one of the first broadband data services. We were also the first to provide DSL to the market.

As Dan mentioned, DSL had been sitting on the shelf of the Bell Companies for years. It wasn't until CLEC started to deploy the technology that it really began to take-off in the market. And we're also deployed fixed wireless service.

A couple of examples here on this slide, PacWest, one of our members, is currently rolling out a new service to triple the speed of dial-up access, and this is going to be particular advantageous for rural areas that don't have typical broadband They're going to be able to get availability today. the equivalent speeds over their dial-up service without having to pay extra cost for it, or without having to upgrade their computers. It's an example of the kinds of innovation that we're able to provide.

And why are we able to provide that?
Well, it's because we use the local loop that we lease
from the Bell Company. This pictorial tries to
demonstrate how we provide service. We connect our
equipment, and the three switches there that are in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

color on this screen are meant to exemplify the intelligence that we put onto what we call the dumb pipe, which is the transmission capability.

Now I use the word "dumb" not pejoratively towards any particular company. It's just the best way to make the point that the actual transmission technology, whether it's the copper or the fiber, is fairly transparent. It just carries data back and But the more intelligence you put on that pipe, the higher quality service you can provide to the consumer, and that's what our companies specialize in. with the more sophisticated We come up intelligence and data speeds using the dumb pipes provided to us by the phone companies.

I've provided here a few examples our humanitarian programs. In particular, I'll mention Covad's grant program to Micro Entrepreneurs specializing in helping companies owned by women and minorities, but we have all kinds of these kinds of public service programs that our companies provide.

Now to face the main question of this panel head-on, you've been asked to consider this

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

notice of parody, and Scott has done a good job of framing the issue for you. In terms of parody between the Bell Companies on the one hand, and the cable companies on the other, I respectfully suggest, that should not be the main question that this group focuses on. That's a false premise on which to start this debate.

The real question is, what's in the best interest of the consumer, not what's in the best interest of two sets of giant companies and industries. And in that score, I think, as I've demonstrated, the participation by our companies, the CLECs, provide an awful lot of benefits to the consumer, and you should -- I would ask that you keep that in mind, the tremendous consumer benefits that we provide.

But if you do want to talk about parody, well, let's really talk about parody. Let's talk about all the advantages the Bell Companies have over the CLECs, over our competitors. The Bell Companies have access to every city street. They have access to every building. They have access to extremely low

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

cost of capital. They have access to loops and transport, and they provision their customers much more quickly than they provide them to us.

These are all ways in which the Bell Companies have a disparate advantage over the competitive industry. So if you do want to go down that road, we're happy to go down that road, but there are an awful lot of disparities out there in the marketplace that we would ask you to take into consideration.

The Bell Companies will similarly make the argument that they need to be deregulated in order to promote broadband, and deploy it more widely. If you look at the evidence, however, on investment, it shows a very different story than what you might be led to believe. In fact, investment has been very, very high since 1996, in large part because of the competition that the 1996 Act set in motion. If you look at the CLECs investment, our industry alone has invested \$71 billion. I think that's comparable to the \$75 billion that Dan mentioned from the cable industry. Even though we're a far smaller industry than the cable

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

companies in terms of revenues, we're actively building these competitive networks as much as we can.

And when you look at the Bell Companies' investment levels and track them over a decade, rather than just looking at the last two years, you see that investment their levels $\circ f$ have increased significantly, almost doubled in 2000 over their historic rate of investment through the 1990s. think this is all because of the competitive forces that were set in motion by the 1996 Act, so there's really a great success story here. The amount of significant. investment has The been verv availability of broadband is higher than it's ever been before, and something to be proud of. Up to 83 percent of consumers now can choose a broadband provider, if they wish.

So what the Bell Companies plea for deregulation comes down to is, you should feel sorry for us. And Scott signaled that there are all these players in the broadband marketplace, and they're the only ones that are regulated. But if you look at their financial statistics in the last few years,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

they're doing very, very well. Most folks realize that they now have more long distance customers that they've lost in the local market, and their revenues are very high. Their EBITDA margins are very high, higher than our's, so there's no reason to feel sorry for the Bell Companies.

So in conclusion, I would ask that you consider that consumers will benefit most from a wide variety of competitors, and including the competition that our CLECs provide in the marketplace. Ideally, consumes should want a variety of players offering various technologies, over a variety of platforms.

Scott mentioned that if they refuse to let us have access to their network, we could go somewhere else. Well, we can't. We might like to go to the cable companies and their platform, use technologically, it's not available to us. It's not possible. Our only avenue of providing competition is through leasing the local loop from the Bell Company, and that's how consumers are going to benefit the most. Thank you.

MR. GOLDBERG: Thank you. I'm glad we're

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

finally getting at some of these regulatory issues. And I think maybe what we'll do once we finish all the presentations, be about time for the break, is to offer rebuttal opportunities down the panel so we could answer some of the questions each of you are bringing up.

Our next speaker is Nick Miller. He's the Managing Partner of Miller & Van Eaton, a law firm that is involved in telecommunications and cable TV law. He served as Communications Counsel to the U.S. Senate, and was special consultant to the White House on telephone deregulation issues. He represents local governments and real estate interest in telecom and cable television matters.

Mr. Miller is a frequent public advocate for the rights and interests of local governments in modern communications. Mr. Miller is also counsel to ALOAP in the cable modem proceedings at the FCC. That's the Alliance of Local Organizations Against Preemption, and it includes the National League of Cities, U.S. Conference of Mayors, National Association of Counties, International Municipal

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

Lawyers Association and others.

2.1

Mr. Miller received his law degree in `73, and his undergraduate degree in Economics in 1966, both from the University of Washington. He served with commendations and awards in the U.S. Navy, and his service did include a tour of duty in Viet Nam. Mr. Miller.

MR. MILLER: Thank you very much. First, I want to say it's an honor to be here. I want to be clear about who I am, and what I'm representing. I am counsel to the National Municipal Local Government Associations in the proceeding at the FCC dealing with the DSL and cable modem issues. The acronym is ALOAP, as Larry indicated, but I bring you greetings from the local elected officials.

That hat means I am not here speaking on behalf of consumers. I'm here speaking on behalf of folks who care deeply about consumers, but who keep the consumer interest in balance and perspective with other interests that are also in the day-to-day fray that is before every city council. So one of the things I would point out to you is that there are very

NEAL R. GROSS

well expressed consumer views that have been filed on all of these matters by very substantial consumer organizations here in Washington, D.C. And I would the committee would take hope that those under advisement and read those with great care. I'm speaking specifically of the comments of the Consumers Union and Consumer Federation of America, and various other organizations, including AARP.

So with that said, let me explain the point of view of local governments as we look at this issue. One point I think we bring is, we are less concerned about the deployment of technology, and much more concerned about the deployment of services.

If you want to roll-out fiber optic to the home as quickly as possible, you create an unregulated monopoly. You generate super profits in the marketplace, and guess what? Wall Street will flow money to that result. But the price you pay, is you also give up control of the services market in that process. And so I would ask the committee to keep in mind clearly the question of what is the way that you're going to allot the most, and most competitive,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

and most diverse range of services to consumers? And what is the way in which you will allow consumers to avoid market failures, and to have their voice really heard as they vote with their dollars for and among those services. So it's striking me, for example, and I assume that this is only the first of many of these sessions that the committee will have, that it seems to me that the service providers are a group that ought to be heard from by this committee.

Local governments see the issue two-fold. There is a problem now that's created by the fact that cable modem and DSL service is not being rolled out in a competitive market. Even Scott's figures suggest that 50 percent of the homes have only the choice of one provider. And, in fact, I believe that data - and I'll allow him to clarify - I believe that data is based upon zip code availability, not actual homes passed. So in only 50 percent of the zip codes is there two service providers offering service to one home in that zip code. So I would suggest that right now, we are still very much dealing with a monopoly service provider environment. And to step

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

back and totally deregulate the behavior of that monopolist in that context is very threatening, and has a lot of implications for how the market will take shape.

Then there's a second problem. When the market becomes competitive, at this point, no one is talking about more than a duopoly, but let's assume a duopoly isn't fair, it is, in fact a competitive market. You still have the problem of market failure in adopting appropriate rules that give consumers real recourse as individuals when they experience real problems as individuals. And this is where I think the Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities is quite disturbed at what has happened in this building in the last year.

