CONSUMER ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Federal Communications Commission

Commission Meeting Room TW-C305, 445 12th Street, Southwest, Washington, DC

Friday, January 27, 2017

Welcome and Call to Order
Eduard Bartholme, CAC Chairperson

Chair Bartholme called the first meeting of the 9th Consumer Advisory Council (CAC) to order at 9:00 am and thanked members for their attendance. These members were appointed in October 2016. This CAC has already been given a task and so has gotten off to a quick start. One working group has been very active and the other two have had some phone calls. The working groups will have a chance for more focused discussion later in this meeting.

Introductions and Meeting Logistics
Eduard Bartholme, Scott Marshall, CAC DFO

Scott Marshall, the CAC Designated Federal Official (DFO), welcomed new and returning CAC members. He thanked Federal Communications Commission (FCC) staff member Brittany Gomes for her work during these meetings. Chair Bartholme and Mr. Marshall reviewed meeting logistics and decided to save introductions until after FCC Chairman Ajit Pai's arrival. Mr. Marshall asked members to review the mailing list for accuracy and to designate an alternate representative. Members who change their alternate representative should update Chair Bartholme and Mr. Marshall about this change.

Remarks of Chairman Ajit Pai

FCC Chairman Pai thanked the CAC members for their work and highlighted consumer issues that he hopes the FCC will tackle in the coming years. One of these issues is robocalls. Robocalls are the largest source of consumer complaints received by the FCC. Many robocalls are scams run by call centers that target vulnerable populations and receive a lot of money from their victims. The problem is only getting worse, and so Chairman Pai hopes that the FCC, with CAC input, will take aggressive action to end robocalls. Solutions that the FCC can pursue include taking enforcement action against unscrupulous telemarketers and robocallers and establishing a safe harbor so that carriers can block spoofed calls from overseas without fear of liability. Creating a safe harbor would allow carriers to experiment with different technological solutions for robocalls. Chairman Pai asked CAC members for input on how the FCC could make it easier for consumers to tell the FCC about received robocalls and to make it easier for the FCC to take enforcement action against fraudulent robocallers.   The FCC is granting the petition of

51 consumer advocacy organizations to overturn the FCC-created exemption for federal contractors in robocalling regulations.

Chairman Pai is also committed to closing the digital divide. He believes that every American who wants internet access should be able to get it; however, many Americans do not have access. Chairman Pai's Digital Empowerment Agenda includes three proposals, the first of which is a proposal to create gigabit opportunity zones. These zones would require congressional authorization and would involve setting up a geographic area where the median income is 75% or less of the national median. The U.S. government would provide tax incentives to the private sector to build out broadband in these areas if state and local governments adopted broadband deployment friendly regulations and if there were appropriate safeguards on the federal level to ensure oversight on the use of those funds. This proposal would also give entrepreneurs tax incentives to hire people living such gigabit opportunity zones. The second proposal of the Digital Empowerment Agenda is to create a three-step plan to boost mobile broadband in rural America. The steps are 1) to increase the build-out obligations for wireless carriers, which would be done by increasing the percentage coverage requirement and terms for certain licenses, 2) to move forward with Mobility Fund Phase II to ensure that federal subsidies are effectively put towards solving the problem of mobile connectivity, and 3) to create a rural dividend by devoting 10 percent of money made from spectrum auctions to rural broadband. The third proposal is to remove some state and local regulatory barriers to broadband deployment. Examples of this include reforming pole attachment rules to reduce cost of deployment and getting rid of unreasonable fees for companies to attach broadband infrastructure. Other ideas include developing a model code for communities that want to have a broadband-friendly approach to make it easier for them to do so, making Dig Once a national policy and speeding up the deployment of broadband on federal lands.

Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau (CGB) Update
Mark Stone, Deputy Bureau Chief
Karen Peltz Strauss, Deputy Bureau Chief
D'wana Terry, Acting Deputy Bureau Chief
Anita Dey, Assistant Bureau Chief, CGB

Mark Stone, Deputy Bureau Chief of the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau (CGB), spoke first. The CGB has received a number of petitions regarding the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA). Mr. Stone discussed two of these petitions, both of which concern robocalls from the federal government and its contractors. The first is a petition for the FCC to reconsider its decision in the Broadnet Teleservices LLC case, in which the FCC interpreted the TCPA to say that the federal government and its contractors are excluded from the TCPA's robocall protections. The petition asks that the FCC reconsider their decision and find that federal government contractors are included in these protections. The FCC has already sought comment on this petition and is now reviewing the record. The second is a petition regarding an order released by the FCC last summer that addressed a new section of the TCPA. This new section directed the FCC to adopt rules addressing debt owed to the federal government. The petition asks the FCC to reconsider the rules, including ones regarding a three-

call limit and restrictions on calls to reassigned numbers. Comments in opposition to this petition are due February 1st and replies to these oppositions are due February 13th.

Karen Peltz Strauss, Deputy Bureau Chief of the CGB, spoke next. She presented information on recent disability actions taken by the FCC. In December, the FCC adopted a report and order as well as a further notice of proposed rulemaking on real-time text (RTT) as a way for wireless telecommunications providers and manufacturers to have the option to support RTT rather than text telephones (TTYs). TTYs are antiquated and made for an analog environment. RTT is reliable in an internet protocol (IP) environment and is ideal for emergency situations because characters and words are sent as they are typed or spoken. RTT will be built into mobile devices. The wireless community has been actively engaged and is starting to deploy and implement RTT technology. Wireless carriers now have the option to move to RTT rather than support TTYs, and the FCC has been granting waivers to entities that choose to do this. The schedule of implementation for entities opting to support RTT rather than TTY starts at the end of 2017 and goes to 2021.The order establishes a particular interoperability standard as a safe harbor so that RTT users can cross networks, providers and equipment.

There have been complaints regarding the lack of interoperability and portability across providers with regard to video relay service (VRS). On January 17th, the CGB released a Bureau-level order and notice of proposed rulemaking to address these complaints. This document incorporates a standard which, if complied with, will ensure interoperability for consumers of VRS. The CGB is also issuing waivers through its Direct Video Calling project. This project is designed to encourage companies and agencies to have the staff and technology in place so that they can directly communicate with consumers in American Sign Language over video, rather than having to use a third party to translate, thereby giving equal access to those who sign. The CGB hosted a major showcase regarding Direct Video Calling on November 4th.

The CGB recently released a public notice announcing the second term of the Disability Advisory Committee (DAC). The DAC now has 37 members, an additional 24 subcommittee members, and three ex officio members from the Access Board, Department of Homeland Security, and Small Business Administration. Ms. Peltz Strauss encouraged CAC members to stay abreast of the DAC's actions, and noted that the 2nd DAC's first meeting is in March 2017. The DAC has subcommittees on emergency access, relay services and equipment distribution, tech transition and video programming. The CGB also issued a public notice on January 10th seeking comment on a petition filed by the Alliance for Community Media for a waiver for some of the FCC's closed captioning certification and registration rules. Comments are due February 9th and 24th. The CGB issued a public notice granting video relay certification to Convo. The FCC's Media Bureau issued a public notice requiring televisions, set-top boxes and other video programming apparatus to have accessible user interfaces for people who are blind or visually impaired by December 21st.

D'wana Terry, Acting Deputy Bureau Chief of the CGB, spoke next. She began by giving some background information on the informal complaints process. Several years ago, the FCC initiated a complaint reform effort with three goals in mind: 1) to simplify the consumer experience, 2) to streamline complaints

processing, and 3) to make complaints data more publically available. The FCC did consumer outreach to better understand how to reach these goals. As a result, the FCC launched the Consumer Help Center in 2014. The Consumer Help Center addresses the above goals through the Consumer Complaint Center and the Consumer Data Center. The CGB looks forward to continue working with the CAC to brainstorm ways to make the complaints process simpler and to provide necessary data to consumers and providers.

