

CONSUMER ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Federal Communications Commission

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

Monday, September 18, 2017

Welcome and Call to Order

Eduard Bartholme, CAC Chairperson

Chair Bartholme called the meeting of the Federal Communications Commission's (FCC) Consumer Advisory Council (CAC) to order at 9:15 am. He welcomed members and thanked USTelecom for providing lunch.

Introductions and Meeting Logistics

Scott Marshall, CAC DFO

Council members introduced themselves. Chair Bartholme noted that due to the hurricane situation in Florida Commissioner Clyburn would not deliver remarks as previously planned. Scott Marshall, the CAC Designated Federal Official (DFO), provided logistical information for the meeting.

Remarks of Matthew Berry

Matthew Berry, Chief of Staff to Commissioner Ajit Pai, welcomed CAC members. Mr. Berry said the Commission's top consumer protection priority was stopping unlawful and unwanted robocalls. As robocalls are the number one source of consumer complaints, the Commission is undertaking a multi-pronged strategy to progressively address this issue. In particular, the Commission is attempting to eliminate caller ID spoofing by allowing carriers to block calls in which the caller ID shows an invalid or unassigned number. Another strategy that has received a Notice of Inquiry (NOI) has been to establish a call authentication system. In a recent address to the Mobile World Congress Americas, Chairman Pai noted that creating that system should receive input from industry.

Addressing problems with reassigned numbers will be instrumental in eliminating robocalls. Tough enforcement overall will be critical to this endeavor, and the Commission has proposed \$120 million and \$80 million fines on individuals who have engaged in robocalling. Finally, Mr. Berry said going forward the Commission will also be tougher on "cramming and slamming," Rural Call Completion (RCC), and disability issues. The Commission has begun codifying rules to mitigate those problems.

Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau (CGB) Update

Patrick Webre, Acting Bureau Chief, CGB

Mark Stone, Deputy Bureau Chief, CGB

Roger Goldblatt, Associate Bureau Chief, CGB

Suzanne Singleton, Chief, Disability Rights Office (DRO), CGB

Patrick Webre, Acting Bureau Chief of the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau (CGB), spoke first, thanking CAC members for their contributions. Mr. Webre reviewed a meeting between his and Chair Bartholme's staff, in which they discussed the present meeting's agenda and the CAC's deliberations on robocalls in May. This meeting also touched on how to make the CAC more productive, particularly in how to better inform members of issues to bolster their recommendations.

Mark Stone, Deputy Bureau Chief of the CGB, spoke next. Mr. Stone elaborated on the Commission's effort to eliminate unwanted robocalls. In July the Commission launched an inquiry into reassigned telephone numbers, and announced their intent to establish comprehensive databases and require robocallers to check if a number has been reassigned. The Commission is seeking comment on which providers should contribute reassignment information to said database, whether the database should be managed by the Commission or by industry, and how often it should be updated. Additionally, the Commission proposed two rules to counteract slamming and cramming. In July the Commission banned the act of carriers misrepresenting themselves when telemarketing to consumers and placing unauthorized charges on their bills. This proposed rule states that carriers must expressly check with consumers before switching their account to another carrier. Further, the Commission asked whether consumers must authorize third party charges. Regarding public safety, in June the Commission proposed rules that would unmask anonymous callers that harass schools, religious institutions, and other victims. To ensure consumer privacy, the proposed rule stipulates that one's identity can only be revealed for truly threatening calls.

Roger Goldblatt, Associate Bureau Chief of the CGB, spoke next. Mr. Goldblatt—who currently oversees the Consumer Affairs and Outreach Division (CAOD) as well as the Web and Print Publishing Division (WPPD)—introduced Becky Lockhart to give more information about an upcoming event. Ms. Lockhart told the Committee about the Accessibility Innovation Expo taking place on October 23rd from 10 am to 12 pm. Taking place at the Pepco Edison Place Gallery, the event will showcase broadband-enabled health technologies. Mr. Goldblatt introduced Howard Parnell and Mike Snyder for their presentation.

