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P‑R‑O‑C‑E‑E‑D‑I‑N‑G‑S

9:09 a.m.

CHAIR POCIASK: All right, well, let's start, call to order. My name is Steve Pociask. I'm with the American Consumer Institute and I'll be chairing today's session.

I want to thank everyone for coming to -- this is the 10th Charter, first meeting for the Consumer Advisory Committee and I thank you all for coming.

Again, I'm Steve. I'd also like to introduce my Vice Chair, Ms. Debra Berlyn and the Designated Federal Officer here, Scott Marshall. Make sure to speak with them.

And, so, a couple things, I understand Joslyn, are you on the phone?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR POCIASK: Or Larry?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR POCIASK: So, we'll circle back. So, let's do this, let's go right through, just to start off, why don't we get everyone to identify themselves, tell me your organization. And, we'll just -- why don't we just start right here and we'll just go all the way around.

And, do we have a sign in sheet, too?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, pass around a copy of the roster for a sign in sheet.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay.

MR. MARSHALL: All right.

CHAIR POCIASK: All right.

MEMBER KAMPIS: My name is Johnny Kampis.

CHAIR POCIASK: Oh, make sure you raise your hand before you start.

MEMBER KAMPIS: Yes, oh --

MR. MARSHALL: To get your mic, yes. And the control people know to turn the microphone on.

MEMBER KAMPIS: My name is Johnny Kampis. I serve individually. I also work in Taxpayers' Protection Alliance.

MR. MARSHALL: There, you're on. You might want to say that again, Johnny, now you're amplified.

MEMBER KAMPIS: Okay. My name's Johnny Kampis. I'm officially serving individually, but I also work at the Taxpayers' Protection Alliance.

MEMBER ROOKER: I'm Shirley Rooker. I'm the President of Call for Action and I'm the Director of the WJLA Call for Action here in Washington.

MEMBER SANTORELLI: I'm Michael Santorelli, serving individually, but I am a Director of the Advanced Communications Law and Policy Institute at New York Law School.

MEMBER SLOVER: I'm George Slover. I'm with Consumer Reports, formerly known as Consumers Union and my name tag still has -- it's from last time, I think it still has the old name on it.

MR. MARSHALL: Sorry about that, George.

MEMBER SLOVER: That's quite all right.

MEMBER HURLEY: My name is Brian Hurley. I am Vice President of Regulatory Affairs for ACA Connects, America's Communications Association.

MEMBER DORISON: Sam Dorison, name tag pending. I am the Chief of Staff at the Trevor Project. We run a 24/7 lifeline for LGBTQ youth serving about 125,000 per year.

MEMBER HILDEBRAND: Good morning, Kyle Hildebrand, serving individually.

MEMBER FOLLANSBEE: Lynn Follansbee, USTelecom.

MEMBER KAHSAI: Dawit Kahsai with AARP.

CHAIR POCIASK: Raise your hand, please, before you start.

MEMBER NEMETH: Rachel Nemeth with CTA.

MEMBER ZACHARY: Bohdan Zachary, Milwaukee PBS.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Thaddeus Johnson, NASUCA.

MEMBER GERST: Matt Gerst with CTIA. I've also been instructed to say that I am on the Board of Directors of the Universal Service Administrative Company. And, as such, I will be recused from all Universal Service issues.

MEMBER MORRIS: Steve Morris with NCTA.

MEMBER LONG: Vonda Long with AT&T, federal regulatory relations here in Washington, D.C.

MEMBER LEECH: Irene Leech, Vice President with the Consumer Federation of America. And, in my work life, I teach Consumer Studies at Virginia Tech.

MEMBER HAUENSCHILD: Jonathan Hauenschild, American Legislative Exchange Council.

MEMBER KOCH: Eric Koch, serving individually. Also, a member of the Indiana State Senate.

MEMBER UMANSKY: Barry Umansky, long-time communications attorney in Washington, now in the Midwest with the Digital Policy Institute.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: And, I'm Debbie Berlin. I'm representing the National Consumers League.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. So, do we have anyone on the phone?

MEMBER DAY: Yes, good morning. Joslyn Day, Consumer Division Director at the Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Cable.

MEMBER WALKE: This is Larry Walke of the National Association of Broadcasters.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. Anyone else on the phone?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay, so there is a list going around, just check beside your name so we'll have the full attendance on record.

So, as general protocol, I guess we've sort of noticed, but just make sure that, if you ever want to speak for some reason, make sure you raise your hand and then identify yourself for the record.

I just want to take a second here, also, to thank NCTA and Steve Morris for the refreshments today and this afternoon. So, thank you very much for that.

Just also want to note that we will have Chairman Ajit Pai and Commissioner Carr will be here in just a little bit. But just if you quickly go through your agenda and if we need agenda, I have some here I can pass some extras out.

But just in a nutshell, so we'll have the Chairman and the Commissioner start us off and then from there, we're going to touch base and get an update from the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau.

Then, after that, we're going to change directions and talk to the attorney in the Office of General Counsel regarding the Federal Advisory Committee Act that governs the rules of this committee. So we'll get some clarification on how that all operates.

And then, after that, we're going to touch base with the newly formed Office of Economics and Analytics. And so, we'll get an update on that.

And then, we're going to take on two issues which I think will become starting out our two working group issues.

So, the first will be in regard to call authentication.

And then, the second issue will be in regard to robo blocking.

And so, those items, we're going to have somebody come in and update us on where we are. Just keep in mind, the second item is still in the Sunshine period, so we won't be able to get any questions on that.

Then, afterwards, at the very end, we're going to move on and talk a little bit about the Consumer Education on TV Broadcaster Relocation. It's an important issue.

And then Scott and I will just touch some -- on some closing issues regarding sort of the rules of the Committee and the formation of working groups and so on.

And then we'll just open for comments at the end. And then, we'll just go over to -- we'll adjourn and then, at that point, we'll have lunch if people want to have lunch or if you want to leave early. So, that's kind of what we're up to today.

So, if there is nothing else, do we have any questions or anything starting out?

Okay.

(OFF MICROPHONE COMMENTS)

CHAIR POCIASK: All right, okay. All right, so we have the Chairman here to give us some keynote remarks.

If you'd like to, why don't you join us right up here, Chairman. Thanks so much.

CHAIRMAN PAI: Good to see you.

CHAIR POCIASK: Good to see you.

CHAIRMAN PAI: In my defense, it is Monday.

(LAUGHTER)

CHAIRMAN PAI: But, yes, the cup is upstairs.

Anyway, thanks so much to Steve for allowing me to be here. And, thanks to our Chair Emeritus, I guess, you might say.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Vice Chair.

CHAIRMAN PAI: Vice Chair, yes, for helping us lead today's efforts.

And, I just wanted to say thanks to all of you for taking the time to be here to participate in our labors.

A lot of issues on the FCC's plate, but these days, the one I hear about the most is the one you probably hear about the most. In fact, maybe since we've been gathered here, you've probably already gotten one, which is robo calls.

The number one source for years of consumer complaints that we get. And, we've been pulling out the stops in order to attack this problem through both regulatory changes and enforcement changes.

And, in particular, this Thursday, as you might have heard, we're going to be voting on a proposal to allow call blocking by default so that consumers don't have to affirmatively call up their phone company, ask for a particular service and then have it applied.

We would make clear that those types of services can be offered by default. And, we think this is going to be a major step in the right direction in attacking this problem.

We certainly welcome other solutions and including collaboration with our sister agency, the Federal Trade Commission or other agencies that might have equities and consumer groups.

But there's no question that time is not on the side of the American consumer that is, like I said, every single place I go, whenever folks ask what it is I do, the number one thing they say is, oh, you've got to stop these robo calls.

And so, that's one of the things we want to be able to attack.

But I know that there are other issues as well on your plate. You have called ID authentication, other types of issues that you're exploring.

I just wanted to say that we look forward to working with you as we're crafting solutions for this problem and some of the other major problems that are facing American consumers.

I want to thank those in particular, the leadership of the Committee. But also those of you who've been here for now, what, two, three, even ten terms I think. You have -- that's impressive, that's a long time to be on the Committee.

But we really do appreciate the fact that so many experts from around the country are willing to take the time out of their busy schedules to be here. And, as I said, labor jointly with us in these waters.

So, thanks for letting me intrude. I hope I didn't disrupt things too much, but you are in very good hands with our august Chair and Vice Chair as well here at the Committee.

And I wish you well in your deliberations. And, yes, let us know what you think about some of these issues.

Thanks.

CHAIR POCIASK: Can you take a couple questions?

CHAIRMAN PAI: Oh, sure, yes.

CHAIR POCIASK: Does anybody have a question?

MEMBER LEECH: I don't have a name tag.

CHAIR POCIASK: You can identify yourself.

MEMBER LEECH: But I'm Irene Leech with the Consumer Federation of America.

CHAIRMAN PAI: Yes.

MEMBER LEECH: And, I happen to live in a rural area that's not served by broadband very well.

CHAIRMAN PAI: Yes.

MEMBER LEECH: And, I see that we're making progress. My electric co-op is looking toward, but I'm still, they're telling us it's more than five years away before we'll get anything.

And, the over-the-air service that I've been able to get is very expensive and I still can't use it to upload pictures or to watch videos because I can't afford the bandwidth.

CHAIRMAN PAI: Yes.

MEMBER LEECH: And, I'm in a better position than many of my neighbors. So, just as you all are working and as I look at the definitions of things, there's still a lot of gaps.

And, please, please, remember that also my family farm in the geographic center of the state is getting, it appears, a high pressure pipeline for 1.1 mile through the middle of our property.

And, they originally told us that they were going to monitor it with broadband. And, they have decided not to do that.

We also don't have broadband in that electric co-operative has -- is also working, but also says it will be at least five years before our farm gets access to real broadband.

So, just wanted to give you the in the trenches update on where we are with that, even though there are glowing reports about the expansion.

CHAIRMAN PAI: What state, I might have missed it, what state?

MEMBER LEECH: Virginia.

CHAIRMAN PAI: Oh, in Virginia? Yes.

No, well, you put your finger on one of the central reforms we've had to some of our Universal Service Fund programs, which is encouraging more nontraditional players to participate.

In fact, two weeks ago, I was in Okmulgee, Oklahoma where I had a chance to meet with East Central Electrical Cooperative. And, this is a decades old cooperative that, back in the Depression Era wired up rural Oklahoma with broadband.

And, even now, in the 21st Century, one of the things they're struggling with is the same thing that you're identifying, is that there's a patchwork or sometimes no broadband at all.

And, that's one of the reasons why East Central and a number of other electrical cooperatives around the country have participated and have won funds, subsidies in our Connecting American Fund Auction to provide broadband.

So, East Central, for example, is getting I believe it's $22 million over the next several years to build up broadband to these unserved parts of the country.

And, I've seen many other electrical cooperatives that are doing the same thing. Westfield Gas and Electric, which I visited in Western Massachusetts, a number of other electric cooperatives.

And my message to them is the message I'll give to you, too. Is that, frankly, from our perspective, we don't care what type of company is aiming to serve these rural areas, we just want all of them to have a strong incentive to serve.

And to me, and I've said this many times before, so pardon me if you've heard it. But if you've read those Robert Caro books about Lyndon Johnson, in Volume I, Path to Power, there's a chapter about the electrification of the Hill Country of Texas.