On March 15th of 2002, the FCC unilaterally adopted a Declaratory Order that set aside the existing set of regulatory rules that govern all forms of consumer protection with respect to broadband services by declaring that cable modem service was not a cable service and, therefore, was out from under the whole regulatory regime for cable

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

franchising. But, in fact, was an interstate information service. They unilaterally attempted to prevent the state regulators and the local regulators from being available to provide recourse to consumers who are having real problems.

Now that was March of 2002. We are now in July of 2003. We still have no rules in place that give any guidance or any state or local regulator guidance about what kind of remedies are available when a consumer experiences real harm, and real injury in the marketplace. So I would ask this committee to focus on that issue, and come to grips with it relatively quickly.

particularly Local governments are concerned because, in fact, we had a very elaborate, and we thought pretty efficient set of regulatory remedies out there to protect consumers individual markets through the cable franchise process. By declaring that this service is no longer a cable service, the Commission has taken all of those regulatory remedies out from within the grasp consumers.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

Now we do have some staff letters from the FCC that suggest that that decision doesn't completely local eliminate and state consumer protection authority in this area. But what that practically means is that the 35 to 36 hundred local franchise authorities have to adopt new rules and regulations, specifically aimed at the cable modem service. that the 52 state regulatory commissions have to adopt specific rules aimed at DSL service, trying to get through the legal landmine that the Commission has created with its decision.

So we are here before the Commission as the National Associations, asking the Commission to pay attention to what Commissioner Copps said in his dissent, when he said, "The Commission was adopting a decision on March 15th that was clearly far beyond the reach of the headlights of the Commission. And was creating an" -- and if I can extrapolate what I believe Commissioner Copps was saying, we have set up a situation that's going to replicate the problems that we had with long distance slamming.

There is not today a place that a consumer

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

can take a complaint if they are unhappy with the service that they are getting from their cable model provider, except to the provider itself. There is no other remedy out there.

Now there are some jurisdictions that are their traditional moving forward with expanding consumer protection relation, and I would encourage you to go home and encourage your local elected officials to take that initiative to fill that gap. But there's a real problem out there, and this group has something to say on that. And I would encourage I would be happy to provide whatever assistance local governments can provide you understand that problem in more detail.

I think there's a growing awareness that you cannot have even a competitive market without rules in place that allow investors to understand what the expectations are, that allow consumers to understand what the expectations are, and that provides an unbiased place to adjudicate and resolve disputes.

The example I like to use is - because I'm

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

a real soccer fan - is World Cup Soccer. You know, when the World Cup final game goes onto the playing field, you have the two best, most competitive, perfectly at parody teams competing with each other. If you did not have a set of rules and a referee on that field, you could not have a game. Thank you.

MR. GOLDBERG: Thank you. As I mentioned, we'll have a chance for some follow-up statements and rebuttals after the break. But finally, we'll now hear from the states.

David Svanda is a Commissioner with the Michigan Public Service Commission. He's been very active with the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, NARUC, as the elected President, as an Executive Committee and Board Member, and having held other leadership positions.

Mr. Svanda is also very familiar with the FCC and its advisory boards as a member of the Commission's Local and State Government Advisory Committee. He served as Director of Administrative Services for Governor John Engler, as Director of the Governor's Northern Michigan office.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

Mr. Svanda has a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Political Science and Urban Affairs from Western Illinois University, and a Master's in Public Administration Degree from Maxwell Graduate School at Syracuse University, and he's been involved with elective politics, as well, having run for Congress in 1994. Welcome.

COMMISSIONER SVANDA: Thank you very much,

Larry, and Madam Chairman and Members of the

Committee. It's an honor and privilege to be here

with you. And so early, as you are beginning your

service to the FCC and to the communication needs and

interests of this country, I understand this is just

your second meeting. And so I guess it makes it even

more meaningful to be here so soon as you begin your

work. I appreciate that.

In case some of you don't know what NARUC is, just a moment of explanation about it. It is the National Association of State Utility Commissioners. We represent the interests at the national level of the state commissions of all 50 states, plus the District of Columbia, plus the U.S. territories, and

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

so we are a constant advocate at the national level in this town, both before Congress and the Administrative Agencies, with regard to a wide range of issues. And those issues do include, as was already mentioned, trying to present a balanced position, which is what state commissions attempt to do back home, and what we work towards in our policy attempts here in Washington.

We do try to balance consumer interests with those of shareholder interests. We do that on a continuing basis. We attempt to balance the interests of the various consumer classes represented in many of by you in this instances some room, acknowledging that there are vast differences between the needs of each of us as individual consumers of services, and in this instances, network services and our commercial and our industrial types of friends, who also have needs of their own and are very real as they make their contributions to how this country works. And lastly, balancing the needs of individuals as we identify them with the particular sets of needs that they bring to the table.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

I tended to focus my thoughts coming into this session on the issue of parody and regulatory parody in particular, thinking that that was the issue that you were tending to struggle with. States sit in a fairly unique position with regard to the question of parody because we're right in the middle of the federal mix that happens to occur around broadband, happens occur around other telecommunication to And what I mean by the "federal mix", is the FCC representing our national government, certainly has interests that flow across state lines, interstate in nature, don't recognize are the differences between the states, but recognize, fact, that networks, national and international communication systems need to be very free and flowing, so the FCC has a very broad scope.

The states have a very narrowed scope in relationship to what the FCC does. The states are concerned with what we tend to call principally plain old telephone service. Plain old telephone service is what most of us have grown up with over time, and recognize it as the outgrowth of what used to be just

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

old AT&T. And yet, states have a very strong concern for new developments, new technologies, what broadband is doing for us, and what it can do for us. And those interests are because there is a direct relationship between that plain old telephone service, what the new technologies are, what we can expect by way of pricing, what will be delivered by way of service. And it is all interrelated and interconnected.

As we see the Internet, as we see cellular phones replacing the need for old wireline phones in many instances, we have ways that our kids and grandchildren use to communicate that we maybe never thought of, as a possibility. It all points to the need for better coordination and view.

And lastly in that regard, we are the entity that in many instances across the country are responsible for the creation of cities, and counties, and townships as creatures of state government. Local governments are responsive to state legislature, state executives, and in some instances, constitutional kinds of provisions. But we recognize - and I will slip to my Michigan Commissionership a little bit -

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

recognize the need to coordinate as best we can, being in the middle, the efforts of local governments, our own efforts at the state level, and then what's occurring at the national level, so that we can get to a climate that is conducive to achieving the objectives that we all tend to set out for ourselves.

Like my panel colleague at the end, Nick,

I wanted to talk to you about regulatory parody by

talking about a sport game. Instead of soccer, Nick,

I wanted to draw out an example of parody for you by

talking about the national sport of baseball, and

thought this late in the afternoon after you've been

flooded with probably technical and legal kinds of

presentations all day, thought you might be up for a

little baseball.

But think about a baseball, two baseball teams starting the season out, say this season. Two professional baseball teams at that league and playing at that level. One of those teams has been around for 100 years, and has all of the usual kinds of trappings that you would expect from a major league baseball team that's been around that long. And the other one

2.1

is just starting out as a brand new upstart. That brand new upstart, and the old 100 year old team are obviously expected to play by the same rules. Three strikes, four balls, same number of innings played, same number of fielders, all of those kinds of things. The umpires are expected to call them as they see them, the balls and the strikes, and the sliding outs and all of those kinds of things. And it is professional baseball, so it's hard and fast. The pitches are thrown fast, and the short stop to first can be approaching 80 or 90 miles an hour as they whip it over.

Now the same rules, remember. However, the new team can't quite afford to have gloves or bats, and in not being able to afford gloves and bats, they also ride around in a bus, and so getting to games is a little slower. Now imagine those two teams. When they meet on the playing field, you guys can probably pick the winner. You can probably pick where they will finish at the end of the season in terms of statistics, and where they are in the rankings. And so it's something to be considered when

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

discussing parody; playing by the same rules, umpires calling them exactly the same way, but what are the resources that are available, and how can it be deployed in the game strategy and playing it out.

That is the point of, I quess, my little diversion here, is to point out that in addition to considering regulatory parody, there is a much bigger environment that has to be taken into account. are other things that also need to be brought into parody at the same time, or relative time as parody in regulation is considered. And that can't be done overnight. It can't be done quickly. It requires transition to get there. It sometimes, in fact, requires planning in order to get there. It requires the players to be trying to achieve the same public interest, and one of the other panelists mentioned what that focus should be. And that's a focus on consumer services, and quality, and pricing that suits the needs of consumers of all types.