Howard Parnell, Chief of the WPPD, gave an overview of the WPPD. Formed in 2011, the WPPD is focused on consumer education, and manages 160 consumer guides on topics such as robocalls, scams, and accessibility, among others. In addition to English, these guides are provided in Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese, Korean, and Tagalog. Mike Snyder, Deputy Chief of the WPPD, added that the Consumer Help Center webpage is the WPPD's most used resource, and includes information on robocalls and the library of consumer guides. Mr. Goldblatt said WPPD's newest project is adding more blog posts that emphasize consumer's personal stories, and that CAC members could submit those stories if they knew

of any. Chair Bartholme noted it was encouraging that some WPPD projects had previously been CAC recommendations.

Questions from the CAC

Member Berlyn asked if the WPPD tracked how many consumers requested information online. Mr. Parnell said that although he didn't currently have a full report the division regularly tracks analytics for consumer pages. Popular pages included information on robocalls, telephone scams, accessibility, and broadband. Mr. Snyder added that the Office of Media Relations monitors the division's social media interaction and asks for feedback on which posts garner the most attention. Member Wein asked if the CGB was using their website and social media platforms to discuss new technologies, which could be especially helpful for lower literacy populations. Mr. Parnell said they would work on that. Member Pociask suggested there should be an effort to promote broadcast repacking. Mr. Parnell and Mr. Snyder said CGB had been working with the Incentive Auctions Task Force on this issue for a few months, and that getting the timing right would be essential. Mr. Goldblatt said they would present the incentive auction outreach plan at the next CAC meeting.

Member Leech of the Consumer Federation of America (CFA) asked if the CGB had guidelines to aide consumers with equipment repairs. Mr. Parnell agreed that was a health and safety issue. Mr. Snyder said they didn't have any resources directly related to equipment repairs at present, but would work on it. Member Leech expounded on her earlier comment with a story of her mother, who waited twelve days for her landline to be repaired. Mr. Parnell agreed that was very serious. Member Day asked if the CGB would offer resources in any additional languages. Mr. Parnell said they would be open to that, and asked if Member Day had a specific language in mind. Member Day suggested Haitian Creole, Russian, and Portuguese, to which Mr. Parnell said he would consider it.

Ms. Suzanne Singleton, Chief of the Disability Rights Office (DRO), updated the CAC on her office's recent activities. On July 12th the Commission passed video description rules, which supplements on-screen activity with auditory descriptions for the blind and visually impaired. Those rules—which increase the hourly requirement from 50 to 87.5—will be effective July 1st, 2018 and will apply to the following networks: ABC, CBS, Fox, and NBC for broadcast networks and Disney Channel, History Channel, TBS, TNT, and USA for non-broadcast networks. This network list will be updated in 2018 following analysis of the Nielsen Ratings. This summer the Commission also passed a rule on internet delivery of video clips, which stipulates that as of July 1st, 2017 live and near-live clips require captioning if they were first aired on television. This rule extends from the 21st Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act (CVAA), which was originally adopted in July 2014. The rules do not extend to third-party websites or third-party apps.

Another rule that affects Multi-Channel Video Program Distributors (MVPD) dictates that audible emergency information must pass through secondary audio stream on second screen devices. For

example, text crawls containing emergency information must be made in audio form to laptops, cell phones, and tablets. This rule only applies if the information is delivered to the subscriber who is watching the MVPD's scheduled programming over the MVPD's network as a part of their service. The DRO also released an order to establish four-year compensation rates for video relay service (VRS) and telecommunications relay service (TRS). In July a public notice was released to inform state programs to file their recertification applications by the end of October 2017.

Regarding emergency information, on September 13th the DRO held a workshop on 911 outages, which is archived online. On September 27th at 2:20 pm there will be a test for the Emergency Alert System (EAS) to evaluate the effectiveness of that test. The Commission's Public Safety Support Center of the Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau (PSHSB) will establish an online filing system to assess the effectiveness of the EAS. On October 16th the Disability Advisory Committee (DAC) will be meeting to make recommendations to the Commission. The theme of this meeting will be related to the National Disability Employment Awareness Month (NDEAM). Finally, Ms. Singleton informed CAC members of accessinfo@fcc.gov, which provides subscribers with information on access issues.