And, that same sense of national purpose we had in the 1930s for wiring these poor rural areas, I think we have to have that same sense of mission in the 21st Century.

And, that's why we've encouraged all of our friends in the electrical cooperative business who tend to have a deeper footprint, sometimes, than some of the telecom companies, participate in our options to build up broadband.

And we need to encourage as many providers as possible to do the hard work and get parts of Virginia or to Oklahoma or where ever it is, we want to make sure we close that gap as much as we can.

But thanks for highlighting and we'll get on the stick in central Virginia and I'd love to visit the farm some time.

CHAIR POCIASK: You have another question, anyone?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN PAI: We solved the world's problems, all right.

(LAUGHTER)

CHAIRMAN PAI: But, thanks again for your participation and we -- I really do mean it, though, we -- this is a top issue for us and if you have solutions on how to attack that problem in particular, just let us know. We're all ears.

All right, thanks, guys.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAI: Thank you.

(OFF MICROPHONE COMMENTS)

CHAIR POCIASK: So, we're going to get started and there will be some agendas coming down. But if somebody would like an agenda right now before we go any further?

Here, just pass a few down -- here, pass a few down anyway. I'll pass a few more this way. There's some envelopes coming in about five minutes for others.

So, all right, so, okay. Let's get started here, so we'll move on with the next?

(OFF MICROPHONE COMMENTS)

CHAIR POCIASK: Yes, go ahead.

MEMBER SLOVER: Yes, George Slover.

While we're getting started, something that was prompted by something that Chairman Pai said, I'd just be curious to know, is there anybody here who has been serving on the Advisory Committee for, say, five terms or more?

Is there any, you know, he said, so -- Debbie?

CHAIR POCIASK: Shirley.

MEMBER ROOKER: I'm the original Chair.

MEMBER SLOVER: Oh, from -- so, ten? You've been on ten times?

MEMBER ROOKER: Yes.

MEMBER SLOVER: Wow.

MEMBER ROOKER: Well, Ed took over for a few years. So, he abandoned us.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: AARP.

MEMBER LEECH: And the AARP has been on for a long time.

MEMBER SLOVER: Yes.

MEMBER LEECH: And CFA was on before --

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: CFA has.

MEMBER LEECH: -- I became involved.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Yes, CFA has been on a long time.

MEMBER SLOVER: Yes, and we might have been, too. I was just wondering like personally, is there anybody sitting around this table who --

MEMBER LEECH: I probably have been, too.

MEMBER UMANSKY: Three maybe, three or four, maybe.

MEMBER SLOVER: Okay, thanks.

CHAIR POCIASK: All right. So, our next speaker is going to probably be here in about five minutes, if we want to just take a short break and just grab a little cup of coffee or something and be right back.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 9:27 a.m. and resumed at 9:34 a.m.)

CHAIR POCIASK: Now, we'll get some remarks here from Commissioner Carr.

COMMISSIONER CARR: Thanks, thanks so much. Great to see you all again. I know this is the first meeting of the 10th Advisory Committee and want to start by thanking all of you for your service.

You all have very, very full day jobs. I know this is an add-on to that. So, thank you, particularly those of you that have served on past Advisory Committees here. You know what you're getting into, so I have less sympathy for you --

(LAUGHTER)

COMMISSIONER CARR: -- than for the new faces.

But I really can't tell you how important this function is to feeding into the work that we do at the FCC. And so, it really is very appreciated.

You know, your mission is such an important one.

I want to highlight just a couple of some of the consumer side issues that are top priorities for me. I know you guys are just getting settled in today and you're going to start talking through the issues that you want to focus on.

Obviously, first and foremost, for me, is robo calls. We have an item that we're voting on this week at the Commission that's designed to empower wireless providers to take even more aggressive steps to combat this issue before the phone calls hit your phone.

And, I know there's been some pushback on that, some folks asking the FCC to delay the vote or asking us to water down the decision. And I'm absolutely opposed to those steps.

Americans are sick and tired of receiving robo calls and being bombarded with calls. And so I'm full steam ahead with the FCC's decision, look forward to getting that across the finish line this week.

I also think it's certainly not necessarily the silver bullet, it's not the end of the process. And, we're working to stand up SHAKEN/STIR which can be an authentication framework that can take another big bite out of robo calls.

And, literally, this is the one issue, it used to be two issues, but now it's just down to one issue, so we're making progress, one issue where, when I'm walking down the street in my neighborhood, I live not too far from here, over in Dupont, my neighbors will literally throw their windows open and yell at me --

(LAUGHTER)

COMMISSIONER CARR: -- from the second story about what are we doing to combat these robo calls.

And, I was just in Montana and Wyoming last week, spent about three or four days out there driving through some of the most rural and remote parts of the country, some spotty cell service to be sure.

And, a lot of times, the first time we'd get a cell signal back, we get bombarded with robo calls on my phone.

So we've got to take aggressive action. The vote that's up this week does that. And I look forward to get that across the finish line.

And, more, and hearing your all feedback as well.

Another big priority for me has been 5G, and in particular, making sure that every single community in the country has a fair shot at next generation connectivity.

From a consumer perspective, the stakes are too high to see 5G deployed only in places like New York or San Francisco or even San Jose. We've got to make sure that every single community in the country see the benefits.

And I know that's been a big focus for a lot of your groups as well. So, interested in your feedback on the additional steps we can do to get the infrastructure deployed for 5G and making sure consumers have the fair shot at receiving and taking advantage of that technology, again, whether it's autonomous cars, whether it's new artificial intelligence. There's smart city applications that can make a big difference.

And on that related topic, closing the digital divide has been something that this FCC has really elevated I think to another level.

We sent a report out just last week. It's ironic since I was out in Montana and Wyoming when this report came out. And the report that the FCC put out on the pace of broadband deployment in the country was really reflected in my own experience last week on the road, and in the 30 states that I've had the chance to spend time in across the country, which is we have really accelerated the pace of broadband build out in this country.

More fiber was deployed last year than any year in history. Internet speeds are up 40 percent.

In terms of small cells, these building blocks for 5G, we had about 13,000 that were built in 2017 and that number jumped to over 60,000 in 2018.

So, the job that Congress set out for us in 706 was to look at the pace of deployment. Is it going out in a reasonable and timely way?

Congress didn't ask us to put out a report and say, do 100 percent of Americans have next gen connectivity today or not? That wouldn't be a very useful report.

So we look hard at the pace at which it's being deployed, and is it reasonable and is it timely?

I know a lot of people back here in Washington characterized the report as saying, the job is done. And anybody that read the report would know that that's not true. And if they did read the report, they're just trying to mislead the public about what's in it.

Again, what's in it is exactly what I saw across the country last week. I was in Utica, Montana. Very remote, very rural part of the country and fiber broadband, miles of it, is being plowed into the ground there today.

I was in Powell, Wyoming and held a community town hall and talked with people about some of these new fiber builds that are going into their communities.

And the story is we're not across the finish line yet. We're not at a point where the job is done.

But if you look around at the pace of deployment, the investment, the miles of new fiber going in, and I've had the chance to actually, you know, ride on the plow trains that are putting this fiber in to some of the most remote frontier parts of the country.

That's great news, that's something that we need to celebrate.

And at the same time, we need to keep our eye on the prize, which is, we're not at the finish line yet. There are still millions of Americans that don't yet have that next generation connectivity and we're not going to stop at the FCC. And you all are here to keep our feet to the fire on that until every single community has it.

But let's celebrate that the policies that we've put in place are working. Let's not rest on our laurels. Let's get the rest of the millions of Americans that don't have connectivity a fair shot at getting it.

So I'm pleased with the progress that we're seeing on that front.

Finally, I want to touch a little bit on jobs. You know, when we talk about building out this next generation infrastructure, it's actually a great job story, both from a consumer perspective of using it and starting businesses and innovating, but also deploying the physical infrastructure that we need to get 5G across the finish line.

I announced a jobs initiative a month or two ago. Essentially, industry right now could hire 20,000 tower climbers to build out 5G infrastructure. And, if you expand beyond that to the fiber builds that we need as well, it could very easily be a hundred thousand from some of the contractors that I've talked to. And, these are good paying, solidly middle class jobs.

On the tower side in particular, you could go into a community college program with no training and through a 12-week program, a mix of classroom education and physical tower climbing skills, you can come out and get a job as a 5G worker building out this next-gen infrastructure.

And I was down in Graniteville, South Carolina at a community college that's doing just that, putting that program in place.

So those are some of the top priorities for me as I look for the next six months of this year and beyond. And really appreciate the time that you all are putting into this.

Happy for you to put new issues on my radar that I didn't talk about and help direct the conversation at the Commission with your expertise.

So, just again, thank you for the time that you're putting into this. Happy to take a few questions if you guys want.

CHAIR POCIASK: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CARR: Or move on and let you do the --

CHAIR POCIASK: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER CARR: -- actual real work you need to get done today.

CHAIR POCIASK: Yes, we have a couple questions.

MEMBER LEECH: I'm Irene Leech, representing the Consumer Federation of America.

I wonder to what extent you all could work with other agencies that are promoting infrastructure around the country and connect the broadband with it.

For example, there are two high-speed large pipelines going in Virginia. And, originally, the Atlantic Coast Pipeline said they were going to monitor it with broadband.

If they had done that, that would have put broadband through very rural areas that they are crossing through.

They've backed off and decided not to do that. That means that that infrastructure that could be there for a hundred years will never have broadband because they don't, you know, it'll continue to use the old technology.

And, we didn't have any way when -- as citizens who asked that they do that, nothing happened with FERC. So I don't know what ways you all have to incentivize through the infrastructure that's going through, but I think that's something you could consider.

COMMISSIONER CARR: Yes, great point, thanks for raising it.

We do have some work that we do to try to coordinate with other federal agencies.

When I was on the road last week, USDA, for instance, has a loan program that can be leveraged for this infrastructure.

But you're right, there's some bills in Congress, too, that look at what we call Dig Once, so moving off the pipeline example, they're just building roads. How do we make sure that if an infrastructure project like that is going through, let's put conduit in there as well.

And so I think you're right, we can continue to focus better on ways to look holistically at all infrastructure projects going on and let's put conduit, let's put fiber along with those projects.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. So, Joslyn, Larry, anyone on the phone have a question?

MEMBER DAY: Not at this time.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. Anyone else here --

MEMBER DAY: Thank you.

CHAIR POCIASK: -- have a question?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR POCIASK: Well, it looks like everything's been answered.

COMMISSIONER CARR: Good.

All right, thanks again for your service, really appreciate it.

CHAIR POCIASK: Thanks, Commissioner, appreciate it.

All right, so, let's move on to the next item on the agenda. So, we're going to get an update for Consumer and Government Affairs Bureau. Let me get -- ask for Patrick Webre to join us.

MR. WEBRE: Good morning, everyone. As Steve mentioned, I'm Patrick Webre, Chief of the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau.

A few months ago, I converted to an iPad, and I'm not using anything other than electronics now, so hopefully, I'll be able to read my remarks and they'll come through clearly and I won't stumble over my words or anything. But this is the first time I'm actually not using paper when I give an address.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. WEBRE: So, hopefully, it'll be good.