So parody at the regulatory level is dependent on, must be cognizant of the rest of the environment in which regulation is occurring. Access

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to capital parody might be a good thing to also be Access to the customer might be a good discussing. parody issue to be discussing. And so with that said, from the State Public Service Commission perspective, certainly getting to parody is a goal that we should all have tacked up on the wall. It's one where we should be working towards, but one that we cannot in an artificial way move too quickly because we'll have many undesired consequences that would not be productive. The goal is certainly one to endorse. Adding our efforts to achieving it is certainly one that state regulatory folks have an interest in pursuing, but to do it with care and caution.

In that regard, State Utility Commissions through our research, put together a 2002 survey of what states are doing with regard to broadband regulation. By and large, it is a very light-handed approach, and one that is consistent with how broadband regulatory attitudes generally seem to be; and that is to stay out of the way of a great technology, and let the innovative forces unfold as they will.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

There are a few states that have gone a little further than that, and I quess we're all watching for what comes out of the FCC in its final order on tri-annual review, to understand whether or not the state actions will, in fact, remain valid afterwards, or if they will be open and subject to And there are, I think, a good number of challenge. states that have taken the approach - my own State of Michigan is one of these - taken the approach that we want to do everything that we can in our state to incent broadband deployment. So it is not a matter of burdening deployment with regulatory layers, instead, understanding what the needs are to broadband deployed in every corner of our state just as quickly as it can be, and serving the needs of our citizens and businesses.

We have, in Michigan, enacted just last year what some call a model set of statutes that does exactly that, and I'd be happy to talk individually or at a future time with all of you about what's entailed in those provisions.

Let me close at that point, and I look

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

1	forward to the rest of the conversation.
2	MR. GOLDBERG: I appreciate how well
3	everyone here has worked towards explaining these
4	issues, and the sports analogies, I think, are
5	appreciated by some or most. As a Yankee fan living
6	in Boston, I very much appreciate that.
7	We'll take a break now, maybe just 10
8	minutes. We'll do our rebuttals right after the
9	break, and maybe we'll enter the game of darts after
10	that. Ten minutes.
11	(Whereupon, the proceedings in the
12	above-entitled matter went off the record at 2:28 p.m.
13	and went back on the record at 2:49 p.m.)
14	CHAIR ROOKER: Okay. Larry, we're going
15	to turn it back over to you.
16	MR. GOLDBERG: Thank you, Shirley.
17	CHAIR ROOKER: Do we have anything else
18	that we need? No, we're going to go back to business.
19	Okay. It's your's.
20	MR. GOLDBERG: Okay. Well, I promised a
21	couple of minutes for rebuttal or answers to the
22	questions that were raised by the other panelists. So

why don't we go down and try to take no more than two minutes, because we really do want to get to Q&A by members of the committee. So in the order that we started, Scott.

MR. RANDOLPH: Okay. Thank you. I'm not really sure who was the incentive to get the telephone companies to roll-out DSL, whether it was the CLECs or the cable companies, but I'll let you guys fight about that. But I would like to say one thing about that.

DSL is an interim technology. It's not a means to an end. It's not going to get us where we need to be in the broadband networks of the future. We're going to have to be able to make significant investment out there in the network. We're going to have to deploy more fiber to neighborhoods, and even all the way into individual customers' homes.

In fact, we have a trial going out in a neighborhood called Brambleton out in Loudoun County out here in Virginia, where we are wiring houses directly with fiber. So that's going to take quite an amount of investment, and we're going to have to be able to sell the services and applications and be

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

successful in the market out there in order for us to be able to recoup that investment.

One point that I'll just make that Nick had brought up, regarding my chart being sort of showing that there are 50 percent of the customers in our territory that have no choice. Well, that's not where we want to be, and hopefully by the end of this year, we will reach about 80 percent of our customers with DSL. And as Dan mentioned, cable is available to about 90 percent of the households in the United States, so we're going to get there as far as deployment.

The question is, how do we compete in this market? And for us to compete in the market, we need to be able to sell the services and applications, and the content that the consumers want. And we can't do that under the current rules. It's impeding us.

I will say one more thing, just to comment to one of John's remarks regarding the competitive local exchange carriers. Even with the FCC's ruling that they came out with in February, that we're awaiting the order on regarding local competition, the

2.1

1	FCC declined to require us to unbundle our broadband
2	networks and sell it in piece parts to competitive
3	local exchange carriers. But they did preserve the
4	right of the CLECs to continue to have access to
5	loops, so going forward in the future, even as we are
6	putting fiber out there into neighborhoods and to our
7	network, the competitive local exchange carriers will
8	still have access to loops to be able to serve
9	customers.
10	We don't think that anything that we are
11	proposing as far as broadband is concerned in the
12	FCC's open broadband proceedings will affect the
13	capability of some of the CLECs to be able to access
14	customers.
15	MR. GOLDBERG: Thanks. Dan.
16	MR. BRENNER: Yeah. There are just 27
17	quick things.
18	(Laughter.)
19	MR. BRENNER: I'm kidding with the 27.
20	One thought I had, you know, I was thinking about
21	consumer protection. And I don't think, contrary to
22	some of the views here, that consumer protection turns

on how many players there are in the market. You can have 100 different car companies, car dealerships, and you still need consumer protection. And you may have one provider of clock repair, and you don't need extensive consumer protection of that.

I think the key is really not how many players there are in the market, but what is the utility of the regulation. Will the apparatus that you're spending taxpayer money for benefit the customer? And I think you always have to analyze that. And I think that that debate does get lost.

One of the points Nick made was gee, we've had no consumer regulation since March of `02 to July of `03, and it's going to go on for maybe more months. I don't see that the sky is falling down. What I have seen is that more and more people are taking broadband, more and more people are finding new ways to offer applications of broadband. And that while there have been some consumer complaints, the FCC does log complaints from cable, including broadband, and it's less than 100 complaints nationwide. Ron is disagreeing with that number.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

Anyway, at the FCC I'm saying. There may be complaints at the local level, but -- and I'm not saying that it's a complaint-free service, but many of the issues on the Internet are not -- if there are local issues or local billing problems, that are often issues that ought to be settled out, I think, between the customer and the cable company.

I've said this when any people complain about video service or cable service, if you're not getting what you're paying for, don't pay for it until the cable operator gets a clean good picture into your home, don't pay for the service. And just insist that the cable company deliver a good picture, or come to some settlement as to what the picture is worth. But don't pay for something that you're not getting, and that goes for cable modem service, and it goes for DDS service, it goes for telephone service from and Verizon, it goes for service from and any CLEC company.

Unfortunately, we don't quite have that relationship with the government, but -- I point to you, David. You withhold tax and see what happens.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

The cable industry, and Nick knows this, did not oppose the definition of cable modem service. In fact, the cable industry went along with that. It was the FCC that changed it, although we didn't oppose the FCC's view of it either. At that point, we were paying a cable franchise fee, or a 5 percent fee. But it's not as if municipal governments are bereft of funds to regulate cable.

You may not be aware of it, but over \$2 billion a year come out of your customers or out of consumer's pockets who are cable subscribers to pay for regulation at the local level. That's what the money is supposed to be used for. It's not supposed to be used to balance budgets. Maybe it is being used for balancing budgets in these times of lack of revenues from cities, but the idea was that there would be an adequate fund for regulating cable, and the administrative cost of it. That's a lot of money. It's 10 times the budget of the building we're in, so if there is still an inadequate amount of consumer protection due to lack of funding, I'm suggesting that it's not a funding question.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

And finally, we've heard a lot about parody. You may have noticed in my comments that I didn't really address how the telephone company should be regulated, or how CLECs should be regulated. We are not in the business, as a trade association, and I think I'm glad -- it makes my job easier, and I think I feel better about my job. I'm not in the business of telling government how to regulate other industries.

If the phone companies deserve to be deregulated based on their history, based on their current offerings, based on policy judgments, then so be it. But I don't think that there's any magic to the word "parody." What you want to do is have the right regulation for the right circumstances. If regulation doesn't help and doesn't work, don't impose it because it does impose costs.

MR. GOLDBERG: Thanks. John.