Anita Dey, Assistant Bureau Chief of the CGB, spoke last and provided highlights on the CGB's recent outreach efforts. The CGB has issued three robocall alerts over the past few months and used internal and external sources to understand what robocall scams impact consumers the most. The three scams covered by these alerts are gift card, utility and financial. The alerts would explain the scam, inform consumers on where to report said scam, and provide general and specific tips to consumers on how to protect themselves. General protection tips for consumers include 1) don't answer calls from unknown numbers, 2) if suspicious, hang up the call and then look up and call the number of the organization to verify the request, 3) if asked to hit a button to opt out of receiving calls, hang up instead, and 4) ask the phone service provider if they offer a robocall blocking service. The FCC's website also provides additional information and resources on blocking robocalls. The CGB hopes to host webinars on robocalls and other popular topics in the near future and would welcome the CAC's input.

On September 26th, the CGB held an informational session on tech transitions. The CGB also updated its Tech Transitions Consumer Guide to include a section on battery backup. The CGB, along with the Public Safety Bureau (PSB), have also released tech transition guides directed at state and local governments officials and public safety entities. These bureaus have been in communication with state utility commissions and public safety entities to learn more about on-the-ground consumer experiences and to address any tech transition public safety issues. The was a joint conference of the National Council of Statewide Operability Coordinators, the Department of Defense's SAFECOM, and the Public Safety Bureau to further discuss tech transitions.

Questions from the CAC

Member Herrera asked if the CGB has any statistics showing the percentage of criminal robocalls versus legal but unwanted robocalls. Mr. Stone responded that the CGB is working to refine their complaint data and so does not currently have this specific breakout, but hopefully will soon. Member Berlyn asked if the CGB has any thoughts on how to make the complaints process easier for consumers. She also asked how the FCC could clarify to consumers that complaints regarding robocalls should be made to the FCC and not to the Federal Trade Commission (FTC). Member McEldowney asked what outreach the CGB is doing for consumers who do not speak English as a primary language. Ms. Dey responded that the CGB is working to provide the consumer guides in more languages and is partnering with consumer groups to come up with solutions. Member Harris asked if the FCC has thought about doing any outreach regarding the new privacy rights released in late 2016. Member Defalco asked for any insight as to why AT&T recently cancelled their two ongoing trials with the tech transition. Ms. Dey responded that she wasn't best equipped to answer this question but would ask the Wireline Bureau.

Member Herrera asked if Ms. Dey could share her summary and statistics regarding fraudulent robocalls with the CAC.

Consumer Device Security
Kurian Jacob, Electronics Engineer, Cybersecurity and Communications Reliability Division, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau

Kurian Jacob, an Electronics Engineer with the Cybersecurity and Communications Reliability Division, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, presented on the whys and hows of consumer device security. Securing one's personal devices is important these days because the amount and complexity of internet connected devices has increased in many households, most of these devices are connected all of the time, many devices' functional lifetime will outlast their software support lifetime, and cybercriminals are becoming more efficient and are targeting any kind of connected device. Cybercriminals are scanning and working to exploit devices on a daily basis. Consumers can secure their devices by understanding which of their home devices are connected to the internet, knowing the software support life of these devices and taking this into account when shopping for new devices, creating strong and unique log-in credentials for all connected devices and changing the default credentials, patching all connected devices with the latest available software, turning off the remote access feature on connected devices if it is not needed, and completing periodical security reviews for connected devices. Consumers should be proactive in updating their connected devices because not all manufacturers provide update reminders. The FCC, consumer organizations and manufacturers provide information about specific devices online.