So, anyway, it's my pleasure to welcome you, the 27 members of this morning's Consumer Advisory Committee meeting.

And, as has been mentioned, it's now in its tenth two-year term. So, it was originally chartered as a Federal Advisory Committee in November of 2000.

And, as has also been mentioned, three of our members, AARP, where's AARP? Okay, Call for Action, and NAB, and on the phone have all been with us since the beginning, since November of 2000. So, thank you all for your commitment and contributions over the years.

And, I know many of you have been with us for several terms. Thank you as well for your continued contributions and support.

So we hope you'll find today's experience to be, or the CAC's experience of the two-year term, to be rewarding. And we certainly look forward to your input and participation.

I also want to recognize your immediate past Chair, Ed Bartholme, who's currently with us. He's taken on a role as part of our CGB leadership. He's an Associate Bureau Chief in the front office overseeing our outreach and education efforts.

We're lucky to have him. But I'm confident you won't miss a beat with your new leadership, Steve Pociask -- did I get that right?

CHAIR POCIASK: It's all good.

MR. WEBRE: And Debbie Berlyn.

CHAIR POCIASK: Excuse me.

MR. WEBRE: Chair and Vice -- that might be a robo call.

CHAIR POCIASK: It is.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. WEBRE: So, this will be an ongoing topic of discussion for the entire day. You'll hear a fair amount about what we're doing on robo calls, as you've heard already from both the Chairmen and Commissioner Carr.

So, you'll shortly be hearing from some of the leadership team on CGB's staff and that includes one of our new members, our other new member, Diane Burstein.

Diane is a Deputy Bureau Chief. She's overseeing our work on disability and accessibility issues.

She most recently served as Vice President of NCTA. She's also a past member of the CAC. And, she also served on our Disability Advisory Committee, the DAC.

Turning to your agenda today, there's a diverse mix of topics we hope you will find both interesting and engaging.

Primarily focused on robo calls, and we're going to start off by having our staff attorney, Karen Schroeder, from our Consumer Policy Division, talking to you this morning about another step, as the Chairman mentioned, that we're going to be taking this week to combat the scourge of robo calls.

Now, last term, the CAC did great work on several robo call recommendations and we expect -- certainly expect that to continue this term.

We will also be asking your advice on educating consumers, helping them to understand the caller ID authentication framework that's being put into place by carriers.

This is commonly known as SHAKEN and STIR. These are both technical terms and technical protocols that are going into place.

Staff from the Wireline Competition Bureau will be here today to talk to you about our efforts in those regards.

And, we're thinking that the CAC is in a unique position to help us formulate messaging for consumers to help educate and inform them about caller ID authentication, what it means to them, and, you know, what's going to be expected when it's implemented by carriers.

This is certainly an ongoing process, but, you know, when the implementation is taking place or has taken place, what is the consumer going to see? What should they do with that information when they get it on their mobile phone or their home phone?

So we want to engage you guys on helping us with that kind of messaging and those thoughts.

That's pretty much it for me for now. Again, I appreciate all you're doing and all you've continued to do. And, we look forward to your recommendations and your wise counsel.

So, we're going to start, we have a few Deputy Bureau Chiefs and our Associate Bureau Chief, Ed Bartholme, that are going to talk about their areas of responsibility.

And so, our first one is going to be Mark Stone who oversees our Consumer Policy Division and our rule makings. So, I'll hand it off to mark.

Thank you, everyone.

MR. STONE: Thank you.

So I'm neither a new member of CGB, nor do I read electronically. I've got paper.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. STONE: So hope this goes well, too.

Welcome to all of you. I know it's taken a little bit of time to get here, so we appreciate your patience and we look forward to your service working with us.

In my part of CGB, we've been focused on, no surprise, robo calls. As several folks have mentioned, you're going to hear a lot about that today, including the draft call blocking item the Commission will consider on Thursday.

You'll also hear about SHAKEN/STIR, caller ID authentication which is a fairly critical part of dealing with unwanted robo calls.

So I wanted to mention one thing you won't be hearing extra about today that we worked on since the CAC last convened, and that's the issue of Reassigned Phone Numbers.

The Commission, in December of last year, set forth a path to establish a comprehensive Reassigned Numbers Database that would enable callers to scrub their calling list free of numbers that have been reassigned.

So this is a fairly typical problem where a consumer gives their consent to receive a call and then they give that number up without telling the caller.

The caller then tries to reach that person, but instead, reaches the person who now has the number. So the person that now has the number gets a call they don't want. The person that gave the number up misses a call they want. And then the caller has wasted their time.

So the Commission set forth a path to establish this database. It asked another advisory committee, the North American Numbering Council to advise us on some operational, technical, and fiscal issues.

So, once we get that recommendation, we'll put that out for comment and then move forward to making that database a reality.

So, lots on robo calls, but I'm here to say, we actually do want to work on things that aren't robo calls occasionally.

One area that's kind of a longstanding consumer issue that no longer gets a lot of attention, but is still important, particularly to certain vulnerable populations, and that's the issue of slamming.

The Commission continues to do work on slamming but in enforcement context and some rulemaking. It doesn't get a lot of headlines because of the way that phone service is usually taken these days. It doesn't lend itself as much to slamming.

Nevertheless, what we do in CGB is we adjudicate individual slamming complaints to try to make consumers whole when they believe their carrier has been changed without their approval.

So we've been attacking this pretty forcefully over the last several months and have reduced our level of work down significantly thanks, in large part, to our very good staff and our policy division.

So with that, that's the news from my corner of CGB. And, I'll turn it over to the next Deputy up.

MS. BURSTEIN: Okay. Hi, thanks.

Good morning, my name's Diane Burstein and I'm Deputy Bureau Chief here at CGB. In my role as CGB Deputy Chief, I help oversee the very talented and dedicated staff of the Disabilities Rights Office.

And while I just started two weeks ago in my position, so I'm very new to this, I have worked with accessibility issues for many years and know many of you from working as a lawyer in the field.

I'm lucky today to have Suzy Rosen Singleton here with me to help me answer any questions that you might have on the substance of any of these issues.

Given this is the first meeting of the CAC in a long time, I was hoping to provide a broad overview of what the Disability Rights Office does and highlight some of its consumer engagement initiatives.

And given that the last CAC meeting was nearly a year ago, rather than simply provide a long list of all of the DRO accomplishments over the last year, I was hoping to more of a broad overview.

Some of you may know that DRO focuses primarily on three major areas of accessibility, modern communications, video programming, and emergency communications.

In addition, DRO works with other bureaus to address areas that benefit from multiple teams of subject matter experts.

To give you some idea of the breadth of DRO's purview, here are some of the items that fall under each of these major subject areas.

Under access to modern communications, DRO deals with issues such as advanced communication services, direct video calling, hearing aid compatibility, the National Deaf/Blind Equipment Program, real time text, and telecommunications relay services.

This category encompasses a large part of the Disability Rights Office portfolio and DRO has principle responsibility for several important outstanding rulemakings in this area designed to help improve communications for those users with disabilities and to protect these important programs against waste, fraud, and abuse.

Under access to video programming, there are topic areas such as closed captioning both on television and the internet, the display of closed captioning on television sets, and access to that captioning, and video description of video programming.

DRO collaborates with the media bureau on many of these issues and it will work on an upcoming report to Congress this fall on video description.

Finally, under the broad category of access to emergency communications, DRO deals with important topics such as direct communications with 911, the Emergency Alert System, wireless emergency alerts, and televised emergency information.

Among other things in this area, DRO is working with the FCC's Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau to help resolve some issues regarding the -- regarding accessibility that came to light during last October's nationwide wireless emergency alert and EAS test.

DRO not only acts as a subject matter expert on policy in these various areas, it also directly engages with consumers on a variety of issues.

One way we work with the affected communities and individuals is through our informal compliant resolution process. And, the DRO team does an outstanding job overseeing accessibility complaints in consultation with DRO subject matter experts and other Commission staff.

DRO is also in the process of making online consumer complaint forms much more mobile friendly and as easy as possible for anyone to use. And, you can find those forms at fcc.gov/complaints. And, you can reach DRO with feedback at dro.fcc.gov.

DRO also staffs the American Sign Language Consumer Support Line, where we accept video calls directly from individuals who are deaf and use ASL.

This service leads to faster, more efficient, calls and higher consumer satisfaction. We engage in outreach to encourage organizations, whether they are governmental, private, or nonprofit that have consumer support call centers to include direct video calling at their call centers.

DRO also produces an ever-growing library of ASL videos.

And, just a few other ways where DRO promotes stakeholder engagement, we have the upcoming Chairman's Award for Advancement, also known as the AAA Awards coming up on June 18th.

We offer a variety of online consumer and small business guides, provide an access info listserv and accessibility clearinghouse, roundtables, and forums.

There was just one recently earlier in May on Enhanced Electronic Newsroom Technique Best Practices.

And, finally, we consider the CAC another incredibly important stakeholder engagement opportunity. We are pleased to add the Disability Rights Office to the long list of those people at the Commission that deeply appreciate and benefit from your work.

So, that's a pretty quick overview of what the DRO does. And, any questions, feel free to ask or reach out to the DRO webpage at fcc.gov/accessibility.

Thanks.

CHAIR POCIASK: Thank you.

MS. BURSTEIN: All right. Turn it over to Barbara.

MS. ESBIN: Good morning. My name is Barbara Esbin. I'm also Deputy Bureau Chief in the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau. And, I oversee the Governmental Affairs portion of the Bureau's work.

Largely, this consists of overseeing the operation of two divisions within the Bureau, the Office of native Affairs and Policy, and the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs.

Each of those offices, in turn, has an advisory committee under its auspices. The Officer of Intergovernmental Affairs has the Intergovernmental Advisory Committee.

And, the Office of Native Affairs and Policy has the Native Nations' Communications Task Force.

That task force is actually comprised not only of elected tribal officials, but senior staff from the FCC.

The IAC is comprised solely of elected officials from state, local, tribal, and territorial governments.

Both of those advisory committees are distinct from the CAC in that they are exempt from the Federal Advisory Committee Act. And their meetings are off the record. But once they produce their work product, we post it on the webpage of the respective committees.

So the Commission has asked each of these groups to help advise it in set areas. And, both are working very hard to provide us with recommendations.

The IAC has provided one set of recommendations on ways to incent state and local governments to put their real estate list property holdings into a federal database that would be used by providers who want to -- looking for locations to site communications facilities.

The Native Nations' Communications Task Force is in the final stages of its first set of recommendations which will be on ways to improve and expand broadband deployment on tribal lands.

Each of my officers, IGA and ONAP, perform outreach and education functions on behalf of the Commission. And, each serves as a central point of contact for their respective constituencies.

ONAP gets numerous requests from tribal officials and members for assistance with FCC processes. And, IGA receives numerous requests from state and local officials and organizations looking for a point of contact or a briefly.

ONAP provides regular briefings in Indian Country by going out, ideally, once a quarter and doing what we call FCC Tribal Work Shops.

They're usually two days of presentations and discussions on matters of tribal interests that the FCC is working on.

We are going out next week to Oklahoma for a tribal work shop hosted by the Chickasaw Nation.

And, all members of ONAP, myself and Patrick Webre, are planning to attend. And, the work shop will be preceded by a full day meeting of the Native Nations' Communications Task Force in person to continue their work on their broadband deployment task.