MR. WINDHAUSEN: Thanks, Larry. Actually, I'll respond to Scott's comments. Scott, you're indicating that your view of this FCC decision on bundling rules is that it will not harm the CLECs.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

And I certainly hope that's true, but I have a couple of reasons for thinking otherwise.

First, I think your suggestion is that we'll continue to get access to the loop, so we'll continue to be able to do the -- have access to our current customers and technologies. That's kind of a best case scenario, but think about that. Even in that case, that relegates the CLEC industry to the older technology, and that will not allow us to participate in the broadband future.

companies specialize in broadband Our deployment. That's one of the bia marketing That's why we've said, we advantages we have had. came up with DSL first before they did, frame relay and these other sophisticated broadband services. We don't want to be relegated to the old technologies. We want to participate in the future, as well, and be able to continue to provide these full benefits for the newer generations of technologies. So that's why we think we should be able to get access to all of the network, regardless of the technologies deployed, and we pay for it. We pay a rate for it that compensates

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

the Bell Companies, and we're willing to do that.

Now that's the best case scenario. worse, however, is that our big fear is that, as you know, it's very difficult to identify, go into the telephone network and say okay, that piece equipment is a broadband piece, and that piece of Because actually, the telephone equipment is not. network is so interconnected, and has so many pieces to it, and to get a broadband service may transmitted over lots of different technologies, our big fear is that as the Bell Companies say okay, our broadband technologies exempted from are unbundling, that they'll start applying that that could be a huge exemption, which they start taking away our basic rights to the existing facilities in And that -- if that interpretation the ground today. is what happens, that essentially puts us out of I mean, and that gets rid of the whole business. competitive thrust of the Telecommunications Act of Our companies really do then fold up shop and have to go away, if that's how this order ends up being interpreted.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

MR. MILLER: Larry, I just want to make two brief points. One is, and this is a personal view, the genius of the U.S. economic system, to me, has always been its use of the rule of law to provide remedy so that third-parties who are total strangers can do business with each other with confidence.

If you look at the developing world, the single most serious problem they have is that you cannot do business outside the oligargee because there's no remedy, if you are cheated, or if you are lied to, or if the person ignores the contract.

The genius of this system is we have a rule of law that provides a remedy. If you want to vibrant broadband services create the most environment, you have to simultaneously create a set of rules that provide real remedy to the participants in that marketplace. And let me give you a specific I'm a Comcast cable modem subscriber. example. love the service. I need the service. Every night my firewall tells me that Comcast has downloaded to my machine a piece of support software that is trying to get through the firewall back to the Comcast server

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

and the firewall blocks it, and asks me do I want to permit or block, and I block it every day.

I cannot find out from Comcast what information they're trying to download from my home computer that all my personal financial information on it. And there's no place I can go with that question. You know, now that means that Comcast -- if I don't find a solution to that problem, there will come a point at which the information on that computer is so sensitive, I will stop using that service in the way that I have become used to using it.

Now that's a burden on the economy, because there isn't a rule in place that gives me a remedy. And that's what I would ask this group to really focus on, those kinds of very real day-to-day problems. And the fact that -- and let me give you another example.

Dan made the comment that this is really an interstate world and, therefore, it's really not up to local officials. It's beyond the -- he didn't really say this, but let me extrapolate. The implication to me was, it's beyond the capability of

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

local officials to deal with it.

2.1

You know, we refinanced -- my wife and I refinanced our house last month. The first payment went off to the mortgage company. The mortgage sells the paper to another mortgage company. I get a notice from the second mortgage company that the first payment is late, with a \$150 charge attached.

Now that's in interstate commerce, because when I called the second mortgage company, it was clear they were in California. But you know what, my remedy is with Maryland State Consumer Protection Office, and I'm prepared to use it if there isn't a fix to it. So the fact that we are an interstate world doesn't mean that we can't adopt rules that are appropriate to deal with a specific problem. And again, that's what I would hope you folks would focus on. Thank you.

MR. GOLDBERG: Jared.

MR. CARLSON: I don't have rebuttal for any of these guys. It probably has to do with where I'm sitting. I guess that's how I got isolated clear over here on this side of things too.

NEAL R. GROSS

(Laughter.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

MR. CARLSON: I have sat in chairs similar to your's, I guess, in terms of sitting on a committee that's trying to give good advice to the FCC on very critical and important issues to folks that you represent. And I guess rather than spending any time in rebuttal and, in fact, spending much time at all, I guess I just wanted to put out there by way of suggestion to you as you work your way through this issue, as you have your discussions after this panel is over. And I think that probably the reason you had us as a panel was to try and build some common understanding of the issue, so that your discussions were more coordinated and efficient.

And so, I guess I would just add to the mix of the comment, that you consider whatever recommendation you ultimately are able to formulate, consider it in light of assuring that that into all recommendation takes account the complexities that you've heard from this panel.

This is not one of those issues that is very complex with a simple answer. If it had a simple

NEAL R. GROSS

answer, others would probably have already presented it. And so, think very carefully as a group about what recommendation you enter on the record with the FCC, assure that - and I know this is how you live your lives - assure that all of the groups have good representation in terms of the solution that you represent to the FCC, and that you are not inflicting any sort of unintended consequential harm to parties to the record.

MR. GOLDBERG: Good points. Our working group which, at this point, I assume that MCCA would like to join. You're on. Well, let's hear from the rest of the CAC now, and the members of the working group. WE've heard a lot about parody, whether it's possible, whether it's good, about needs for consumer protection. Does that include such things as rate regulation, must- carry, universal service, those sorts of things. I know lots of people have questions. We'll go right to Ron Mallard.

MR. MALLARD: Thank you, Larry. First of all, I didn't want to interrupt Dan during his comments, but I was -- and I didn't really disagree

NEAL R. GROSS

with 95 percent of what you had to say. I think my
only real objection was to the implication that
because the FCC had only received 100 complaints,
meant that there wasn't a problem, and there wasn't a
need for some kind of regulatory action at some level
of government. Because we're clearly experiencing
great numbers of complaints across the country with
cable modem service, and there are no solutions for
local governments to handle those kinds of complaints.
They're customer they're the basic kind of they
are the very same kind of basic customer service
complaints that we experience with cable television
services everyday. And it comes from the same
providers that provide cable television services, so I
would ask the panel - and I'm not posing this question
right now - what better authority is there to handle
those kinds of local consumer problems than the local
government regulatory agencies that have been set up
at the local level to do that?

So anyway, again, it's not the -- as I say, I didn't disagree with most of what you said. I do take issue with the small number of complaints that

the FCC is having. But let me get on to my question, if I could.

This is kind of a proposition, and then I'd like some responses from at least three of the I would argue that local government panel members. franchising authorities are really the only practical level of government, the only government provider of investigation consumer complaint and services that can be responsive to legitimate consumer problems. And I would ask first, Mr. Brenner, then Mr. Svanda, and then Mr. Miller to respond to that allegation, or to that argument, whether you agree with it, or if you don't agree with it, why not.

MR. BRENNER: Well, I should go first. I mean, I think it sort of relates to my question - I didn't interrupt your presentation, but I do think it relates to the nature of the problem. There are -- I've been to a call center of a cable company that handles incoming call center problems with data. And, you know, actually in the customer care area of data services, there are Level 1, Level 2, Level 3 type call centers. And Level 1 deals with, you know, maybe

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

some of the billing questions, stuff that has nothing to do with the network. Level 2, you know, may get more into the actual connectivity and some of the technical problems. And, you know, Level 3 may be an advanced problem somewhere on the net. I'm having a problem getting to this website. It keeps coming up.

I don't see that the local government regulator is good at any of those. I think it turns out that every one of those problems has to be addressed, because I think the local government regulator can put pressures. And Nick says in the end, it's a back-stop if the cable operator doesn't answer his phone, and doesn't respond to questions, and doesn't correct a billing problem. It's good to have a backup there. But the problems that are going to get solved in this, what is really an interstate service, are not going to get solved by a local regulator who will simply, you know, then have to call the cable company and say you better answer your phone.

I think you could put, and the FCC could be charged with setting up those kinds of rules. It's

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

part of the inquiry that the Commission is looking at since the March order, as to what is the role of consumer protection in this service. But I just don't know if local government has any expertise on the real problems that confront consumers.

There's an enormous consumer education issue that needs to be performed by local government. But solving the problems, now they're probably going to get solved either by the cable operator, or by somebody conking the head of the cable operator if they don't answer the phone properly to get the answers.