Questions from the CAC

Member Herrera asked Mr. Jacobs for his thoughts on getting the larger consumer public to follow the steps listed above. Mr. Jacobs responded that raising awareness of the risks of not securing one's devices is key, as is simplifying the process of doing so. Thaddeus Johnson, an audience member, asked for Mr. Jacobs' opinion on the effectiveness of using a virtual private network (VPN) on connected devices as an additional layer of security. Mr. Jacobs responded that this is a good idea but that most consumers don't have the resources or knowledge to maintain a VPN. Member Leech asked if password management tools are a good solution for consumers to use to keep track of their passwords. Mr. Jacobs responded that these tools can be useful for consumers with a lot of passwords, but that many consumers don't know how to use these tools. Member Morris asked if Mr. Jacobs has considered partnering with the CGB to do consumer outreach on device security. Mr. Jacobs responded that they have not yet partnered on this issue but that the CGB and PSB have partnered on outreach efforts in the past. Member Mallory asked Mr. Jacobs for recommendations on good device security resources for consumers on FCC's website. Mr. Jacobs recommended the FCC's Smartphone Security Checker as a good resource. Chair Bartholme and Mr. Marshall will obtain additional links to helpful resources from Mr. Jacobs and email them to the rest of the CAC. Member Gartland asked where consumers can find security information when shopping for smart devices, because this information is often not included on the packaging. Mr. Jacobs responded that many manufacturers don't make this information readily

available and so consumers need to demand it. Chair Bartholme asked if manufacturers have to have a discussion about device security in order to obtain a FCC logo on their device. Mr. Jacobs responded that this discussion is currently not required in the logo process, but that it might be included in the future. Chair Bartholme asked if there is a security primer available for cities that are deploying internet of things (IoT) devices in large scale.

Spoofing Technologies and Robocalling
Antonio Sweet, Technology Policy Advisor, Office of Strategic Planning, FCC

Antonio Sweet, a Technology Policy Advisor with the FCC's Office of Strategic Planning, gave a presentation detailing how robocalls work and what can and is being done to mitigate them. Telephone systems used to have one input and one output and relied on a system of trust. Email introduced a multi-input and multi-output system and broke this system of trust because users no longer had to authenticate their identity. Voice calls now can originate on the internet, creating a hybrid system. About 99% of all spoofed calls come from internet voice networks. There are many types of spoofing, such as anonymized spoofing, in which the caller uses a randomized number or a technique called neighborhooding to remain unknown, or impersonation spoofing, in which a caller pretends to be a government official or family member by using their number. Robocallers and call spoofers can be difficult to detect because the content of the message doesn't start until someone picks up the call. They can also be difficult to trace because the call path is often lost when the call is routed through the internet. Some industry groups and telecommunication service providers are working to enhance the traceability of robocalls and create a path information header for calls.

Another issue is the lack of interoperability between the internet and traditional networks. The Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) and other industry groups are working to increase this interoperability. One way of doing this is to develop a protocol in which a caller's identity is verified through an encrypted digital certificate. Through call pattern analysis done on voice networks, providers can see when massive floods of calls are made through a number and could take action if they suspect robocalling or spoofing. Another idea in development is to create a Do Not Originate list that uses call paths to identify probable fraudulent callers and flag them. Industry groups are also working to streamline the trace-back process so that the FCC can more easily identify the robocalls' source. Solutions that consumers can use depend on their network but may include using a captcha system for calls, phone printing and mobile apps that allow one to crowdsource the reputation of a number. The FCC's database is updated frequently and so third-party app developers can augment their algorithms for detection with real-time pushes of data. In this way, the FCC is able to protect consumers from robocallers.

Questions from the CAC

Member Goodman asked if carriers have any engineering reasons for why they have not responded to the issue of robocalls in a more timely fashion. Mr. Sweet responded that standards bodies are working to get broad consensus on the architecture of any solutions because these solutions only work if

everyone follows them. Member Lieberman asked if some people are more likely to receive robocalls than others. Mr. Sweet responded that sharing contact information in marketing promotions and answering unknown numbers can increase one's likelihood in receiving robocalls. Frederick Ellrod, an audience member representing the National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors (NATOA), asked if implementing the trace-back process would require a complete redesign of the telephone network. Mr. Sweet responded that it would be difficult to retrofit the telephone system and so most security solutions are for IP purposes.