So, I just wanted to give you a quick overview of what I do for the Bureau so that you can tuck that away in case you ever need to know it.

CHAIR POCIASK: Thank you, Barbara.

All right, so, Ed?

MR. BARTHOLME: I just wanted to check real quick in case the same thing that happened to George happened to me and they still have Call for Action listed on my name card.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. BARTHOLME: It didn't happen.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. BARTHOLME: So, let me, again, echo the thanks that you've heard from Commissioners and from my fellow CGB staff this morning.

I understand the commitment and the time that you're taking to share your expertise with the Agency and we're grateful for that.

I get the privilege of updating you on the activities of the Consumer Affairs and Outreach Division and the Web and Print Publishing Division within CGB, or in plain language, the Outreach and Education teams here at the FCC.

One major new initiative since the CAC last met is our rural tours. We've done three since last fall, the Pacific Northwest, Appalachia, and the Southeast. Up next, at the end of June, is the Midwest and we're going to be visiting Minnesota and Wisconsin.

They provide us with an opportunity to meet directly with people to hear their concerns and frustrations, learn about the latest scams and pain points for consumers in the telecom space.

It's also a chance for us to see creative approaches to tackling connectivity challenges and bridging the digital divide.

Our plan is to do these meetings -- these trips, sorry, tours, quarterly and we welcome suggestions for regions to visit and groups that we can work with to organize events while out on the road.

As part of Older Americans Month last month, we visited multiple senior centers. We hosted a webinar here in the CMR covering our biggest consumer issues and that is an archived event on the FCC website.

And we also worked with AARP, thank you, to do two live webcasts. Kristi Thompson from the Enforcement Bureau and myself got to go over there two evenings in late May and do sort of newscast style presentations for AARP's audience. It was a really fun opportunity.

We also are very excited that we recently released an animated video on spoofing and it was created entirely in house by Web and Print Publishing staff. And you can find that at fcc.gov/spoofing.

We're really excited to have these capabilities on staff and we have a second animated video that will be released later this summer.

Each month, we're also doing multiple consumer help posts at fcc.gov/consumers. We recently did one on the one-ring scam that was in the news early last month.

We've also done some that explain different types of spoofing scams. And part of what we're trying to incorporate in those is actual audio from the scam so that when a consumer reads the writeup, they can also hear the con, so to speak, and listen in to what that phone call is actually going to sound like to them.

And there will be more things to come there.

One thing that we've heard from the CAC many times over the years, and I hope that Ken McEldowney is watching this somewhere right now, is that we need to do more in languages beyond English.

I'm happy to share that every consumer help center post is translated into five languages, Spanish, Korean, Vietnamese, traditional Chinese, and Tagalog.

And those are the five most commonly spoken languages other than English in U.S. households.

We also know that part of the challenge is getting information and materials into the hands of people who are not digital natives.

So we've created a number of tip cards on our most popular issues. I have some examples here.

We do these also in those five languages beyond English. Some of them are one -- are all in one language, some of them are two sided where the English on the front and a second language on the back.

So we've -- we get these out there. Last year, in sort of the latter half of the year, we distributed over 17,000 copies of our spoofing one across the country. So we're getting them out.

Those efforts have actually led to a unique partnership with the National Asian-American Coalition, or NAAC.

So this week we have staff traveling around California and out to Las Vegas doing ribbon-cutting ceremonies at a chain of Asian grocery supermarkets.

And they have in these supermarkets, through the partnership with NAAC, something called Hope Booths.

And these are sort of like the customer service kiosks, but they cleaned it out and they staffed with volunteers. And they do educational information.

So in those, I believe it's 15 locations, we have trained the volunteers to answer questions about telecom issues, to do education about robo calls and spoofing.

And we've also had in-language versions of all of our tip cards sent to each of those store locations so that they can do direct hands on engagement and also leave them with something to take out of the store with them in the form of a tip card.

Additionally, we have an internal resource that was created last summer and allows us to quickly identify the most commonly spoken languages by county in the U.S.

This tool has been used in former outreach before and after natural disasters. We have also used it to identify which languages are in use in areas we visit during our rural tours and other activities.

So last fall, for example, in the Pacific Northwest, we identified that there was a need for Russian language tip cards, and we were able to have our cards translated into Russian and take those with us for some of the meetings that we did.

We've also done French Creole in Louisiana and others as needed.

As a reminder, the Chairman's Awards for Advancements in Accessibility is coming up on June 18th, more commonly referred to as the Chairman's AAA.

If you'd like more information about that event, it's in Virginia in the sort of Northern Virginia area. Please reach out to us and we'd be happy to get you more specifics on the event.

And lastly I want to encourage everyone at the table, many of whom I know, and it's great to see so many familiar faces, some of you are new faces, but I'd like to encourage you to stay in touch.

And if we aren't in touch, get in touch. We want to work with you if you have events where we can support or participate, let us know.

If you have ideas about education topics, let us know. We hope to work with you collaboratively and look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you.

CHAIR POCIASK: All right. So two things before the group leaves.

First, I was just going to open it up quickly since we have the entire staff here, you can hold on for a minute, so what we have, we've heard a little bit from -- regarding the robo calling which we're going to touch on again, a little bit on slamming.

We heard about the disability office, the intergovernment affairs, the native affairs, you know, we just heard a little bit about outreach and education.

So I just wanted to open it up just quickly before I move to a second item here, just to see if anyone had any questions in the room.

We can call somebody up before they leave or we can move on. But if you -- for any of the presenters we just had, if anyone has a question on the phone or in the office right here, just raise your hand and let me know.

(No audible response.)

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay, then, that's good. So then we'll just move to the second item.

I just wanted to mention that, you know, it's, you know, really nice to sit here, but I've got to tell you, I have a lot of kudos for you. You've done an excellent job.

I just kind of remember looking back at your leadership here as, you know, as Chairman or Chairperson, I guess, your sort of cool demeanor that you all were able to project and a very diplomatic tact.

But most of all, your leadership and I just wanted to recognize, you know, how much, you know, you know, we're all very happy for you and, you know, kind of missed you in this role.

But I just wanted to recognize that.

(Applause.)

CHAIR POCIASK: Scott?

MR. MARSHALL: And Ed, on behalf of the Committee, we wanted to present to you the now traditional commemorative Chairman's gavel.

(Off-microphone comments.)

MR. MARSHALL: And the reason why we don't give it to him, this is personal though, before this point in time, is I was always afraid you'd hit me with it.

(Laughter.)

MR. MARSHALL: But, anyway, congratulations. Thank you, man, pleasure working with you.

MR. BARTHOLME: Thank you all, thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIR POCIASK: Great. All right, so if there is nothing else at this point, we'll be back in about -- come back into the room in about 15 minutes. We're really scheduled to start at 10:30. And, you know, just make your way back in the room a few minutes ahead in case we're ready to move. So let's take a break.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:13 a.m. and resumed at 10:32 a.m.)

CHAIR POCIASK: All right. Okay, let's get started. All right, let's get started.

Okay, everyone, let's get going.

So groups like these are governed under the Federal Advisory Committee Act. And so we have Paula Silberthau here. She's an attorney advisor for the Office of General Counsel and she's going to kind of explain the rules of the road.

Paula?

MS. SILBERTHAU: Hi, everyone. Good morning.

I'll just go through a couple things, and at the end, just like ask any questions if you have any.

What I've found is it usually people don't have questions at the beginning, but sort of, as you go along and you work in advisory groups, you might have some questions then. You can field them through your Chairman or through Scott. And like, you know, I'll get back to you if there are some answers to it.

So we are governed by the Federal Advisory Committee Act and by the GSA rules. And sort of the biggest guiding principle is, I guess you have a copy of this, I'm just going to walk through it quickly.

Opening -- openness and government, having a diverse membership, and being accountable.

And all of those things are reflected in sort of the rules of the road. So the first rule is, you can't just decide tomorrow to hold a meeting. You actually have to give advance notice.

And the notice requirement is a Federal Register. We also go sort of about 15 days notice. We go above and beyond that because we realize not everyone in the world reads the Federal Register, at least I don't.

And so we do public notices and if there's a switch, you know, Scott would -- in a date, you know, Scott would let you know by emails.

But it can't be -- things can't be just done last minute because that's sort of contrary to the openness organizational principle.

Meetings have to be open like this. Sometimes, occasionally, if there's like some sort of emergency meeting that's done and a lot of the membership maybe can't -- it's a snowstorm or whatever, people can't meet in person, can't get into D.C., you can have meetings where you hook people up electronically.

So that's just sort of good to keep in mind when you're making winter plans. We greatly prefer having people come here because we think dialogue is better sort of face to face. I know I'm old fashioned on that concept, but, you know, if you can't make it in person to a meeting, there are always ways to hook up electronically and for members of the public to be able to dial in as well.

There are some cases that I don't think would apply to the things that you guys are doing where you can close the meetings in various matters of national security, classified information, that sort of thing.

We have had that happen in the past where people might be talking about vulnerabilities in their telecommunication system. We wouldn't necessarily want the entire world to know that kind of thing. And so there's a process for closing the meetings.

If for any reason you think that something that you're working on involves your discussing things that shouldn't be available or broadcast to everyone and in a transcript, let Scott know and we would try to close that part of the meeting.

We keep all the communications available in a public file so people can come and look at them. And you folks can look at them, too, if you feel that you want to look at the transcript or the video tape.

You're working on recommendations and you want to understand why there were ten dissenting votes on something, and you want to go back and look at things, get in touch with Scott. There is a public file available, not just for members of the Advisory Committee, but for the entire members of the public who want to see things.

And in that regard, too, I do want to mention that the DF -- any communications you have, whether it's working group communications, whether it's organizational, whether you're working on some recommendations and you're maybe sending some ideas back and forth, whatever, please include Scott as the DFO on all communications.

Because that is the only way we can have records, which we're required to keep, of the, you know, of what's going on with the Advisory Committee.

Not every record of the subcommittees would necessarily be considered a full Advisory Committee record. The recommendations of the subcommittees would be and would be publically available. But not everything else, but nonetheless, any communications you have in your subcommittee should include Scott because it becomes, at the very least, like an Agency record, you know, something that could be FOIA'd, that kind of thing.

And the other reason it's important to include, I don't know, you're going to have some other liaisons, Scott, to work with the different working groups, or will you be the main contact?

MR. MARSHALL: I will be the main point of contact.

MS. SILBERTHAU: Okay.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Can you -- I'm sorry, can you just define subcommittees? Are those the same things as working groups?

MS. SILBERTHAU: Yes, subcommittee, working group, same thing, task force, whatever, yes.

But anyhow, so the key takeaway is please make sure that Scott is on the communications because we have to keep records of it.

Now, the Committee Chair and Vice Chair serve as sort of a focal point, and they'll work and help set up the working groups and come up with suggested meeting agendas.

The agendas are ultimately set by the DFO, and that's under the GSA rules, and in a sense ultimately through the Chair of the Agency because they have certain, you know, the Commissioners have certain tasks they really want you to get working on.

But if you have other ideas of things that you are interested in working on, we're always open to that. So just let Scott know and he can bring those ideas to the appropriate people.