MR. MILLER: I want to go back to my home mortgage refinancing example. To me, the regulatory entity that should step up and assume responsibility is the entity that gave the license to that person to be in business. That's who the consumer has a legitimate complaint against, if that licensor is not overseeing the behavior of the licensee. And that's the local government that gave that franchise to that cable operator. I mean, that's why the cable operator enjoys that privileged position in the community. And

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

I don't think you can look at a taxpayer, or look at a consumer as a city council member and say you have no responsibility. And it makes no sense to the consumer to say you've been preempted by the federal government, so call the FCC.

COMMISSIONER SVANDA: I would answer yes, in theory in the perfect world. Now there are practicalities that cause me to probably attach some caveats to that. One is, that the local franchising authority really needs to be in sync with thousands of other local franchising authorities, so that there is a common and recognized set of standards that don't costs impose business service providers on deliverers that are just unreasonable and crazy, and counterproductive in the way that they might implemented. So if we can solve that, if we can assure that the local franchising authorities are not playing games and, in fact, are working in the best common interest, then we're working with a good system.

The local franchising authority in that same vein, should not be in a position to act as a

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

barrier to entry. My experience at the state level has shown me some examples where local franchising authorities will act as barriers to entry for one reason or another, will have selected some provider than another provider, and that doesn't add up to very good business plans for a business to do its roll-out either. And so I think with some practical overlays, yes, it doesn't necessarily answer some of the things that transcend wireless and satellite, and some of those kinds of issues. I'm not sure how quite local franchising authority applies, and with that then, would it work on the radios that we have in our vehicles and that sort of thing. Probably not.

But in general, of course, the closer to home you can drive things, the better off it's going to be. I think even as the FCC explores some of these issues, over time we've talked with them about well, where is the floor of people in this building, the portals building that's going to be answering the phones if they, in fact, start ringing? The local franchising authorities in a particular area may well receive in the course of a month 100,000 calls. And

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

if all of those calls were to start coming into the FCC, who's going to answer the phone? And they aren't staffed-up. State Commissions are not staffed-up, so -- and for certain, we can't abruptly change that system. Once again, if a new -- if something new is going to work better, it's going to take some time to get there.

COMMISSIONER SVANDA: I think pretty broad agreement here, actually, on the general But I want to sing a refrain you often hear from the local governments, and it's called "unfunded mandates". I think local governments are truly prepared to step-up and do this, but one of ironies in what the Commission did last March, is they said oh, by the way, not only do you lose regulatory authority, but you lose all your franchise fees associated with cable modem services. So taking Dan's point, that it would be nice to have some source of revenue that could pay for this regulatory authority, it would be nice to have the Commission be consistent about this, and recognize that if we're going to take responsibility and provide real consumer relief, we

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

ought to be able to set the tax, rent, and fee policy with respect to cable model services, as well.

MR. HOROWITZ: I have a foundation which is called the Fight Back Foundation for Consumer Education. We also have a website that's called FightBack.com. I do a lot of media stuff, and as far as you're concerned, Mr. Miller, we can get those problems solved for you in probably 24 hours, without going through the measures that you want to go through with the mortgage company and all that. That's what we do.

And the reason I'm saying this, is I'm listening to something hear that really, really has met upset, because I'm listening to a bunch of really important people who are out on the street, supposedly, knowing what's going on. And I feel like you're twirling around like you're on merry-go-round.

First of all, as far as complaints are concerned, the gentleman from Verizon. Verizon happens to be a monopoly now. It's a monopoly. They joined with a lot of companies. They joined with Bell

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

Atlantic, and they joined up with a wonderful company that was called -- in Los Angeles that was called -- oh, God. They're a wireless company. And if you go to the FCC, the state commission, these guys have been fined millions of dollars for bad customer service, and haven't paid it. All right.

I have a DSL connection. I started with a company that I call PacHell. And PacHell was PacBell, which became Southwest Bell which, as you know, is a monopoly. It took them seven months to try to find out what the problem was with the DSL line. And the problem was that they were running the wires to my house out of an old set of cables that were not fiber optic cables. And then they told me well, you know something. I hate to tell you this, Mr. Horowitz, but you're at the end of the line.

I said, "Oh, really? I'm at the end of the line. You mean we don't have fiber optic cable here, as I was told when they installed my DSL? Oh, no. You don't have fiber optic cable there."

Well, it's very simple. I went to my state agency and complained. These guys immediately came on

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

and said well, we'll take care of it. They still have not taken care of it. What they've done is they've refunded every month that it doesn't work. I don't want the refund. I want the service. Okay? And someone said well, just don't pay your bill. Well, you don't pay your bill to a DSL or to one of the monopoly phone companies, you will not have any service. They'll cut your service off.

Now my DSL has gone from DSHell with the earlier phone company, to DSHell with Southwest Bell.

And finally, I got to a point that what I did is I took our internet service provider that feeds all the computers in our office, and I now have a dial-up which is a pain in the ass. But the good thing about it is I have my computer working every day, and I don't have to call DSHell or any of those DSL companies.

Now with these other remarks that were made, I mean, I'm just absolutely floored by it. You guys would like to have open competition in a marketplace that is a monopoly marketplace. You can't have open competition in a monopoly marketplace

2.1

because you have to go to the local companies that run whatever is there, and make a deal with them to hook-up, so that you can get into the houses and the places where you want to sell your goods. And they're not going to give you a bargain price because you compete with them. They compete with you.

So then we get back to the -- you know, we always look to government for the reward to go in and save us. Government can't save you in a situation like that. You want the FCC to come up with a set of rules that's going to apply to how you deal with these companies intra and interstate, so that there would be a uniform rate that you could pay for whatever systems you want to put in there. That's part of what they call "free enterprise."

And, you know, I feel here that you're calling this parody. You want parody. That's the free enterprise system. And to compete in this marketplace, you have to be pretty tough, and you have to be pretty fast on your feet. And when you talk about going and being fast on your feet, and you're dealing with these franchise boards and the local

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	municipalities, you're dealing with entities that have
2	picked one provider usually, or maybe two in a market
3	who are going to give you all the service for whatever
4	you watch on television. Now that to me is not fair.
5	MR. GOLDBERG: Could you give the guys a
6	chance to answer some of these things?
7	MR. HOROWITZ: No, wait. I've got to
8	finish, and I'll be out of here, because this is
9	really bothering me.
10	MR. GOLDBERG: We only have 15 minutes.
11	MR. HOROWITZ: Let me just say this. That
12	is not fair. It is not fair for a local municipality
13	to decide on what they think would be the company that
14	provides the service in that market. And yet, most of
15	the companies that provide the service in those
16	markets are, guess what, monopoly companies. And what
17	we're facing here is a war with the monopolies.
18	Now if you could find a way to defeat the
19	monopolies and have them kick back money so that they
20	could give you a good deal to get into those markets
21	and be professional, that would be great. But by and

large, across the United States we get so many -- I

mean, I can't believe you guys don't go into areas where you could find out what the complaints are really like. Go to the State of California, go to the Public Utilities Commission there, you know, don't depend on the FCC complaints to be able to give you a true picture, because a lot of people do not know that they complain to the FCC. Nor do they have, believe it or not, a computer, nor do they want to be bothered with it.

We're trying to make it known that the FCC will do things for you. But to say that 100 problems, there's got to be tens of thousands of problems across the country. And I can vouch for that, because we get thousands.

MR. GOLDBERG: All right. Any one care to respond? Scott.

MR. RANDOLPH: I'll just say a couple of things, and I'm not sure what your experience was with PacBell, but I can tell you, you know, when we started first rolling out the DSL, and I think Rich can agree with this. We had some real problems, and our service was fairly lousy in a lot of places because it was a

2.1

new technology. The telephone network was not necessarily designed to roll that technology out. There's a lot of old stuff out there on those copper wires that have to be pulled out. And I'm one them too. I work for Verizon, but I have Comcast cable modem because I'm, you know, at the end of a long loop. But that's exactly what we did in March with our announcement, that we were going to go out there and take the step to pull fiber out there, to get out there closer to the neighborhoods, to shorten those loops to be able to provide DSL.

Let me something about service quality. Our service quality has improved. In fact, it has to improve. We can't compete in this market unless it does, because the cable -- you know, consumers are going to go to cable companies who are going to blanket the country with 90 percent penetration very quickly if we're not able to really deliver on our service.