**Report Back: Implementation of CAC's May 2017 Robocall Recommendations.
D'wana Terry, Acting Deputy Chief, CGB**

D'wana Terry, Acting Deputy Chief of the CGB, gave the presentation on CAC's robocall recommendations that were passed in May. Ms. Terry first addressed Member Leech's comment on outages, and elaborated that in certain cases time-sensitive requests can be expedited if consumers follow up with the Commission.

Ms. Terry noted her appreciation for the CAC for their recommendations to restrain robocalls. Ms. Terry then reviewed the recommendations, beginning with the suggestion to simplify the consumer complaint filing process by developing a form that allows information to be entered on multiple unwanted calls. The CGB agreed this recommendation would be beneficial to consumers, and is exploring how to implement that form. In response to the second recommendation—to create a separate intake portal for unwanted call complaints—in July the CGB added a "file an unwanted complaint" button on the landing page of the Consumer Complaints Center's website. This new process will be closely monitored to see what changes need to be made in the future, and Ms. Terry encouraged CAC members to solicit feedback from their constituents on this button.

One recommendation that requested making complaint data available to third parties in near real-time would not be implemented, as the CGB found the current practice of releasing data on a daily basis was sufficient. The CGB will continue to look into this issue to see if a different time-frame is preferable to all parties. In response to the recommendation asking that the Commission incorporate educational information into replies to consumer complaints, on August 8th the CGB began linking resources (including consumer guides) in their response to complaints. The CGB will continue to explore the

recommendation to develop an app allowing consumers to file complaints on mobile devices that received robocalls. This project may take time, as the Commission needs to choose the right strategic partner. Finally, on the suggestion that the Commission build upon the existing memorandum of understanding with the FTC by creating a co-hosted single education and complaint portal, Ms. Terry explained that the FCC routinely examines its collaboration practices with federal partners. Chair Bartholme said the CGB recently updated its Education Resources Guide and enforcement actions.

Questions from the CAC

Member Leech thanked Ms. Terry for the CGB's work on implementing these regulations. Member Ellrod of Fairfax County asked where the "file an unwanted complaint" button was on the website. Ms. Terry said it could be found in the upper-right on the consumer complaints landing page. Chair Bartholme voiced his appreciation for the Consumer Complaints Center and for James Brown in particular, who created a system that allowed consumer complaint data to be visible by time period. Ms. Terry reiterated CAC members could always reach out to CGB and provide them with information.

Review of NPRM, Protecting Consumers from Unauthorized Carrier Changes and Relation Unauthorized Charges from July 2017 Meeting

Kimberly Wild, Attorney Advisor, Consumer Policy Division (CPD), CGB

Kimberly Wild, Attorney Advisor, Consumer Policy Division of CGB, gave the presentation on the July 2017 meeting's notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM), which proposed to curtail the practices of "slamming and cramming." The NPRM was voted on in the July meeting, was published in the Federal Register in August, comments were received on September 13th, and reply comments are due October 13th. For clarification, "slamming" is an unauthorized change of a consumer's preferred carrier, and "cramming" is the placement of an unauthorized charge on a consumer's telephone bill. Both longstanding consumer problems, the FCC received over 8,000 complaints on these issues in the last two years. Because certain states have their own cramming rules—in particular, California, Texas, and New York—the Commission is likely not receiving all of the relevant complaints for these practices.

Carrier tactics have changed as rules to prevent slamming and cramming have been implemented. In many cases carriers are committing fraud, either misrepresenting who they are when placing calls to consumers or when the switch to a new carrier is being verified. One recent enforcement action highlighted a scam in which companies contacted consumers under false pretenses to obtain personal information, which could then be used to authorize a change. There has also been a considerable increase in unauthorized charges in elderly and immigrant populations. This drastic evolution in slamming and cramming scams is the reason the present NPRM was so crucial.