And just so we know how important Scott is, so the DFO duties by regulation include calling the meetings, approving the agendas, going to all the meetings, getting all the communications, maintaining the Committee records, and making sure that there are transcripts, that sort of thing of the minutes of meetings.

And that's all set by GSA regulations. So Scott has to do all those things, even if he doesn't want to. It's just required.

So some of you, many of you probably have heard me explain this before, but there is a big difference in the way that these large meetings are conducted versus the way the informal working groups are conducted.

Until the law changes, and there is -- every year, there is legislation on this, but until the law changes, right now, informal working groups can operate sort of under the auspices of the FCC, but more in private.

The requirements for 15 days notice and the requirement for open meetings, and the requirements for public -- to allow public attendance, none of those requirements apply to the working groups.

Because the working groups are supposed to be the groups that gather information, and it's sort of on a preliminary basis, they might gather information, they might make recommendations, but those are not the recommendations of the full Committee.

Everything the working group does in terms of recommendations and support for it then has to come up to all of you as the parent Advisory Committee. And then it'll be voted.

So in order to make sure that the working groups do not sort of go too far, we have to make a couple of precautions.

One is, in size, the working groups cannot be a quorum of the Advisory Committee. Because if you have too many people on the working groups, they have now become -- their meetings have become like Advisory Committee meetings.

So if you hear Scott say, I'd love to place you on the working group of your choice but it's already filled up, it's not that we're being ornery, it's that if you have too many people on a working group, it becomes the equivalent of the Advisory Committee.

And I emphasize that because it's always a point of contention, but we can't help it, we have size -- basically size limitations.

And then the working groups should be balanced, just like the whole Advisory Committee should be balanced.

And the working groups do not speak for all of you. If you really hate a recommendation of the working group, it is not the recommendation of the CAC, it's the working group and you can discuss it, you can modify it, you can vote it up, you can vote it down, you can do whatever you want with it, but that's, you know, the working group recommendations are typically the first step.

And the other thing to remember about working groups is that you can't --- because you're operating under the auspices of the FCC, you can't do surveys.

Because, if you do a survey, which would otherwise trigger the Paperwork Reduction Act, then we have to get OMB approval.

So the work that you do, I mean, you might call one or two people who can give you some information or go to the library or do clippings out of the newspapers or go to the Internet, but please don't do surveys unless it's something that's very long-term and you don't need it for, you know, a couple of months.

In that case, we could consider doing -- getting approval for a survey through the Paperwork -- through OMB through the Paperwork Reduction Act. But that takes a while.

So that's not preferred unless you have a long, you know, a long leash in advance on it.

Ex parte rules, I think most of you know, we typically put out within a week or two of when you have your first meeting, and basically and ex parte exemption so that the conversations and discussions you have both in your working groups and at your public meetings where there might be staff available who -- or Commissioners who are working on an issue, in the normal case, you would need -- if you spoke to that issue, and there's a pending NPRM, you'd need to file and ex parte saying what you discussed, when you discussed it, et cetera.

When you're having those discussions at the working groups or maybe a roundtable that was sponsored by the CAC or at your meetings, you will not need to file ex parte presentations relating to what you might have said at the meetings.

If what you discussed something that the Commission will rely on, the staff will, I think we work it out with the staff, right, will file ex partes for you at some later date.

Oops.

MR. MARSHALL: Sorry.

MS. SILBERTHAU: Are we okay?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, we're okay.

MS. SILBERTHAU: Okay.

MR. MARSHALL: If all else fails, I remove the bannering.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. MARSHALL: That's old technology. Go ahead. Sorry.

MS. SILBERTHAU: That's why I don't trust technology.

So anyhow, we'll do that for you.

Now, if you were meeting, you know, individually with staff, you're a member of the CAC but on behalf of your organization, you're meeting individually with, you know, the Chairman's Office or with just people working on an item and you're -- and it's sort of outside of this meeting context, then, you know, you'd sort of be representing your own organization's view, and you would have to file an ex parte in the ordinary course.

So the exemption goes to sort of the substance of what you're discussing which is or sort of the function which you're playing, which is acting as a member of the CAC. The exemption doesn't follow you, you know, in your individual capacity in some other sense.

MEMBER ROOKER: Excuse me?

MS. SILBERTHAU: Yes?

MEMBER ROOKER: I must be dense, I have a radio program. If I were to interview someone from the FCC on that program, what do I -- you're not talking about something like that, right? You're talking about me coming in and talking about issues and presenting my own ideas to the Commission?

MS. SILBERTHAU: Yes.

MEMBER ROOKER: Is that what you're --

MS. SILBERTHAU: Correct.

MEMBER ROOKER: -- saying?

MS. SILBERTHAU: Yes.

MEMBER ROOKER: Okay. So I can question y'all all I want, huh?

MS. SILBERTHAU: I think so.

MEMBER ROOKER: Okay, thank you.

MS. SILBERTHAU: If that's wrong, because I'm not an ex parte expert, you know, if there's --

But, I mean, you would be doing that in your private capacity.

MEMBER ROOKER: Right, right yes.

MS. SILBERTHAU: So presumably, if it got into something that became, you know, a presentation under ex parte rules and you're interviewing someone from the staff, they would know and they would -- if they needed to file something, they would file it.

MEMBER ROOKER: I guess I'm still a little vague on what these boundaries are in terms of discussions.

MS. SILBERTHAU: Well, I think that the main thing is that, if you are promoting the views of your organization --

MEMBER ROOKER: Okay.

MS. SILBERTHAU: -- individually, as it relates to an item that is before the Commission, then typically, you know, you're having a meeting, you're trying to influence the decision makers, which is not nefarious, this goes on all the time --

MEMBER ROOKER: Yes.

MS. SILBERTHAU: -- people come in.

MEMBER ROOKER: Okay.

MS. SILBERTHAU: Then they file ex partes and it goes in the record.

And the -- one of the major reasons for that is so that other people can respond if they --

MEMBER ROOKER: Well, no, sure.

MS. SILBERTHAU: -- think the information you're giving is just --

MEMBER ROOKER: Makes sense.

MS. SILBERTHAU: -- totally wrong --

MEMBER ROOKER: Okay, thank you.

MS. SILBERTHAU: -- they want to know.

And this sort of -- this exemption sort of delays the ex parte filing.

Because, of course, if you guys are looking at something that's the subject of a pending proceeding, and you're tasked with making recommendations, then it'll be discussed at the meeting and we're just sort of trying to avoid, and since it's already public, people know what's being said, so it's sort of an unusual setting.

MEMBER ROOKER: Yes.

MS. SILBERTHAU: As opposed to private meetings.

MEMBER ROOKER: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: I have a follow up question.

MS. SILBERTHAU: Yes?

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Because this actually did come up once in a CAC meeting.

So about ex parte rules, if someone in a CAC meeting asks a question about an ongoing proceeding of a staff member, do we have to file an ex parte?

MS. SILBERTHAU: No, that's why we have the exemptions --

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Okay.

MS. SILBERTHAU: -- in place so that when you're doing something and discussing the meeting items as part of your CAC meeting --

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Okay.

MS. SILBERTHAU: -- you know, we'll exempt you.

But, you know, let's say that someone here makes some really persuasive comment in the conversation and later on the -- and it's sort of the first of its kind and the staff people want to rely on it later, then they would put, not everything at the meeting, but that comment and that discussion, that piece of a discussion in the docket so other people who weren't at the meeting could see it and react to it.

So we still can't rely on things that are said to us without getting it in the record. It's just really a matter of timing.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Okay.

MS. SILBERTHAU: So it might be a little bit later for things that are at this meeting.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Okay.

CHAIR POCIASK: And then staff can't answer questions if the item -- if the issue is in Sunshine? That's the -- that's my understanding, right?

MS. SILBERTHAU: That's my understanding.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay.

MS. SILBERTHAU: Right, Scott? Because I'm not --

MR. MARSHALL: Well, that's happening today. Yes, that's -- my -- do I have a microphone?

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. MARSHALL: That's my understanding of it because I had to look into this because of a presentation that you're going to be hearing today. And that it is best that questions not be asked when we're in a Sunshine period.

I'm told that in certain circumstances, the Chairman's Office could permit this and it would be on a permit and disclose basis.

But really, the Sunshine period is supposed to be a quiet period. So about these matters that the Commission will be voting on.

And that's why today, we're not going to be able to take questions on the call, robo call by default, authentication issue.

CHAIR POCIASK: And I guess one other thing, if this is correct, let me --- please correct me if I'm wrong. But I just, in the case of someone here may be writing an op-ed, and in your byline then you say, you know, I'm so and so with this group, and I'm also a member of the CAC, the warning is, once you've done that, then you have to go on to explain that you're not speaking on behalf of this group.

So at a certain point, you're going to be -- you're going to have a whole paragraph of bylines. So my advice is don't do it unless you're willing to put that whole disclaimer in.

MS. SILBERTHAU: Right. And that's what I was going to say. That was my, actually, my next little point here is --

CHAIR POCIASK: I'm sorry.

MS. SILBERTHAU: No, no, no, but that's perfect. That's good.

Which is that in the past, sometimes people have written op-ed or opinion pieces, which is great, you know, you should be able to say whatever you want.

But instead of signing it, you know, Joe Smith, head of the Consumer Advisory Council or something, they've said, you know, Chairman, you know, FCC Working Group on -- so it makes it look as though whatever story is the formal opinion of that group as opposed to the individual opinion.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Right.

MS. SILBERTHAU: So that's, you know, just a caution. You know, we're not trying to say you can't express your own views because, of course, you can. But just, if you say, I also serve as, you know, a member of the Advisory Council, to be sure to say but these are my individual views, you know, these are not --

Because, a lot of times, people are hot on an issue and it's before the Council has even -- before an Advisory Committee has even taken a position on something.

MEMBER KAMPIS: I was curious, if I wrote -- because I may write something about some of the things we discuss for Taxpayers Protection Alliance, but more of a reporter news not really op-ed opinion piece. How does that affect it or just kind of writing about what happens kind of journaling what's going on as opposed to writing an opinion piece.

MS. SILBERTHAU: I mean, you know, that's -- I don't think there's any problem with that, just updating people as to what's going on.

I mean, would you -- what might make sense to also say just to make sure it's characterized right is to also say, you know, for more information, and Scott has some ideas on this, too, but you know, for more information, you know, you can get the, you know, go to the FCC website, you can plunk in the website thing where there are, you know, other public documents or maybe the transcript or something like that.

MR. MARSHALL: And Johnny, I -- we had a kind of a similar situation previously. We had a member who wrote a daily report on telecommunications issues that went out to a wide audience almost like a Comm Daily or a TR Daily, but it was free.

And he was representing an organization on the CAC. And the way we worked that out was that, and it did seem to make sense, that, you know, discussions leading up to a recommendation were kept here either at the working group level or here at a public meeting of the CAC.

And that the reporting part didn't come until we actually -- until you actually passed a recommendation and it was adopted. And then it was a public document that could be reported upon, that kind of thing.

Does that answer your question?

MEMBER KAMPIS: Yes, thank you.

MR. MARSHALL: Okay.

MS. SILBERTHAU: And I would say, you know, in terms of reporting the working group deliberations, until they move to the CAC, like until you have a document, you know, here are my ten recommendations, you move it to the CAC and it gets posted, those we consider basically sort of private just because the meetings are closed.

