

**STATEMENT OF  
COMMISSIONER JESSICA ROSENWORCEL  
APPROVING IN PART, DISSENTING IN PART**

Re: *Electronic Delivery of MVPD Communications*, MB Docket No. 17-317; *Modernization of Media Regulation Initiative*, MB Docket No. 17-105

If you, like me, are a subscriber to cable service, you know getting it set up takes time and effort. But after you do, you'll have loads of programming to watch and all sorts of content to call on.

While you kick back and enjoy that service, you'll also get a lot of notices. Many of them are required by law. So sending these notifications via e-mail can be convenient. It can cut down on lots of paper. If a cable company wants to e-mail me information about signal quality complaint procedures, that's fine by me. If it wants to e-mail about local franchise authority contact information, that's okay, too. If it wants to electronically share a list of signals accessible without a converter box, I'm game. And if it offers some detail in e-mail about equipment compatibility, all good. In fact, these things are not really going to impact my watching or wallet, so sending them along to a verified e-mail address makes sense.

But if that same company wants to send me rate increases in e-mail, it better first ask me for permission to do so. Sliding new charges and new fees into my already crowded e-mail in-box makes it likely that I miss any increase in cost. So before having my video provider raise rates via e-mail, I think I deserve the right to choose to have it do so.

However, that's not what my colleagues decide today. Instead, they determine that your cable company can make these choices for you. If they have your e-mail on hand, they can simply stop sending you notices of billing increases in the mail and instead let them pile up in your e-mail in-box, where you may not be looking for them nor expect to find them—or where they may get stuck in your spam file so that you never see them.

This is not acceptable. The record in this proceeding includes not a single consumer—it features only filings from companies in the multichannel video programming market. So, this consumer has had enough—and on this aspect of today's decision, I dissent.