To combat these fraudulent practices, this NPRM will:

- 1) Prohibit misrepresentations on telemarketing and sales calls. If a misrepresentation occurs, the proposed rule stipulates the subsequent authorization for a change would be rendered invalid
- 2) Prohibit unauthorized charges on telephone bills.

In addition, the NPRM is seeking comment on a number of proposals, including:

- A) Making a Preferred Carrier (PIC) Freeze the default for all consumers rather than a process initiated by the consumer
- B) Forcing carriers to re-verify an authorization to change carriers
- C) Blocking third-party billing without a consumer opting into those charges
- D) Requiring carriers to record sales calls and retain those recordings
- E) Eliminating third party verifications (TPV) or revising the rules that govern their usage. CGB is also considering methods for certifying TPVs.

Questions from the CAC

Member Pociask of The American Consumer Institute (ACI) asked if slamming referred to resellers or larger companies with infrastructure as well. Ms. Wild said the Enforcement Bureau (EB) has primarily been investigating resellers. Member Pociask said it just made sense that consumers initiate those processes. Member Goodman asked if the complaints system had data on slamming and cramming in regards to Lifeline customers. Ms. Wild was not aware of any resource of that kind, but would look into it. Member Ellrod suggested that recordings of sales calls be provided to consumers. Ms. Wild agreed.

Member McAuliffe of Americans for Tax Reform (ATR) asked why a carrier calling consumers back to verify switches was an issue, and also asked if any consumer billing complaints were actually unrecognized tax bills. Ms. Wild said some billing complaints do wind up being taxes and fees. To the first question, Ms. Wild said switches provided carriers with retention opportunities. Member McAuliffe asked if the multiple phone calls were a TCPA violation, to which Ms. Wild answered that this practice wasn't limited to phone calls. Member Pociask mentioned the retention opportunity issue, and asked what was wrong with the original provider offering a better deal to customers. Ms. Wild said the new provider doesn't like that rule. Member Day asked if there was enforcement action if a customer with a bundled service receives an unauthorized charge. Ms. Wild said there can be but that was not EB's primary focus.

Review of July 2017 Call Authentication Trust Anchor Notice of Inquiry (NOI)

Ken Carlberg, Chief Technologist, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau (PSHSB)

Ann Stevens, Deputy Division Chief, Competition Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau (WCB)

Ken Carlberg, Chief Technologist of the PSHSB, gave the presentation on the Trust Anchor NOI, beginning with background information and an historical overview. In 2016 the robocalling Task Force was divided into four different tasks, including determining the standards and protocols that could be

used to trust incoming phone calls. Two standards bodies—the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) and the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS)—shared in developing those protocols. The Commission has traditionally relied on the IETF to create their standards, especially with the development of the session initiation protocol (SIP), which is used to establish calls over IP networks. Roughly ten years ago the IETF attempted to create a trust mechanism, though that tool was focused primarily on domains and not phone numbers.

Three years ago Henning Sholstream assembled an FCC task force to further develop those trust mechanisms, including efforts to improve SIP and create digital certificates in which trust could be placed. IETF worked primarily on improving SIP while ATIS built the digital certificate framework. The IETF working group came to be known as Secure Telephony Identity Revisited (STIR), which prompted ATIS's working group to be called SHAKEN. SHAKEN determined who could use digital certificates, and developed the trust anchor to be the root certificate authority. From that point, officials with the Wireline Competition Bureau (WCB) issued an NOI to ascertain if the STIR/SHAKEN approach was correct and what changes should be made. With the comments period now over, the Commission will take recommendations to implement necessary changes.