Introducing the Robocall Strike Force & Next Steps
Linda Vandeloop, Asst. VP External Affairs, AT&T

Linda Vandeloop, Assistant Vice President of External Affairs at AT&T and Chair of the Robocall Strike Force, presented on the Robocall Strike Force and its future plans. Last year, FCC Chairman Wheeler sent a letter to some carriers asking how they planned to address the robocall problem. As a result, AT&T agreed to chair an industry-led strike force. The Robocall Strike Force consists of about 30 different companies of various sizes and types and met for the first time on August 19, 2016. It focused on and had corresponding working groups for four areas: caller ID authentication, empowering consumer choice, detection and mitigation, and regulatory support. Chairman Wheeler had asked for 60-day deliverables, and so the working groups began work before this official meeting. Each working group met at least two times a week and some members were in multiple groups. Ms. Vandeloop found the Strike Force to be very cooperative and dedicated. Solving the robocall problem is difficult due to the flexibility of robocallers, and so the solution must be flexible and comprehensive to work.

The Authentication Working Group was able to move up the approval of the caller ID authentication standards to October 2016. The Empowering Consumer Choice Working Group worked with this group and identified key features for consumers with respect to caller ID authentication. The Empowering Consumer Choice Working Group also worked with the FCC to develop a website that pulls together into one place all of the consumer information gathered by companies involved in the Strike Force. The FCC also reached out to the App Developers Association to see how app developers could be encouraged to develop robocall blocking solutions. The Detection, Assessment, Traceback, and Mitigation Working Group has been working to increase the number of companies involved with traceback solutions. These solutions become more effective the more companies that are involved. The number has increased from three to 19 and is still growing. The Strike Force did a feasibility study on the Do Not Originate list because it is a debated solution. The study so far has been successful and there have been additional trials. The study will be completed by the first quarter of 2017. The Regulatory Support Working Group found that there are no rules that allow companies to block a call at the request of the number assignee. As a result of this finding, the FCC issued a public notice clarifying and giving companies the authorization to block those numbers. The Regulatory Support Working Group is also working to shorten the cycle time.

Questions from the CAC

Member Goodman asked if the Strike Force has any rules regarding the intellectual property interest member companies might have in different software and hardware solutions. Ms. Vandeloop responded that there are no such rules and that the Strike Force does not consist of vendors.

Introducing the ATSC 3.0 Broadcast Standard
Patrick McFadden, Associate General Counsel, National Association of Broadcasters

Patrick McFadden, Associate General Counsel with the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB), gave a presentation introducing the ATSC (Advanced Television Systems Committee) 3.0 Broadcast Standard. The ATSC 3.0 Broadcast Standard is also known as the Next Generation TV standard. Next Generation TV is a new broadcast transmission standard in response to changes in technology. The benefits of Next Generation TV include better picture quality, more immersive and improved audio quality, and a wider color gamut. Next Generation TV integrates well with IP and so would allow broadcasters to offer interactive features and advanced emergency alerts. Next Generation TV would also make it easier for consumers to receive over-the-air broadcast television programming on their mobile devices. Next Generation TV is not backwards compatible with current equipment and so would require a transition. Broadcasters are not asking for federal subsidies or more spectrum to complete this transition. They plan to protect consumers during the transition by creating simulcast arrangements between broadcasters and envision the transition to be wholly voluntary and market-driven. As such, the pace of the transition would not have a firm cut-off date and broadcasters and manufacturers would not be mandated to incorporate Next Generation TV capabilities in their products. Broadcasters are also not asking the FCC to require that multichannel video programming distributors (MVPDs) to carry the Next Generation TV signal. However, MVPDs are welcome to choose to do so. In April 2016, the NAB and other organizations filed a petition asking the FCC to allow broadcasters to make voluntary use of the Next-Generation TV standard. Broadcasters need the FCC's permission to do this because the technology used by broadcasters is mandated by the FCC. Broadcasters are excited about Next Generation TV because it allows them to do more with their current spectrum. The standard is also highly flexible and so allows broadcasters to make choices to best serve the needs of their viewers. Implementing Next Generation TV is necessary for broadcasters to remain competitive and has great potential to enhance public safety and service for viewers. Information about ATSC 3.0 can be found on NAB's website.