MR. HOROWITZ: But, Scott, I can't get
Verizon to give me DSL because we don't have fiber
optic cable. And it's too expensive to run it down

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

Τ.	the nill where it has to go to.
2	MR. BRENNER: Yeah. I mean, the
3	technology of DSL is limited that way. That's why you
4	don't have 100 percent head-to-head competition with
5	the cable and DSL, although they're trying to improve
6	the DSL technology so they can go. It used to be
7	about, you know, a couple of miles from a central
8	office, and if you lived farther than that, you
9	couldn't get DSL. But I would submit that
10	MR. HOROWITZ: I'm two and an eighth miles
11	away from a central office.
12	MR. BRENNER: Well, how about an extension
13	of your see, I grew up in Southern California, so
14	I know who you are. And they're one of the
15	MR. HOROWITZ: I don't think that has
16	anything to do with it.
17	MR. BRENNER: No, it doesn't. But I think
18	you know, I grew up watching you, you know. And I
19	think you are somebody who helped elevate the whole
20	idea of consumers understanding their rights. And
21	that's why I feel, as a consumer, I just last night
22	wrote a letter to my plumber, and I cited the Maryland

Licensing Commission if they don't call me back with my half- installed boiler, you know. But I don't that Licensing Commission is going to do me any good, so I'm not -- you know, I know what you're talking about.

But I think that, you know, I am -- you know, having worked at the FCC for many years, and as a student of regulation, I'm not sure -- you know, bring -- having the club of regulation sometimes is helpful, but in the end, the consumer needs to be able to get answers. And, I mean, if a company doesn't give me a good answer - and that's why I said, I kind of learned a little bit watching your telecast - you keep going well, know, you let me talk to your supervisor, and you just keep going until you get an answer. Now not every consumer has the patience, or willingness or time to do that.

I don't think the solution, really having been a regulator, is to go and seek a regulatory solution in every instance. I don't think that's going to solve the consumer problem either. In the end, the companies have to face competition, because if they don't like the cable company, they can say

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

1	goodbye. Call up and get good service from DSL, if
2	they can provide good service, and we lose a customer.
3	We're losing customers every day to DDS because we
4	don't provide we're fighting back with a better
5	product and a digital tier, but we were losing
6	customers to DDS because we didn't have the right
7	product. But that is a much better solution than, I
8	feel, going to city councils and having them tell us
9	what programming network should be on, and having
10	regulated that way.
11	The market has taught us that we have to
12	improve our service. And I think when you have a
13	monopoly, you need to have regulation if you assume
14	that there's market failure and entry is difficult.
15	The whole point of John Windhausen's
16	MR. HOROWITZ: But wait a second.
17	MR. BRENNER: Let me just finish.
18	MR. HOROWITZ: Dan, this is important.
19	MR. GOLDBERG: We have some other
20	questions.
21	MR. HOROWITZ: That's what we have the
22	Telco Act for.

1	MR. BRENNER: Right. And that's John's
2	organization.
3	MR. HOROWITZ: And we still don't have
4	open competition.
5	MR. WINDHAUSEN: I will ask, have you
6	tried to call Covad?
7	MR. HOROWITZ: Covad?
8	MR. WINDHAUSEN: Covad.
9	MR. HOROWITZ: Covad went bankrupt, and
10	then I stopped with Covad.
11	MR. WINDHAUSEN: No. Covad is back, and
12	going full swing.
13	MR. HOROWITZ: They're back?
14	MR. WINDHAUSEN: Yeah. They are very
15	active, and I would bet you that they would be able to
16	provide you that DSL service.
17	MR. HOROWITZ: I could be surprised.
18	MR. GOLDBERG: We have lots of hands. Don
19	had his first, then Vern, and then Joy. Don, go ahead.
20	MR. SNOOP: I just wanted to David took
21	away a lot of what I was going to say, because he's so
22	eloquent in how he presents things. But basically, I

disagree with part of what he said, only because I think that the phone industry, the cable industry are getting away from being monopolies. There are competition in both industries right now. DVS has been out there for a while, wireless cell phones are coming in. There's a lot of things going on.

The entire broadband issue, access to the Worldwide Web, those type of things are becoming an issue that I think two years from now, we're going to look back and say, you know, we were crazy back then trying to regulate this stuff. Because if we allow it to develop, and we're right in the developmental phase right now, I think we have to allow it to develop. I think we have to allow the marketplace.

The more marketplaces that we have where we have DSL and cable modems both providing that service, and DDS has threatened that they're going to be providing also a satellite delivered service, once we have two or three players in a marketplace, David's point goes away, because now they're going to have more and more people.

I'm a good example myself. I mean, I used

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

to work in the cable industry. I'm now working in the phone industry. I tried to get DSL. My local phone company wouldn't get it. Guess what, I have a cable modem, very happy with it. So there's a lot of things that can happen, and I think we have to allow it to develop.

MR. GOLDBERG: Vernon.

MR. JAMES: Vernon James, San Carlos Apache Telecommunications. Thank you.

I really just want to comment more so than ask questions. I want to make these comments to the panel here, the committee. These are some of the problems that metropolitan and urban areas face. There are greater problems in rural America.

These problems present itself to rural America based on the fact that you don't have the kind of infrastructure to provide the kinds of services urban and metropolitan markets enjoy. True, there is wireless technology that's coming into play, but wireless isn't the total picture. You can't provide for the hospitals, you can't provide for the schools, you can't provide for the community centers, you can't

2.1

provide for the libraries. Those are services that go untended because the infrastructure to provide those services are too costly.

DSL has its limitations, so in a rural setting such as a reservation, the only way you're going to get services to a community that has people living spread out, is to buy the local exchange at a cost higher than what is fair. But you've got to have that local exchange to become a real local exchange carrier. When you become that local exchange carrier, LEC as we call it, you then develop the infrastructure to provide the kinds of services.

In my case, the tribe had to go to the federal government, borrow the kinds of money because they couldn't go to commercial sources, because of the status of the land. So went to the federal government, we borrowed millions to build the kind of infrastructure that is needed to be provide the kinds of services out in our community. With that, the tribe turned around and charged Vernon James here to make sure we pay our loan back, to make sure we make money so that we can improve the infrastructure that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

we just built.

2.1

The problem is insurmountable when it comes to trying to provide the services at a break-even cost. With regulations, services will not come out to rural America, must less reservation. And so when we talk about parodies, let's talk about parodies in rural America. Thank you.

MR. RANDOLPH: Let me address that comment real quick. And like I said before, Verizon, for example, has some wireless trials right now out in McLean, Virginia and some areas in Maryland, where we actually have employees that are testing the wireless applications that we hope will be effective in the rural areas, and we hope that that will happen eventually.

One situation we had recently that came to us, we had a small community in the northeast that knew that we were not going to get DSL deployed into that community for some time. They came to us with a proposition. They said look, we will buy the DSL equipment, the D-SLAM equipment, and either you can put it in your office, or we'll put it in City Hall,

NEAL R. GROSS

or we'll put it somewhere, but we'll let you maintain it. We'll actually incur the cost, and then in turn, you turn around and provide DSL service to the community at a reduced rate. And we actually thought well, maybe that's a good proposition. Maybe that's something we should try out.

But unfortunately, under the current rules that we're under at the FCC, it precludes us from being able to work out individual deals with local communities, or colleges and universities, or school districts, or internet service providers, or any customers. And we have to do a one size fits all. So I would say, I mean, loosen the regulations. Give us the opportunity to do more things like that, or at least test the market to see if things like that are viable.

MR. WINDHAUSEN: Could I make a general comment in response to all three of the last speakers here. The overriding general proposition that I think each of you has raised is that monopolies, in general, do not have good incentives to innovate. And they do not have good incentives to solve customer problems.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

And I think each of the three of you have raised that that's been your experience. But they don't have any market incentive to in usual, because they're not —because if you don't have a choice, you don't have anywhere else to go.