Questions from the CAC

Member Goodman asked if the solutions issued by the standards bodies relied on open source software. Mr. Carlberg said the ITS software is open source, and though ATIS typically only gives clients access to their products they did work with the SIP forum to develop open standards. Mr. Carlberg also mentioned that before the NOI was issued a Georgetown University professor and one of his students presented an implementation on the trust anchor, which only took three months to build. Chair Bartholme asked if the software could also be reverse-engineered for someone to find a way around the standards in a short period of time. Mr. Carlberg said that could not happen as long as the certificate authority was in place, and that the design should work whether or not the software is open source.

Review of July 2017 Rural Call Completion Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (FNPRM)

Adam Copeland, Assistant Division Chief, Competition Policy Division, WCB

David Brody, Attorney Advisor, Competition Policy Division, WCB

Chair Bartholme reconvened the meeting after lunch and thanked Eric Null from the Open Technology Institute (OTI) for their past participation with the CAC. Chair Bartholme then introduced Adam Copeland and Adam Brody, Assistant Division Chief and Attorney Advisor, respectively, for the Competition Policy Division (CPD) of the WCB. Mr. Copeland said that in addition to reviewing the FNPRM he and Mr. Brody will be giving a broad overview of the Rural Call Completion (RCC) issue.

Mr. Brody gave the presentation, beginning with background information on RCC. Due to their remoteness, rural areas frequently face telecommunications issues. The RCC problems that occur most

often are delays in a call, having no ring tone, dropped calls, and busy signals, among others. One key factor at play in RCC problems is that there are numerous providers in a call path. Elaborating on how rural calls are placed, Mr. Brody explained that due to least cost routing procedures it is often the case that an originating local exchange carrier (LEC) does not deliver the call to the terminating LEC. Rather, that carrier uses an intermediate provider to terminate the call. Because intermediaries choose the cheapest route, that path is often not the most reliable, which increases call failure.

The Commission began combating this issue in 2011 with the adoption of the USF/ICC transformation order, which aimed to limit a carrier's ability to arbitrage rates if they did not complete rural calls. In addition, the WCB has issued declaratory rulings stipulating that the Communications Act prohibits carriers from limiting call completion to avoid termination charges. The EB has also taken up investigations and dissent decrees on this matter—specifically looking into Verizon, Matrix Telecom, Windstream, Level 3 Communications, and inContact—which have assessed \$6.45 million in penalties. In 2013 the Commission adopted the first Rural Call Completion Order (13-39), which set up a data collection, retention, and reporting regime. With this rule, covered providers (which include originating carriers with at least 100,000 lines) are required to collect and categorize data on call completion performance. This order also established a safe harbor from the regime for covered providers to cease reporting data after one year if they:

- 1) Pledged to use no more than two intermediate providers in their call path
- 2) Monitored their intermediate provider performance
- 3) Maintained transparency with their intermediate providers

Covered providers reported data quarterly for two years beginning in 2015, which the WCB analyzed and published in a report in June 2017. This report included a provision stating that the Commission would inspect whether to eliminate the RCC rules or to take other actions depending on their effectiveness. Chairman Pai indicated he will complete the follow on rulemaking by April 2018. The June 2017 report on RCC data made a number of findings, including that the aggregate call answer rate was slightly lower in rural areas as opposed to non-rural areas. Mr. Brody indicated this finding was likely due to individual provider performance rather than a systemic issue. However, the data was found to be unreliable due to inconsistencies with how covered providers collected that information. The report found it was unclear that the benefits of maintaining these rules outweighed the costs, and recommended eliminating or modifying the data collection regime.

On July 14th the Commission adopted the RCC second FNPRM, which seeks comment on whether the Commission should adopt new rules requiring covered providers to report data on their intermediate providers and hold them accountable for poor performance. The rule also seeks comment on whether they should eliminate the reporting requirements but maintain the retention requirement, whether small providers should be required to provide said data, and how to preserve existing safe harbor rules.