Now, by the way, I would mention this to working groups, if for some reason you want to have an open forum, if you want to have working group meetings open, there's no law against that. It's just that people usually find that things work a little bit more smoothly to be able to do it privately as opposed to announcing it and then having it sort of set up formally.

It sort of limits your ability to change the meeting time. But also you have to have phone lines so people can call in. And I've heard that people have tried that, and then the people calling in start interrupting to make comments because they're trying to participate, which they shouldn't.

So, you know, that's -- so I would limit that kind of reporting to, you know, the full Committee meetings because these are open.

The only other thing I'd mention is that some people have asked whether we have like written procedures for how you should conduct your business.

And really, the GSA rules leave the procedures of the meetings up to each Agency and the general concept is, as long as they're fair.

So typically, you know, sometimes people in this Committee, I know that Scott looks to the Robert's Rules for guidance on voting and procedures. And we do not, even though the goal is to come up with unanimous recommendations, there -- sometimes that happens, and sometimes that doesn't.

So there can be, you know, people can dissent. You know, you can vote something out as a recommendation that just has a majority vote. And people can make dissenting statements at the meeting if they don't like a recommendation.

Hopefully, not ad hominems, but, you know, logical statements about why you think a different proposal would be better than the one that was adopted.

And we keep transcripts of this and anything that you say in dissent or in favor of things are -- will be memorialized.

I think that's about it.

MR. MARSHALL: Can I make a further comment just on that last point?

We really try to keep everything as open as we possibly can. And that is in line with our -- with the FACA rules for sure.

But if you ever have a question about it, please talk to me about it so I can talk to Paula about it. She's been my lawyer for almost 19 years now. So it's always good to consult with her on these issues as well.

So if there's a doubt about something, please let me know and I'll probably consult with Paula, too, so we can get you the right answer.

MS. SILBERTHAU: Anyone else have any questions about any of this stuff?

CHAIR POCIASK: Anyone online have questions?

MR. MARSHALL: On the phone?

MEMBER DAY: No, thank you.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay.

MS. SILBERTHAU: Thanks a lot.

CHAIR POCIASK: Thank you, Paula.

MR. MARSHALL: Thanks, Paula.

CHAIR POCIASK: All right, Giulia McHenry. Okay, so not too long ago, there was an Office of Economics and Analytics that was formed. And here to talk about that today is Giulia McHenry.

MS. MCHENRY: Hi.

CHAIR POCIASK: Thanks for coming.

MS. MCHENRY: Yes, thank you for having me. It's great to be here. In my previous life, I was actually on the Advisory Council, so it's kind of cool to be here.

So I've been on all sides. I've been the liaison. I've been everywhere.

So thanks for having me. I'm here to talk about the new Office of Economics and Analytics and just kind of run through a few of the details about the office, a little bit about its brief history, its objectives, but then also hopefully leave time for questions for anybody who wants more information.

So the -- I think now, a little over two years ago, the Chairman gave a speech where he talked about wanting to elevate economic analysis at the Commission.

And so this office is essentially the vision that essentially was created out of that.

And so really the goal is to elevate economic -- independent economic analysis at the Commission. And that means a few things.

Number one is, put economics as sort of an independent group which gives us a little bit more latitude to do an analysis of the sort of market forces, the incentives, all those economic issues which is a bit more independent of the policy making decisions that are going on within the bureaus.

So we work in close cooperation with the bureaus, but we have to do an independent analysis of it.

And that, you know, is important. It is -- we recognize that not to say that economics is sort of -- should be driving all policy decisions, but economics should certainly be informing those policy decisions. So this sort of makes that independence a little bit more to have that as sort of a third leg to the stool, if you will.

So, and I think also, you know, in creating an office where all of the economists are together really helps to actually improve the quality of the analysis because we're now in a situation where economists can talk to each other a little bit more, be a little more cross purposes, you know, kind of work across the various policy bureaus that we had been fairly focused on before.

And so I think it's really improving the analysis. And it's sort of given more opportunity for the economists to have a voice of their own.

And, you know, similarly career development.

So I think all those things are easier for economists if you bring them all together.

And then really, you know, I will say, the Chairman's Office has made a real effort to create an environment where economics is part of that policy decision. So it really is informing the policy decision in the Chairman's Office.

So in the report, in order that set up the office, it says something about OEA is required to review every Commission level proceeding. That's basically become every Commission level item down to OGC, everything has to pass through us right now.

And that's, I think, you know, been tricky, been a lot of work, a lot of stuff to review. But it means we put our eyes on everything. And that is really been a priority of the Chairman's Office, and we wouldn't be here today had the Chairman's Office -- had they not been so supportive of really making sure we are part of the process.

So that's a -- and it is, I mean, we have not been standing that long. So we -- so the history is essentially the Chairman gave the speech. There was a report and order in 2018 and then a task force set up to essentially figure out what needed to happen to stand up this office because it is a bit of a tall order.

So that task force had Wayne Leighton leading it up. Jay Schwartz -- I guess it was Wayne and Jay Schwartz leading it up.

It had economists. It had attorneys and it had a number of people from OMD to make sure that we had essentially the ground, the personnel ground floor to make this thing happen.

So in November, we cleared all the hurdles. We cleared past Congress. We had an MOU with the Union and we stood up mid-December.

So that was -- so we've been going strong for about I guess five, six months now. The first three weeks were a little crazy and then we went right into shutdown. So, you know, I think it was -- for about the first three months, I was operating on three-week stints it felt like.

So the first three weeks was all sort of personnel groundwork, making sure everybody was where they needed to be and knew where they were supposed to be.

And then sort of in the developing, you know, those three weeks were only Auctions was working. But it's been fun. And we were definitely, I mean, we were making big progress. I think we have more of the personnel in place and then -- and the economics is -- we are getting in more -- increasingly on the ground floor of the economics.

So starting the economic analysis as items are being or essentially being started, so getting in on the options memos, talking with the Chairman's Office, not just sort of the last minute review.

So with that, I guess I could give you an overview.

We are a group, it's 100, we are currently just over 100 in size, 63 economists, we are hiring -- we just hired -- we just brought on in and are hiring one more this summer off of the job market. So he's a young economist.

Obviously, we also have a lot of retirements.

And so we have 100 personnel, 60 economists. We have four divisions and this will kind of explain why there are -- what those other 40 do.

So our divisions are Economic Analysis Division. That's essentially -- those are most of the economists who came from throughout the building. So most of the economists were here when we brought them in.

So they came from throughout the building from mostly the policy making bureaus as well as OSP, the Office of Strategic Planning.

And so we've essentially -- that's just over 40. And we've stood that group essentially as to have sort of practice groups that mirror the policy making bureaus, so we keep the economic experts in certainly fields, at least working on those fields, but again, kind of going more cross-purposes.

And then we have -- we brought the Auctions Division in whole cloth, so that's 24 roughly. So we are now working in concert typically with the policy making bureaus, but running all Auctions. That's Margie's team, Margie Wiener has continued that great work and her whole team has kind of chugging along at lightning speed, as they seem to always be doing.

We also brought in the Industry Analysis Division, so that was formerly part of WCB. And that is where 477 is collected as well as a number of other data collections throughout the bureau for the individual bureaus.

So that group is now with us. That's a lot of the analytics.

And we are standing up -- we have a data division. That data division is currently one person. Her name is Anne Levine, and she is both Acting Division Chief and Deputy Division Chief.

So we -- that is one area we plan to grow and continue to grow. The goal of that group is to essentially create a data governance group that can help make data that's collected by the FCC and available to the FCC more useable for the bureaus and for the policy making.

So it is kind of where the IT side meets the policy making side to essentially figure out how to store, collect, you know, sort of all the pieces that create good data quality and good data analytics, it's that foundation. So that's what she's working on.

And she's great and has -- is -- works despite being sort of the one and only in her division, does a lot of work sort of with the other sort of interagency within the federal government because this data governance and the federal governance is a really a growing field and an important new focus. So that will be housed in OEA.

So that gives you a little bit of an overview. You know, I think in terms of accomplishments, I will say, you particularly with respect to EAD, which is where we're doing a lot of the new economic analysis or the economic analysis that maybe is now being done with more rigor.

You see, in the beginning we were all drinking from a fire hose, reviewing every item as it was being completed and thrown up to the Chairman's Office.

We are now increasingly getting in on the ground floor. So to do quality cost benefit analysis, you really need to have the time to assess options, prepare detailed, you know, cost benefit analysis, and we want to make sure we do that, not holding up the process, but in concert with the process.

So that means really getting in on the ground floor. So we've been doing a lot of that.

And increasingly we see the bureaus calling us in in the beginning, which is great.

Auctions is obviously -- to those who follow it, we've just announced -- the Chairman announced, December 10th, we will be auctioning -- we'll be starting up Auction 103 and that's millimeter -- it's our third millimeter wave auction.

We just closed Auction 102 which was our second. So now 101 and 101 are being released this -- the results are being released this week, which is exciting.

And then we have some other auctions, we have the -- we are working with Somos to do the TFAM 888 numbers. We have an AMR auction coming up soon. So a lot of exciting stuff there.

IAD continues to do good work on 477, and obviously we're focused on 477 reform now as well.

So those are kind of the highlights, and hopefully that didn't bore you all too much. But I'm here if you have more questions.

CHAIR POCIASK: Actually, I have a question. So you're evaluating many of these items and I heard you say cost benefit is sort of one of those tools that you can apply across many issues.

Has there been any discussion about doing something else with measuring consumer welfare in the sense of actually being able to say, hey, do these things benefit consumers and can we quantify that surplus?

MS. MCHENRY: So that's a good question. One of the nice things about being at the Commission is you have a little bit more of a consumer welfare, you know, sort of a little bit more flexibility in the standard.

So we do look at consumer welfare as part of that. And I think that is an important piece of cost benefit analysis. So yes.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay.

MS. MCHENRY: And I guess I should mention, so we are required to do a form of IRA, both by the report and order and OIRA. We are required to do a formal cost benefit analysis for any rulemaking that has more than $100 million of impact annually. It turns out to not be much.

So we follow IRA rules and work closely with OIRA on those items.

A couple have come close enough that we've looked at whether we're crossing that threshold. We have not had anything cross that threshold, which is actually, I think, in five years, we've only had -- the Commission's only had three items cross that threshold. So, you know, it is a tough threshold.

For anything less than that, we essentially -- we assess the item and look at the cost benefit of a cost benefit analysis, and essentially look at to what extent we think detailed economic analysis needs to happen.

Obviously, reviewing everything, some things just get a pass. Some things don't have any economic analysis, and then there are some things we move deep in.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. Let's open it up. Do we have any questions here?

Yes?

MEMBER KOCH: Thank you.

As we go about our work, can this Committee, as a body or any of us individually, make data requests to OEA? And if so, how and are there any limitations?

MS. MCHENRY: That's a good question. I don't know the answer to that. I mean, you're welcome to -- I guess we should -- with respect to FACAs, there's all sorts of legal stuff, so I don't know what the official answer is. But, you know, we're happy to help out with that, provide whatever data we can.

MEMBER KOCH: Yes, I think maybe Scott can get back with us on that.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, I think that's a thought.

MEMBER KOCH: But I'd be very interested in utilizing your resources as we go about our work.