Ideally, the kind of structure you want to create is a more competitive atmosphere, where you have a lot of different companies trying to provide that service and innovate. And as shown by the research that we've seen, that the Yankee Group has seen, is that our CLECs are doing much better job with customer service. You need to make sure that we're able to stay in the marketplace. And the recent policy changes that the FCC has been considering adopting in this tri-annual review, which has not yet been issued, could really spell the death bell of this competition, and you won't get these kind of choices. And in that case, the only thing you're going to have left then is to go back and to deal with these companies, at least with market power, So I encourage you, if you create more monopolies. competition, the consumers needs are going to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

satisfied more quickly.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

I would just add very MR. BRENNER: briefly, that think in of Indian Ι the case reservations, tribal spaces may be unique in the sense that because of their geographic location, they may need special government attention. And I mentioned in opening remarks about the problem of unserved It's not just Indian areas, but other areas, which for economic reasons, are not being served.

But I do have good news on that score. Some cable companies, small cable companies in North Dakota, and in Minnesota too, that I'm familiar with, and very small markets of five, six hundred and 1,500 subscribers are rolling out advanced services like broadband. So even in very small, what appear to be tiny markets, you can get cable companies to offer that. And I think that will cause phone companies, and maybe CLECs then to come in and try to grab some of that market too. So that's the good news. I think though, in very, very rural areas, that may prove more difficult.

MR. JAMES: If I might just respond to

NEAL R. GROSS

1	that. Indian tribal lands are not the only rural
2	areas. We're talking about close to 1,000
3	cooperatives who are providing local exchange carrier
4	services in mid-America all the way across the plains,
5	into the areas in the west. And they all go and
6	borrow money.
7	The problem that we face is that we get
8	CLECs coming in who want to take advantage of the
9	infrastructure that we built with out sweat, with our
10	blood, and with our tears sometimes. And it makes it
11	harder to repay the loan when CLECs come in.
12	CHAIR ROOKER: Down here if you don't
13	mind. Larry, I don't think you saw that we have a
14	question on the other end.
15	MR. GOLDBERG: Yeah. Debra was on the
16	working group. She does get a shot, and I know Joy
17	has been trying too. And we're almost at time, so see
18	if you can make them quick.
19	MS. BERLYN: I'll be very brief. When I
20	saw the agenda and I saw we had two hours, I thought
21	how are we going to fill up two hours. And now I wish

we had another hour, because I do have a couple of

questions. John, thanks for your last remark, because I was going to make the point that a better option, Dan, to not paying your bill is to be able to have alternative providers that you can go to with your business.

My question, and if we don't have time - I don't think we do. Perhaps it's something that our working group can get the advice of these panelists on, is in light of the eminent tri-annual review and the impending broadband proceeding, what issues should this Consumer Advisory Committee consider in terms of the implications of these decisions for consumers? So it's biq question, and it's, I think, something that we want to take to our working group, and then eventually to the But thank you all. It's been a great panel.

CHAIR ROOKER: Yeah. I think -- I believe we're out of time, if I see that clock correctly. Is my vision failing me? Is it 3:30? Yes. I really would again like to express my thanks also to all of you for taking the time out of your day. You spent a heck of a chunk of time with us, and we really

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

appreciate it. And Larry, you and your group are doing a super job, as our other working groups are doing. We also have a report from Joy Ragsdale and her group that has been passed out to you, so there's lot of things going on here.

Thank you all very much for being here. I'll give them just a minute to get off the podium. But our next speaker is going to talk about Local Number Portability, which is the ability to take your cell phone number with you when you change carriers. And this is a big issue for a lot of people who are using their cell phones now instead of their home They're using it for their business and phones. everything else. And to give us an update on the status of portability is Jared Carlson, who is the Acting Chief of the Policy Division of the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau. Jared, welcome. We are delighted to have you here. Thank you. Let's give him a welcome.

You can actually just -- if you want to sit, since I think the podium has been taken, you can just make yourself comfortable there. The podium is

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

gone, and that's not you.

2.1

MR. CARLSON: Is this all right? First, I wanted to thank you for letting me have an opportunity to speak on what really is one of my favorite topics, and one of the most interesting things that I've had to work on in my five years or so at the FCC, and that's local number portability. And as you know, I am in the Wireless Bureau, so the focus is on wireless number portability.

Let me start off with what the bottom line for the Bureau, and I think the whole Commission is, is that we want to right now work with carriers to ensure that porting process goes as smoothly and efficiently for consumers well in advance of the number portability deadline, which is November 24th of this year for wireless carriers.

Let me start with a little recent history on number portability, specifically, wireless number portability. Last summer in July, the Commission released an order that denied a request for permanent forbearance from our number portability rules, but we did approve a one-year delay in the implementation of

NEAL R. GROSS

number portability, primarily to avoid the simultaneous implementation of number pooling, which I can talk about if anybody is interested, and number portability.

And a big win for this Commission and for our consumers, I think, this order was upheld by the D.C. Circuit just last month. And I wanted to read one quote from that order, because I couldn't have said it better myself. The D.C. Circuit said:

"The simple truth is that having to change phone numbers presents a barrier to switching carriers, even if not a total barrier, since consumers cannot compare and choose between various service plans and options as efficiently."

And some more recent history, last Thursday, just last Thursday, the Wireless Bureau restated our commitment to ensure a smooth process for consumers in terms of wireless number portability by addressing some of the issues that have been brought forward to us by CTIA, primarily, and also by Verizon Wireless.

Let me start with a statement, and then

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

sort of walk through it, and parse it through so that everybody here knows what is actually going to happen come November 24th, when we start to see wireless number portability.

I think you probably heard that on November 24th, you'll be able to take your number with you when switching wireless carriers, but what does that really mean? And let me kind of try to break it apart.

What it means is that wireless customers, and at the very least, certain wireline customers who live in the largest 100 metropolitan statistical areas, will be able to take their numbers with them when they switch carriers.

When you go from a wireless to a wireless carrier, there really is very little question that you will be able to take your number with you. They've already made the investments that they'll need to do. The carriers have to support the technical requirements necessary to handle number portability, and they did so largely when they had to implement number pooling, which is something that's been going

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

on for the last year. And I also wanted to just let everybody know that the Commission is standing firm on the November 24th date for wireless number portability.

When going from wireline to wireless carriers, there is something of a question there that CTIA has raised, and it's fair to say that the whole industry has raised, I think. And that is, that depending on where you live, you may be able to take your wireline number with you to a wireless phone; which is to say, it doesn't mean the Bureau would like to say, you may be able to cut the cord and keep your number with you.

And the reason why it's not so cut and dry when you're going from wireline to wireless is what we call the rate center problem. And this occurs because you've got wireline carriers who historically have always routed and rated calls through the use of rate centers, which are historically the areas that are served by end offices. And these rate centers are the whole entire paradigm of the wireline world. They control not only how calls are routed, but whether a

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

call is local or toll. And while wireless carriers aren't bound to serve customers only on particular wireline rate centers, nonetheless, they do interconnect to the network, and they have to use the paradigm that's out there, the wireline rate center paradigm.

And they also, as a matter of fact, get telephone numbers, when they do get telephone numbers that are assigned to given wireline rate centers. Now they're able to serve fast suaves of people with those numbers, but they are still, in fact, tied to one particular rate center.

And in the wireline world, when you're going from an ILEC to a CLEC, or a CLEC to an ILEC and keeping your number with you, number portability is limited by the rate center. The industry standards that are out there that the Commission has blessed, do say that number portability in the wireline world is limited to rate centers.

And this actually does make some sense, because if you are a home user being served by two companies, and you want to switch between them, then

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

almost by definition, they're both going to be located in the same rate center.

But in the wireless world, CTIA, that's Telecommunications the Cellular and Internet Association, has asked that the Commission, as they it, that the Commission confirm that would have competition demands that wireless carriers are able to port numbers outside of wireline rate centers. according to CTIA, wireless carriers are only about one out of every eight wireline rate centers, so there really could be some fairly major limitations porting numbers. It would only be if you wanted to go from wireline to wireless, you would only be able to do so if you happen to be one of those customers lucky enough to be in one of those one out of every eight of wireless carriers those rate centers where wireline carriers actually overlap.

The other issue that I wanted to point out is that come November 24th, there will be wireless number portability in the largest 100 metropolitan statistical areas. And the way number portability works is one carrier requests number portability of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

another carrier switch. And for the most part, carriers had to do that for the largest 100 MSAs in February of this year. And in the Bureau, as wireless carriers understand that as far concerned, that's happened. Every wireless, or not every wireless carrier, but all of the wireless switches that are out there have received a request So there's for number portability. verv little question that in the largest 100 metropolitan statistical areas there will be number portability come November 24th.