In addition to the Commission's work, H.R.-460: Improving Rural Call Quality and Reliability Act passed the House of Representatives on January 23, 2017, and S-96: Improving Rural Call Quality and Reliability Act passed the Senate on August 3, 2017 and was referred back to the House. This legislation requires intermediate providers to register with the Commission and comply with service quality standards, prohibits covered providers from using unregistered intermediate providers, and specifies that covered providers that serve as intermediate providers need not comply with intermediate provider service quality standards if they are registered as safe harbor providers. From the date of its enactment, the legislation allows the Commission six months to establish the intermediate provider registry and twelve months to set up the intermediate provider service quality standards.

Questions from the CAC

Member Pociask asked what the completion rate for call origination was compared to call termination in rural areas. Mr. Copeland said they did not presently have that data, but they would examine that. Member Pociask asked whether the RCC issue was actually about quality of service or if the money being generated in RCC prompted the Commission to examine it more thoroughly. Mr. Copeland said the traditional framing of the issue was that the problem lay more heavily on call termination, but they would look into it. David Brody said the report showed RCC complaints have decreased over time.

Member Herrera of the National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors (NATOA) asked if the FNPRM would eliminate the reporting requirements or the collecting the complaints. Mr. Brody said the FNPRM would eliminate or modify the data recording and reporting requirement. Member Herrera asked how many instances of RCC failures there were. Mr. Copeland said it was difficult to accurately determine that figure. Mr. Brody added that reports indicated the aggregate call answer rate was 64.3% in rural areas and 68.8% in non-rural areas. Member Herrera asked if there was a 2-4% difference of calls between rural and non-rural areas. Mr. Brody said that is what the data suggests, but the report had several data quality issues. Member Herrera asked if there was an estimate of the number of calls in the report. Mr. Copeland said that information was not available. Mr. Copeland added that the report found there would be a difficulty in using the data for enforcement purposes. Member Herrera asked if there was any information regarding the scope of the RCC issue. Mr. Copeland answered that the best indicator they have is the anecdotal complaint data. Mr. Brody said that the report did conclude RCC problems stemmed from issues with specific providers and was not systemic.

Member Herrera relayed the story of the Commission's work on compelling cable television providers to do performance tests, in which the FCC concluded they would not have to test because an insufficient amount of complaints were received. Since that issue had over 2,400 complaints and the RCC issue had only 288 complaints, Member Herrera asked if the RCC issue warranted an FNPRM. Mr. Copeland said the Commission views RCC as a problematic issue and that Congress was fairly far along in their legislative process. Mr. Brody and Mr. Copeland added they were trying to comply with the 2013 rules, which was to be completed by April 2018. Member Herrera suggested a ballpark figure of RCC problems

would provide a helpful framework for understanding its importance. Mr. Copeland agreed but said data collection problems limited that. Member Herrera commended the WCB for going back to evaluate their questions and posited the FCC should be consistent in their enforcement endeavors.

Member Leech asked for clarification on the costs and benefits of revamping RCC regulations. Mr. Copeland said the cost referred to covered providers who comply with the data collection, the benefit was to consumers, and the report indicated the regime was not effective. Member Leech said she worried this issue could be too expensive for providers and consumers would still have to deal with the problems. Mr. Copeland noted the proposed rule only pertained to the reporting and record keeping regime, and that they were looking to potentially make other suggestions. Altering the data gathering regime would only be done to benefit consumers. Member Leech asked if CPD had suggestions for better quality service standards. Mr. Copeland said the initial proposal required covered providers to monitor intermediate providers. Mr. Brody said ATIS has a call completion handbook that touches on best practices, which is discussed in the FNPRM and could be codified into the new rules. Mr. Copeland added there was a discussion to be had on whether ATIS's guidelines would be the best resources or if something else was sufficient.

Member Defalco said this issue seemed strictly financial, and suggested lowering terminating access rates. Mr. Brody said financial concerns could be a determining factor in RCC issues, but were not necessarily the sole issue. Mr. Copeland concluded that he welcomed further comments from the CAC or from the member's individual organizations.