MS. MCHENRY: Yes, absolutely, that would be --

CHAIR POCIASK: Yes, I think that would be useful.

Anyone else here or on the phone?

Matthew?

MEMBER GERST: Matt Gerst with CTI.

I was going to ask the flip side of that question, which is we're technically not permitted to create survey data, right, and create data on our own without going through PRA, Paperwork Reduction Act, approval.

What type of data, if this group was to look at anything, would be most helpful to your office?

MS. MCHENRY: That's a really good question. You know, so actually I think what ends up being most helpful for us is the type of data that can essentially help us assess consumer welfare impacts on an item by item basis.

I don't know, and this is where, you know, to the extent you all are involved in ex partes, you know, getting the -- getting whatever data is out there by the interested parties to have -- help them file essentially whatever they can help us essentially assess what the consumer impacts would be, that would be helpful.

It's not -- I don't have anything else off the top of my head that would be particularly useful for this group to collect.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. Anything else?

(No audible response.)

CHAIR POCIASK: Giulia, thank you so much. I appreciate it.

MS. MCHENRY: Absolutely, thanks for having me.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay, so next we have two items that, you know, the Chairman is interested in having us look at. And so the -- and I believe these will be formed into working groups.

And so the first one has to do with educating consumers regarding the meaning of call authentication.

And here to give us some background don this first item -- working group item is Lisa Hone.

MS. HONE: Good morning, everybody. I see some old friends and some new faces. As some of you know, I started my career in government at the Federal Trade Commission doing consumer protection work, so this Advisory Committee is near and dear to my heart, and I appreciate your service on this Committee.

And personally I also appreciate probably even a little more, the ex partes, comments, and reply comments you file in wire line proceedings.

Please know that the consumer advocate voice is incredibly important to us, and we appreciate the time, energy, money you spend on participating in our proceedings.

Those of you who know me also know that I'm just a face of these matters. Really, there's a hardworking staff that does all the work.

Matt Collins sitting behind me has the lead on call authentication issues for the wire line bureau and is also the guy on the call authentication summit we're doing in July.

So if you all are unaware of that, there is a call authentication summit in July. I hope you will participate and attend.

And you should reach out to Matt about your interest.

So I know this Committee has done work around call authentication before. And anyway I'm not the right person to do the technological background on call authentication.

But the basic idea, as I think most of you know, of call authentication is carrier assigning calls to say, yes, this is my customer. I have confidence that these calls are coming from my customer.

And then other carriers being able to authenticate that through a public/private key system.

We think it's a game changer, and the super tech people have been working hard on those standards.

SHAKEN/STIR is a great acronym. The language behind that acronym is difficult and hard to say out loud, so I'm not even going to bother to tell you what it stands for. You can -- we have a wonderful combating spoof to caller ID with call authentication page, where we try and keep all of our relevant documents, and it explains what SHAKEN/STIR stands for at a very high level. I encourage you to use that page as a resource.

But that act of -- or it's a bunch of acts, right, of valid -- of signing a call and then other carriers validating that call, making sure that, in fact, it's signed.

That's important behind the scenes work. There is also -- there are also issues as to -- and there are issues about, once that happens, what will carriers do with that information, right?

How will they use the analytics they get from that information to change the way they handle calls and the way they present those calls to consumers?

And I think that's where you all are going to come in. Currently, call authentication is in the testing phase among the major carriers.

As you probably know, the Chairman has demanded that the major carriers implement call authentication by the end of this year. But I think less attention has been given -- some, but less attention has been given to what that means from a consumer facing perspective.

And I think that's a place where you all can get involved in particular. What does that look like for consumers?

So I assume, and they're going -- they're going to go after me, but I assume you all have read the CGB robo calls draft that circulated or most of you have, because it's right up your alley.

So there's a question of carrier blocking of calls and the -- based on analytics and how does STIR/SHAKEN play into it?

So blocking is important, but there's also the question, the presentation to consumers. And as we've talked to carriers about what implementation looks like down the line, we do think that what consumers see, at least those who have caller identification devices, is important.

And we all, I think, probably have experience with, depending on who your carrier is, if you have a wireless carrier saying possible fraud or possible scam or different carriers present it slightly differently.

But I think most -- I think most consumers find that a useful hat tip, if you will. And so one of the things the Commission is going to think about, one of the things I know carriers are thinking about, and I -- one of the things I know consumer groups are thinking about because I've heard it in testimony on The Hill and other places is, how does that present to consumers?

So that is one of the topics we hope to discuss at the summit. And I would like to encourage you all to participate in that, in particular.

One other thing that I want to mention, I don't know how many of you read Communications Daily this morning, but the lead article was a notice -- was an article that said that the Chairman has agreed to include an NPRM on adoption -- on implementation of -- on requiring SHAKEN/STIR if the major carriers fail to meet the deadline he's set by the end of the year for implementation.

And so that's something that my team has been working very hard on over the weekend. And I think you will see an NPRM on that in the robo calls item, I think. You know, I can't speak for the Commission or any of the Commissioners, they will have to vote it out.

But assuming that that is part of that item, again, I would encourage you to engage with us in that rulemaking.

So does anybody have any questions?

CHAIR POCIASK: Can I get clarification on something?

MS. HONE: Yes?

CHAIR POCIASK: So I just kind of want to understand how -- excuse me -- I think we all probably make sure we're closer to the mic.

MS. HONE: Okay.

CHAIR POCIASK: The one thing is, so does this function that if I'm making a call that there is a way to check that that call is going to the actual originating wire center?

I mean, how does somebody verify, how do you verify that whether or not someone's a customer unless there's some way you check on a database that, you know, that there are N and Xs actually originating before the call is passed through into the network to the other end, to the terminating side?

MS. HONE: You're asking how your carrier does that?

CHAIR POCIASK: No, but how would they notify the other carrier that this is a legitimate call and that this is their customer.

MS. HONE: Well, right. So the SHAKEN/STIR framework, so it only applies to IP because more information can be passed in IP.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay.

MS. HONE: And that's exactly what this is. This is a framework that allows for that verification and the key system, the public/private key ensures that nobody can --

CHAIR POCIASK: So it's only IP?

MS. HONE: Only IP.

CHAIR POCIASK: And that's because the old -- the POTS regime, the header record is only like six kilobits?

MS. HONE: Well, it's because, right, there's less flexibility --

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay.

MS. HONE: -- in terms of what can be put in --

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay.

MS. HONE: -- to legacy calls.

CHAIR POCIASK: Thank you, thank you.

Do we have other questions?

MEMBER MORRIS: Steve Morris from NCTA.

So let's assume all the major carriers do this by the end of the year.

MS. HONE: Mm-hmm.

MEMBER MORRIS: And are authenticating among each other. What about all the other carriers who will now be -- their calls will be not able to be authenticated.

Are you concerned that it's going to look like calls from all those carriers are fraudulent calls?

MS. HONE: Well, I guess I would throw that back to you, quite frankly. Right? The question is then, how will carriers handle calls that can't be authenticated, and will it depend on why those calls can't be authenticated?

But that's fundamentally a question for the folks doing the implementation.

MEMBER MORRIS: And I don't know if we know yet, but it's probably something that, as a group, we should all be thinking about because you're going to have --

The ideal would be every carrier is participating. But you'll have some probably lengthy period where some carriers are not participating and their customers -- their calls aren't going to get authenticated, and consumers --

MS. HONE: That's right.

MEMBER MORRIS: -- will need to understand that call -- just because a call is not authenticated doesn't mean it's necessarily fraudulent, it just means that their -- that customer's carrier is not yet participating.

MS. HONE: Well, so that makes a bunch of assumptions, Steve, right? So that assumes that what the carrier presents to the receiving -- to the called party is authenticated, not authenticated.

So this goes to this question of what's the information that's presented to the consumer? Although, even before we get there, there's a question of, how do the carriers use -- what analytics do they get? How do they use them?

So I always use Fort Mill Telephone Company as an example. I don't even know if they still exist, but they were my mother-in-law's telephone company in little Fort Mill, South Carolina.

Pretty confident, excuse me if I'm wrong, Fort Mill, but they are a full legacy carrier with no IP capacity.

So right, so if they have no IP capacity, their calls aren't -- can't be part of SHAKEN/STIR. So then the question is, okay, well, how do the carrier then pick up those calls, handle calls from carriers that they know can't participate in SHAKEN/STIR?

So I think that's a conversation that industry needs to have with each other. And I think that this is a place where folks focused on the consumer side of things can think about, what's the most useful way to present that information to the consumer? Right?

So I don't think there's an obvious and easy answer. And I think implicit in your question, Steve, is the fact that this will necessarily be iterative, and we know that, which makes it both much more interesting, right, and much more important that we recognize the iterative nature of the process and make room for it, and everybody keeps working on it.

CHAIR POCIASK: Is wireless included in this?

MS. HONE: Yes.

CHAIR POCIASK: And so okay, all right. Well, that's fairly good though, because then you'll be picking up the originating calls from there?

MS. HONE: Right, and they have it easy. I mean, their calls are in IP.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay.

MS. HONE: Relatively speaking, they have it easy. There is somebody down there that would like to just -- blanket statement.

CHAIR POCIASK: In general.

Make sure you put your card up.

MEMBER LONG: This is Vonda, AT&T.

MS. HONE: Yes.

MEMBER LONG: So in answer to Steve, the way SHAKEN/STIR is being set up is, there are different levels of certification or authentication of a call.

So it might be calls -- when someone makes a call, it can go through several networks, it could be a network path and it goes from one telecom company, one service provider to another.

So if your call, you identify as a carrier, this is my customer, I know this is my customer, and I'm authenticating that to the next carrier.

Now, if you're originating and terminating the call, you can say, this is my customer, I'm putting it through, I'm authenticating it as my customer. And as it goes down the line, this authentication or certification may change to, I'm not sure, you know, this is my customer. I'm not sure, it was passed from someone else.

There's different levels of certification. So it's not a matter of, okay, if you're not a part of SHAKEN/STIR, we're just going to block your call. That, you know, that wouldn't be fair to consumers.

Even if a call is certified, this is my customer, yes. I'm passing it through all the way. We don't know if the other person is trying to scam you, like we don't know the intent of their call.

So that's something to consider as well. We're, you know, carriers are going to authenticate, this is my customer. Okay, I'm pretty sure this is my customer, or I'm definitely sure it's my customer, I'm passing it through.

Now, when you -- if you answer the call, we can't -- we don't know the content. We don't know the person's intention. We don't know if they're going to say, you know, oh, you know, whatever.

This is your grandmother calling, you know, whatever the case that the scams that go on are. So I just wanted to say that.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. Any other questions? Anyone on the phone?

MEMBER DAY: No, thank you.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. So I mean it sounds to me -- I mean there's various things that we can take within this issue. But one of the ones that seem to be pretty obvious is, how do we notify consumers the condition of the call coming across?

MS. HONE: That's right.

CHAIR POCIASK: And is that the primary interest here, Scott?

MEMBER ROOKER: What did you say, Steve? I couldn't hear you, sorry.

CHAIR POCIASK: So the issue then is, when the customer is looking at say their caller ID, you know, how is that we inform them that something is, you know, has been checked or has not been checked? How do we put it to where they understand?