Questions from the CAC

Member Herrera asked if the reach of Next Generation TV would be more or less than the current reach of digital television. Mr. McFadden responded that it would be comparable. Member Herrera then asked if Next Generation TV would be mostly marketed for mobile or non-traditional televisions or if the plan is to sell televisions that will carry both. Mr. McFadden responded that it would be marketed to all groups and that electronics manufacturers are excited about this standard. Member Herrera asked if there are competing interests within the development of this standard. Mr. McFadden responded that there aren't and that they're currently finalizing the standard for the FCC's approval. Member Defalco asked what would happen in rural areas that only receive one broadcast. Mr. McFadden responded that

broadcasters would have to cooperate and reach voluntary agreements to ensure that consumers are protected, and that areas with only one broadcaster would likely be dealt with on a case by case basis. Member Goodman asked how the simulcast arrangement would impact advertisers. Mr. McFadden responded that advertisers shouldn't be impacted because viewers would still be receiving the two separate streams of programming. Member Lieberman asked if the simulcast arrangement would cause a change in the resolution of the ATSC 1.0 version received by consumers. Mr. McFadden responded that broadcasters want and envision no change in this resolution. However, there may be rare cases during the transition where not every station would be able to continue to offer a high definition (HD) signal. He added that the simulcast arrangements would be conceptually almost identical to the channel sharing arrangements in the incentive auctions. Member Lieberman asked what the plan is to ensure that low-income consumers who can't afford to purchase a new television set don't lose services in the event that broadcasters fully transition to ATSC 3.0. Mr. McFadden responded that broadcasters agree that any sunset of the current standard should be addressed in a separate proceeding, and so this question could be addressed then. Member McEldowney expressed his concern that ATSC 3.0 won't reach a critical mass with a voluntary standard. Mr. McFadden responded that broadcasters are excited about ATSC 3.0 but know about this risk and are asking for permission to take this risk. Chair Bartholme asked if consumers will have to sign up for the advanced emergency alerts or if they will rely on data location information. Mr. McFadden responded that location information would likely come from someone's broadband.

Update on the Incentive Auctions
Charles E. Meisch, Jr. Senior Advisor – Communications and Policy, Incentive Auctions Task Force, FCC

Charles Meisch, Jr., Senior Advisor with Communications and Public Affairs with the FCC's Incentive Auction Task Force, gave an update on the incentive auction. The incentive auction is the first attempt to repurpose spectrum for 21st century uses using a two-sided auction. The two sides were a reverse and forward auction. On March 29th, 2016, eligible broadcasters made their initial commitments to participate in the auction based on opening bid prices offered by the FCC in the fall of 2015. As a result, the FCC was able to begin the auction at a clearing target of 126 MHz with a supply of 100 MHz of licensed spectrum. Bidding at stage 1 of the reverse auction yielded a clearing cost of $86.4 billion and the forward auction yielded a $23.1 billion revenue. The FCC moved on to stage 2 because the revenue did not cover the clearing cost in stage 1. The revenue also did not cover the clearing cost in stages 2 and 3. The FCC is currently in stage 4 of the auction, which has a clearing target of 84 MHz with 70 MHz licensed. The revenue so far is $18.5 billion and the clearing cost is $10.05 billion. The revenue meets the two prongs of the FCC's final stage rule: it is more than the clearing cost and meets the fair and competitive price component. The results of auction will be that the U.S. will have 70 MHz of licensed low-band spectrum to support the U.S.'s continued global leadership in wireless service and 14 MHz of new unlicensed spectrum to be used for innovative devices and services. The U.S. Treasury will receive at least $6 billion for deficit reduction and $10 billion will go to the participating broadcasters.

Bidding for the clock phase will continue until there is no excess demand for any product in any market. Once bidding is concluded, the FCC will hold an assignment phase in which the winning forward auction

bidders will have the opportunity to bid further for specific frequencies. The FCC will release training materials a few days after the clock phase closes and expects the assignment phase to last several weeks. At the end of the assignment phase there will be no more bidding and FCC staff will prepare to release a public notice announcing the conclusion of the auction. The public notice will contain 1) a list of the reverse auction winners with their incentive payment amounts and bid option, 2) a list of the forward auction winners with number of licenses they won and the frequencies for which they'll later apply for licenses, and 3) a list of the new channel assignments for all auction-eligible stations staying on the air. The public notice will also signal the commencement of the 39-month post-auction transition period. The Task Force and the Media Bureau have proposed a phased transition period, the final plan of which should be released soon. The plan proposes limiting the amount of times consumers in any market have to rescan for channels to two and scheduling complicated stations into later phases to give them extra time and ease coordination.