Update on April 2017 Connect2Health Public Notice

Dr. Chris Gibbons, Physician Advisor, Connect2HealthFCC Task Force

Dr. Chris Gibbons, Physician Advisor to the Connect2HealthFCC Task Force, gave the presentation. We are living more of our lives online, Dr. Gibbons explained, which is having a tremendous effect on the health sector. As a result, the FCC is working to provide broadband health opportunities to all Americans, including those living in underserved areas or from underserved populations. Although health disparities do exist in areas that lack quality broadband infrastructure, broadband-based technologies could be used to close gaps in access to care, and would also be beneficial to the entire country. While innovations like telemedicine and telehealth already utilize technology to bring medical expertise across the world, tomorrow's innovations will revolutionize this industry, particularly with regard to how medical professionals contend with problems of distance and time.

Autonomous cars that double as ambulances will be one such innovation of the future. In addition, homes that deliver care to inhabitants based on sensor readings will one day be commonplace. Dr. Gibbons added that in the future there will be 24/7 medical professionals and drones able to provide care whenever a consumer requires it. Ultimately, hospitals will deliver less care, and more care will be offered in-home, which will make care smarter, more responsive, and on demand. Proper development

of these technologies is particularly important for providing care to underserved populations, which would otherwise fortify health disparities and increase overall health costs.

The Commission's Connect2HealthFCC Task Force's two primary functions are to serve as the nexus for all FCC-related health activities and to explore the intersection of broadband technologies and health. To accomplish this goal, the Task Force has already gone on the Beyond the Beltway Tour, which travelled to ten cities talking to healthcare innovators. While on tour they found it was difficult to develop a system to implement innovations in broadband technology and healthcare, which convinced them to set up a "Mapping Broadband Health in America" tool on the Commission's website. The Task Force is also holding a number of virtual listening sessions to talk to people that could provide a consumer perspective. Finally, in April 2017 the Task Force put out a public notice seeking input from consumers on accelerating the adoption of broadband-based health technologies and reducing disparities. The consumer perspective is paramount to this entire project, Dr. Gibbons concluded.

Questions from the CAC

Member Goodman asked what would happen to underserved populations if, for example, telecommunication providers imposed a 5% surcharge for accessing medical-related services. Dr. Gibbons said the low adoption rates had many causes, notably a lack of broadband infrastructure and high costs. In addition, the technologies currently being used may not be the best ones to provide medical care. Further innovations beyond what telecommunications companies can provide may be necessary to establish this network. Member Johnson asked if some people—especially seniors—had been more hesitant to relinquish control of their health services to interactive devices. Dr. Gibbons answered that the opposite was true, that seniors have the lowest utilization of electronic tools but also the fastest rate of adoption. Dr. Gibbons explained that people adapt because the changing world necessitates their trust, which he saw firsthand in a study in which low-income, urban African Americans became utterly reliant on their health-related interactive technology.

Member Alkebsi asked if any virtual listening sessions would specifically work with specialized consumer groups like deaf and hard of hearing communities. Dr. Gibbons said they did plan on holding more listening sessions, and that just the prior week they held one session that specifically spoke to consumers with disabilities. Katie Gorscak, Communications Director for the Connect2HealthFCC Task Force, added that the third virtual listening session on technology and service providers would be held later in the week, but a more general session was planned for policymakers on September 27th. Audio recordings from these meetings would be available at fcc.gov/health. Member Berlyn of the National Consumers League (NCL) asked for some understanding on what the Task Force was trying to accomplish. Dr. Gibbons said the definitive goal of the Task Force is to make recommendations to FCC leadership on health related topics. Member Kearney asked if the Task Force would be using information from the public notice that was put out. Dr. Gibbons said they would.

Consideration of Unwanted Call Block Recommendations

Ed Bartholme & Kevin Rupy, Co-Chairs, Robocalls Working Group

Chair Bartholme called for a motion to move the report for consideration. Member Leech made a motion to move the recommendations for discussion, which was seconded by Member Defalco. The motion to move the report for discussion was approved.