Outside of those largest 100 metropolitan statistical areas, carriers have a maximum of 6 months to comply with a request from another carrier, and those requests can start to come in on November 24th. So what that means is, if there is an area where there are a couple of providers, and one wireless carrier says hey, I think I want to be able to port numbers in because I think I can get customers from this guy coming to me, you can make that request on November 24th. And at most, the other carrier has 6 months to comply with that. So by May 24th of 2004,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

you'll probably see number portability in the vast majority of the country, if not everywhere.

Let me tell you some of the outstanding issues that we have right now. I'll mention some aspects of some of the issues that CTIA, the Cellular Telecommunications and Internet Association brought up. One is, as I said before, the rate center The Wireless Bureau released that letter problem. last week that I mentioned, that stated that although currently grappling with the issue, the boundaries of determining what wireline wireless portability are going to be, there isn't any question that if you are in one of those, like CTIA says, one out of every eight rate centers where wireline carriers and wireless carriers are, you will be able to port from your wireline carrier to a wireless carrier.

Another issue that CTIA has raised and put kind of two different questions to us, has to do with the porting interval. And what the porting interval refers to is the amount of time it takes for a customer to go to a new carrier and say I want to take

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

my old number to this new phone, and the amount of time that the network, the telecommunications network actually takes to recognize that that port has occurred.

If you go from wireless to wireless, this takes place according to industry standards in only two and a half hours. In the wireline world, and this is not only going wireline to wireline, but also wireline to wireless, that period of time is about three days. And there are a couple of issues associated with this.

One of them is a public safety issue, E-911. And that is, during this period of time, you will be able to call 911 and connect to the nearest Public Safety answering point. However, there might be some problems with that PSAP, Public Safety Answering Point, being able to receive your call-back information, so there would be a period of time when, if for whatever reason they needed to call you back, they may not be able to, because the number that's delivered to them is incorrect, or if they try to call-back that number, it could be the old device that

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

actually rings, whether it's wireline or wireless.

But we did confirm in this letter from last week that as far as that issue is concerned, the Commission's rule already do address situations in which, for whatever reason, a valid call-back number can't be delivered to a PSAP. And what the Commission said is that in such cases, your obligation is to at least get the call to the PSAP, deliver whatever call-back or whatever identifying information you can. But at the very least, get the call to the PSAP. And as I understand it, that shouldn't be a problem, even during the porting interval.

CTIA has also taken a look at the porting interval from a competitive point of view. They view it as somewhat of an impediment to get people to port from wireline to wireless carriers, the fact that it takes three days might discourage some people to do so. And that is an aspect that the Commission is also considering.

A couple of other issues I wanted to mention that weren't necessarily brought up by the industry; but nonetheless, that I'd like to talk

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

about. One of them is, what Verizon Wireless has termed "business rules". And Verizon Wireless sent us a letter saying that they would like us to state that — to agree with them, that a wireless carrier can't deny a request for portability from an individual consumer on the basis of an unpaid bill, or an unfulfilled contract. And in our letter from last week, we did state that carriers, and I'm quoting: "Carriers may not refuse to port while attempting to collect fees or settle an account."

The last point I wanted to mention is about cost recovery, and the flexibility that wireless carriers have. Verizon Wireless, for their part, has said they're not going to charge a fee for customers to port numbers. And if that turned out to be the way that the industry went, I'd be thrilled. However, as if often the case in the wireless world, there aren't that many regulations on this topic. And we do permit wireless carriers to recover their costs, however they see fit, so long as they're just and reasonable, of course. And so you could see various paradigms, I suppose you call it, for recouping their number

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	portability costs, whether it's charges on every
2	customer's bill, or charges to port out a number, or
3	charges to port in a number.
4	That's really the state of play of things
5	on wireless number portability. And if anybody has
6	any questions, I'm certainly happy to try to answer
7	them.
8	CHAIR ROOKER: Do we have any questions
9	for Jared?
10	MR. ALLIBONE: Tom Allibone, LTC
11	Consulting. I've been noticing on Verizon phone bills
12	recently, there's been some language that's saying
13	that due to changes, no details, but due to certain
14	changes that the charges that used to be passed
15	between carrier-to-carrier, between Verizon and
16	certain, I guess, cellular carriers are now going to
17	be billed by Verizon.
18	MR. CARLSON: They are Verizon land-line,
19	not Verizon wireless.
20	MR. ALLIBONE: Yeah. Land-line, but on
21	the land-line bill, it's referring to something
22	happening in the cellular industry. And does this

have anything to do with that?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

MR. CARLSON: Yes and no. What you're arrangements that wireline talking about is and wireless carriers, that used to be fairly common, now are not quite so common, are called "reverse toll relationships. billing" type And they were established to encourage land-line callers to call And because of the rate center wireless phones. issue, you've got a wireless carrier who might serve a whole huge area, but really is getting numbers from a rate center that's out here. And there's a land-line caller that's here, wanting to call the wireless carrier. I'm sorry - somewhat further away. there has been a toll associated with that charge, just like there would be if you were making an intralata toll call, you might see a charge on your bill.

It was somewhat common for wireless carriers and wireline carriers to have agreements, whereby the wireless carrier would basically pick up the tab. The charge still exists. I mean, the wireline carrier was still billing somebody for the

NEAL R. GROSS

cost of this toll call because the call had to go a fairly long distance, but the wireless carrier was picking that up.

It used to be easier to identify which calls were local and which calls were toll, just because you could look at the first three digits of the phone number and figure out what rate center it was in. Once you have number portability, that's not quite so clear any more. You've got the potential for numbers to essentially move from one rate center to another, and that's been cited as a reason why these relationships have been terminated throughout the country.

And it's interesting, in some places, like I know that California hasn't had reverse toll billing for a number of years, and I'm starting to see more and more inquiries about reverse toll billing in Texas and Tennessee. I just got a lot of inquiries about it in the last couple of months.

CHAIR ROOKER: All right. Jared, thank you so much. We really appreciate your taking the time to come and visit with us today. Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. CARLSON: Thank you.

CHAIR ROOKER: It's time for those people who have been waiting patiently here from the public, if you would like to make any comments or ask questions of the committee. We're most interested to hear from you. Do we have anyone? This would be the first time we don't have a public comment.

Well, then we've got a couple of things that we need to say. There have been some very interesting topics that have come up today, in terms things that should be considering we committee. And I think what we need to do is to look about whether or not they fit into existing working groups, or whether we might need to setup another working group or two. And we will be talking about that. We'll be talking to Vernon about the outreach to the Indian population, and under-served populations to whether or not we need a working group, whether it fits within one of the existing ones. So there's a whole lot of things that are going to be going on.

I also need to remind you to please take

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

1	off your badges and just leave them. I guess leave
2	them right there by your sign so that we can pick
3	those up and recycle, since recycling is good.
4	Now does anybody have any comments or
5	questions, or concerns that we need to address? Yes,
6	Jeff.
7	MR. KRAMER: Just very basically. Jeff
8	Kramer here. I like this setup much better than the
9	table in the round.
10	CHAIR ROOKER: Oh, you do? The only thing
11	is I can't read people's names, so I have to make sure
12	I know everybody's name.
13	MR. KRAMER: Well, I'm just used to having
14	my back to the podium, and having to turn around the
15	whole time.
16	CHAIR ROOKER: Well, that's because you're
17	young and agile.
18	MR. MARSHALL: I'd like to thank everybody
19	for staying for the duration, as well.
20	CHAIR ROOKER: Yes, indeed.
21	MR. MARSHALL: It's been a long day.
22	CHAIR ROOKER: It's been wonderful.

MR. MARSHALL: And thank you for sticking 1 2 with us. 3 CHAIR ROOKER: Any other questions, or comments, or feedback on today? Well, I do want to 4 5 thank again our working groups. Thank you. It was 6 good. It was good, wasn't it? And, Scott, again 7 thank you for all your hard work in putting this together. Believe me, he has done a --8 9 MR. MARSHALL: It was a joint effort, and 10 all the working groups did the work. 11 CHAIR ROOKER: But at any rate, thank you 12 all so much. Remember our next meeting is in 13 November, and it's on a Thursday. November the 20th, 14 so put that into your planning schedules. And I hope everyone has a safe journey home, and I hope we don't 15 16 have any more thunderstorms out there. But anyway, I 17 thank you for your attention here, and being such a 18 good group. We're adjourned. (Whereupon, the proceedings went off the 19

record at 3:53 p.m.)