The CGB is preparing for an extensive consumer outreach effort. The Task Force has helped by preparing some outreach pieces, such as tutorials, troubleshooting guides and scripts for FCC staff, and updated Consumer Guides. The FCC is working to make these resources available in multiple languages. Transitioning stations must comply with viewer notification requirements and provide the date they will be moving, what station they will be moving to, and where viewers can get more information. Once the auction concludes, the FCC will be able to convene larger stakeholder meetings to coordinate efforts nationally and locally. The FCC appreciates any input from the CAC regarding consumer outreach.

Questions from the CAC

Chair Bartholme asked if there had been any analysis done on the number of markets across the country that might have the competition in local content being greatly reduced due to the auction. Mr. Meisch responded that the FCC will be able to do this once the auction is over, and that any displaced class A stations will be able to come to the FCC for help in finding a new channel.

Report back from Working Groups

Member Fazlullah presented on behalf of the Universal Service Fund (USF) and Digital Inclusion Working Group. The Working Group looked at the National Verifier Plan from the Universal Service Administrative Company, the Boulder Valley petition and Microsoft petition on E-Rate, Free Press's report titled "Digital Denied", FCC Chairman Pai's Digital Empowerment Agenda, the most recent Connect America Fund (CAF) II decision for New York, the FCC's recent digital inclusion plan, and some digital inclusion definitions from the inclusion plan and from the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA). The Working Group is planning to put together a recommendation building off of the Digital Empowerment Agenda and referencing the digital inclusion plan, and hopes to have this recommendation ready by the next CAC meeting. They also suggested having a workshop on digital inclusion issues before one of the CAC meetings so that members could extend their trip to include this workshop. The Working Group requested updates on USF programs from the Wireline

Competition Bureau (WCB) and the Digital Empowerment Agenda from the CGB at the CAC's next meeting. Finally, the Working Group asked when the Lifeline Awareness Week will be rescheduled.

Member Pociask presented on behalf of the Technology Transitions Working Group. The Working Group has nine action items coming out. Two of these are presentations and seven are ideas that are still under development. For the presentations, they would like AT&T to give a presentation on the IP transition, questions regarding wireless local loop, and CAF money for rural areas. They would also like for an FCC expert to come and present on the IP transition and unannounced forced implementation. Some of the ideas for recommendations that they are pursuing have to do with the technology transition and underrepresented consumers, the subsidies issue on the IP transition, and developing model codes and guidelines to address the potential state and local impediments to the development of Next Generation broadband. After the presentations, the Working Group plans to review these concepts, prioritize them and find a recommendation to flesh out.

Member Berlyn presented on behalf of the Privacy Working Group. The Working Group has one action item: by the privacy order, they have a task to come up with a standardized privacy notice. The Working Group started this task in December2016 and has been hard at work in completing it. As part of this task, they have invited privacy experts such as Lorrie Cranor, who used to be the chief technologist at the FTC, and Serge Egelman, a professor at the University of California at Berkeley, to speak. The Working Group has now started to sketch out some thoughts and will present a draft to the full CAC at some point. This task has a deadline of June 1, 2017. Chair Bartholme added that other CAC members are welcome to attend these Privacy Working Group meetings and/or provide input to the Working Group.

Comments from the Public

There were no public comments.

Wrap-up and Next Meeting Date

The CAC has tentatively scheduled their next meeting for May 19, 2017.This date has been chosen to give the Privacy Working Group as much time as possible to finalize their product.

Adjournment

Member Berlyn made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Member Pociask and passed unanimously. Chair Bartholme adjourned the meeting at 3:00 pm.