Chair Bartholme and Member Kevin Rupy, Co-Chairs of the Robocalls Working Group, led the discussion. Member Rupy said the robocalls blocking NPRM and the NOI discuss four specific categories of calls voice service providers (VSP) are permitted to block: do not originate (DNO), invalid numbers, unallocated numbers, and unassigned numbers. To ameliorate this problem, the Working Group gave seven recommendations to the FCC:

- 1) Permit and encourage VSPs to block robocalls in specified circumstances
- 2) Permit and encourage VSPs to block calls from do not originate numbers
- 3) Permit and encourage VSPs to block calls from invalid numbers, unallocated numbers, and unassigned numbers
- 4) Encourage VSPs that have implemented any of the blocking described in 2 and 3 to inform subscribers of that policy
- 5) Encourage stakeholders to collaborate on address issues associated with unintended blocking
- 6) Encourage VSPs to offer optional blocking tools that extend beyond those the four aforementioned categories
- 7) Monitor the effectiveness of the blocking measures over a two-year period starting from their implementation.

Questions from the CAC

Member McAuliffe asked if recommendations 2 or 3 would affect number providing services like Google Voice or WhatsApp. Member Rupy said they would address that issue in the new notice, and that the fifth recommendation should help to mitigate issues like that. Member McAuliffe asked if this also raised a competition issue with the aforementioned services. Member Rupy said that was not the recommendation's intent. Chair Bartholme added they would hope service providers are not sending caller ID through the system that would look like unassigned, unallocated, invalid, or "junk" numbers. Member Rupy noted that issue was also addressed in industry best practices. Member McAuliffe asked if the recommendation extended to text messaging services as well. Member Rupy replied the NPRM focused only on voice calls.

Member Lieberman asked if the reporting expectations would take the size and capability of the VSP into consideration. Member Rupy said the NPRM did discuss that, and that it was a valid topic. Chair Bartholme added that was one of the reasons the report used the broad language of "permit and encourage," and that the sentiment behind recommendation seven was to see if any consumer was

being unduly harmed by the rules. A motion to accept the recommendations was made by Member Leech, seconded and approved. Mr. Marshall provided information on the working groups.

Reports from Working Groups

Member Fazlullah of the National Digital Inclusion Alliance (NDIA) presented on behalf of the Universal Service (USF) and Digital Inclusion Working Group. The Working Group decided they would look into the 477 issue on broadband speeds and discuss potential recommendations around Lifeline.

Member Pociask presented on behalf of the Broadcast Repack Working Group. The Working Group discussed working on issues related to channel reception, consumer education, outreach, and emergency alerts. They will set up future calls to get background information on those issues.

Member Follansbee presented on behalf of the Slamming and Cramming Working Group. The Working Group discussed some of the items raised in the notice. A future call will discuss future recommendations to the Commission.

Chair Bartholme presented on behalf of the Robocalls Working Group. The Working Group deliberated caller ID unmasking, and concluded they should reach out to experts in the field before deciding if it's an issue for the CAC. They also discussed whether issues regarding caller ID, trust anchors, and SHAKEN/STIR were consumer matters or technical concerns. They will hold a call in the coming weeks to confer over reassigned number databases.

Comments from the Public

Several public commenters asked if the U.S. would emulate other countries in allowing TV White Spaces to be used for broadband. The CAC would submit that question to FCC officials. Another person asked if battery backups were practical if they had no visual indication that they're operational and no automatic switchover in case of power failure. Though many of those issues had migrated to the Broadband Deployment Advisory Committee (BDAC), Chair Bartholme said CAC would share that comment. Finally, one person asked how charging rates for overseas calls fits into the Commission's Title II authority. Chair Bartholme asked if anyone else had comments from the public.

Moving on to logistical matters, Chair Bartholme asked if anyone had a strong preference for Mondays or Fridays for meetings. Member Leech mentioned the January 2018 meeting should take place before Martin Luther King Jr. Day. Mr. Marshall suggested Friday, January 26th.

Adjournment

There being no other comments, a motion to adjourn the meeting was made, seconded, and passed unanimously. Chair Bartholme adjourned the meeting at 2:41 pm.