Because if it's not checked, they may get the notion right off the bat that it's a fraud and it may not be a fraud. And I guess there needs to be some assurance that emergency calls come through, right?

MS. HONE: Absolutely.

CHAIR POCIASK: And things such as this?

MS. HONE: Right.

CHAIR POCIASK: So --

MEMBER ROOKER: It's a complex issue, here, isn't it?

CHAIR POCIASK: Yes. So it's one of those things that we may need to get someone else on the -- one of the working groups when they get started to have another expert or two come on so we can make sure we understand the nuances of all of this.

Does anyone else have any other questions? This will be one of our primary issues, I think just starting out.

MS. HONE: And our Chief Technologist is absolutely an expert on it. And to the point, there are different levels of authentication, and until we see this actually working in the real world, major carriers are starting to roll it out between and amongst each other.

But until we see it, how it really works, you know, I think, well, even when we do, I think we will all keep learning things. So to the extent that some of you can develop or already have developed expertise in this, I think it's an incredibly important part of the conversation we need to be having.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay.

MS. HONE: Thank you, everybody.

CHAIR POCIASK: If that's it, well, thank you very much.

All right.

MS. HONE: Thank you.

CHAIR POCIASK: Thank you.

So let's move on, we have a second issue here. And this goes right to the heart of the robo call blocking. We have Karen.

MS. SCHROEDER: Hi, I'm Karen Schroeder, I'm with the Consumer Policy Division within the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau here at the FCC.

I need to start out by saying my comments are my own and not binding on the FCC. However, I am here representing the FCC.

I'm about to tell you about an item that's going to be voted on in this Thursday's Commission meeting. As such, we are in the Sunshine period for that item, which means that I can't take questions and I can't take comments on the item. We're supposed to have silence on it until the meeting on Thursday.

I can, however, describe the item to you and give you some background on what led up to it, and that's about all I can do today.

So let's start with the background. As you know, stopping illegal robo calls to consumers is the Commission's top consumer protection priority. Each year, we receive and analyze hundreds of thousands of complaints about unwanted calls, including illegal calls. And this is a problem that many concerned groups are working on, government, industry, consumers, states, Congress. I think everyone's been very vocal on this matter and have been making some good progress.

The Commission has been active on multiple fronts to protect consumers from unlawful robo calls, and I'm going to go through a couple of the things that have been done to date before getting into this item that will be considered on Thursday.

So from the enforcement perspective, from 2010 to 2018, we've taken enforcement actions involving proposed or imposed monetary forfeitures totaling nearly $246 million, including the Abramovich case which I'm sure many of you have heard of, and if you haven't that's worth Googling.

We have had many educational outreach initiatives. Have you heard of the one ring scam? Has everyone heard of that?

If you haven't, please be aware of it and tell your friends and family. We issued an advisory in early May about this warning consumers to not call back if you start getting a call where your phone rings once and then the caller hangs up. You're going to be hit with some pretty heavy charges if you call that number back. So beware of the one ring scam.

We also have outreach, we have a website devoted to robo call and spoofing issues, which describe our actions and provide consumer tips on how to deal with these robo calls.

Our staff frequently participate in webinars, tele-town halls, and panel discussions to provide the public with information about robo calls.

We target the most vulnerable populations. We work with AARP and go to senior centers and local libraries to try to really get the word out.

And all of our web and printed educational materials are made available in multiple languages.

We also work with industry in many ways, as many of you know. We have supported and strongly encourage the development of the caller ID authentication standard, SHAKEN/STIR that you just heard about.

I won't go into that, except to make sure that you were told that they were going to have a summit on that in July on SHAKEN/STIR here at the FCC.

Industry has also been instrumental in trace back, which allows enforcement to more easily follow a call back through the network to its source. We appreciate industry's cooperation with that.

And industry has also been instrumental in developing call blocking technology, which has been in many ways very successful.

So what have we done here at the FCC? Well, in March of 2018 -- well, actually, sorry, let me get back --

The Courts have been active in this, too. And the D.C. Circuit in March of 2018 issued a decision in the ACA international case returning several key TCPA issues to the Commission, including the definition of auto dialer, reassigned number calls, revocation of consent, and calls by federal government entities. Those issues remain pending before the Commission.

So here is what the Commission has done. In December of 2018, we authorized creation of a reassigned numbers database which should help reduce unwanted but otherwise legitimate calls to consumers.

I think you know the issue there that someone gives up their phone number. A new person gets that phone number. But the prior party had signed up for all kinds of alerts, and now this person who did not consent is receiving them.

This would give the calling parties a repository that they could check and see if that number has been reassigned before they make the call, giving them a fighting chance at getting and knowing that information.

We're working diligently to establish the database.

In November of 2017, the FCC authorized voice service providers to block certain calls on the network. First calls where the subscriber to the phone number requested that the call spoofing that number be blocked. That only works with numbers that don't make outgoing calls like the IRS 800 number that only receives calls. No call should be from that number since they don't make calls. So voice service providers can just block anything that claims to be from that number. That's called do not originate.

We also authorized blocking of spoofed phone numbers that could not be legitimate because it's either an invalid number, an unallocated number, or an unused or unassigned number.

So, this new item follows from that. While that 2017 call blocking report and order took important steps toward ending the scourge of robo calls, it did not address instances where fraudsters or other illegal callers spoof legitimate in-service numbers or where they don't spoof the caller ID at all.

And so, this Thursday, the Commission will consider a declaratory ruling and third further notice of proposed rulemaking that empowers providers to block these types of calls as the default before they even reach consumers phones.

With this step, the Commission continues its multi-pronged strategy to curb illegal robo calls.

So, what I'm about to describe is the item as it has been circulated. It may change before it's actually voted.

So, the item is in two parts. And, let me start with the declaratory ruling part.

A declaratory ruling clarifies existing law, including FCC rules. It does not make new rules. And, it's effective upon release.

So, here, we clarify the voice service providers may, as the default, block calls based on call analytics that target unwanted calls as long as their customers are informed and have the opportunity to opt out of the blocking if they so wish.

We clarify that voice service providers may also offer customers the option to block calls from any number that does not appear on a customer's white list, which could be the contact list on their cell phone.

So, let me talk a little bit about what the blocking options are before this goes into effect.

So, voice service providers are -- many of them are offering call blocking programs now. But it's usually opt in. The consumer needs to affirmatively ask for it.

And, have you heard the term consumer inertia? Definitely going to use that when I've been putting off doing something in the future.

It means that consumers who might otherwise want to have these calls blocked, may be slow to opt in to something where they have to take an affirming action.

And, convincing consumers to sign up for something can be costly, especially for smaller providers.

So, what this declaratory ruling does, it allows voice service providers to, in effect, sign everybody up for these existing options. It allows them to offer opt out call blocking, but they have to give consumers the information so that they are making an informed choice.

They need to give consumers enough information to make an informed choice about whether they want to stay in the program or opt out.

Second, the draft clarifies that voice service providers may offer this opt out call blocking program based on reasonable analytics designed to identify unwanted calls.

So, they could block calls based on a combination of factors such as a large burst of calls in a short time frame, low average call duration, low call completion rates, invalid numbers placing a large volume of calls, common caller ID name values across voice service providers, a large volume of complaints about a specific calling line, sequential dialing patterns, neighbor spoofing patterns, there are many different analytics that could be used that would reasonably identify these unwanted calls.

The draft also reaffirms the Commission's commitment to safeguarding calls from emergency numbers. Voice service providers should not block calls from public safety entities, including PSAPs, emergency operation centers or law enforcement agencies.

The draft also reaffirms the Commission's commitment to safeguarding calls to rural areas that should not get in the way of rural call completion.

The draft suggests that the benefit to consumers of these opt out blocking services which could potentially block billions of illegal or unwanted calls will exceed any costs involved.

They may yield an over reduction in costs incurred by voice service provides since there will be fewer illegal and unwanted calls consuming the network capacity and fewer complaints to respond to.

The second piece of the declaratory ruling is the white list blocking piece. White list blocking stops unwanted calls before the calls reach the consumer's phone based on the consumer's contact list or white list.

It provides an added level of protection from unwanted calls and the frustrations that go along with this.

It requires the consumer to specify the telephone numbers from which they wish to receive calls and it must be made very, very clear to them that they will not receive calls that are not from that number.

We could see this being of value for perhaps an elderly relative who has been bilked by scammers in the past where they want to have a phone where friends, neighbors, family, and trusted doctors and pharmacists can reach them but really want to have a lock down on the number of calls that come in.

Consumers need to understand that they are disclosing their phone number to their voice service provider if they opt in to this and they need to understand that any wanted calls that aren't on that list are not coming through. It's a very severe form of blocking.

So, that's the declaratory ruling. That's clarifying there are existing rules allow for these kinds of things and encouraging providers to offer them.

The second piece of this is a third further notice of proposed rulemaking.

So, this is the rulemaking portion of the item and these are proposed rules and associated requests for information. They are not rules that the Commission is voting on at this time, it's not an order and they would not take effect after. The Commission would need to take further action for these to become rules.

Here, we propose to create a safe harbor for voice service providers that block calls for which caller ID authentication fails. And, we seek comment on extending the safe harbor to blocking of calls that are unsigned.

We propose to require voice service providers that block calls to ensure that emergency calls reach consumers. And, we seek comment on protections and remedies for callers whose calls are erroneously blocked.

So, let's start with the safe harbor. The draft further notice of proposed Rulemaking proposes a safe harbor for voice service providers that offer call blocking programs that take into account whether a call has been properly authenticated under SHAKEN/STIR and may potentially be spoofed.

The draft suggests that authentication, among its many benefits, will provide a strong basis for call blocking. This ties back into your SHAKEN/STIR overview before I was here.

So, first the draft proposed a safe harbor for voice service providers that choose to block calls or a subset of calls that fail the caller ID authentication under the SHAKEN/STIR framework.

And second, the draft seeks comment on whether the Commission should create a safe harbor for blocking unsigned calls from particular categories of voice service providers such as perhaps large service providers that are expected to have implemented SHAKEN/STIR or providers that do not participate in trace back or providers that are known to facilitate large volumes of illegal calls.

And, again, we're just seeking comment at this point.

The next piece of the further notice of proposed rulemaking would give protection -- is asks -- seeks comment on protection for critical calls.

So, certain emergency calls should just never be blocked. And, accordingly, the draft further notice considers requiring any voice service provider that offers call blocking to maintain something called a critical calls list. And, that's a list of numbers that should just never be blocked.

It could include outbound numbers of 911 call centers, government emergency outbound numbers, numbers that we believe all consumers would want to make sure that those numbers are not blocked.

The prohibition on call blocking would only apply -- we are asking if the prohibition on call blocking should apply to authenticated calls only.

So, the draft item seeks comment on, first, whether such a list would be beneficial? What numbers should be included? How it should be administered and protected from abuse? And, whether critical call list protection should be limited only to those calls for which the caller ID is authenticated?

The Commission has emphasized repeatedly that voice service providers should not block emergency calls. And, the Commission's rules prohibit voice service providers from blocking emergency calls to 911.

The draft seeks comment on the extent to which these emergency numbers have received calls with a spoofed caller ID reporting false emergencies, if that is a problem we should take into consideration.

The draft item also seeks comment on protections and remedies for legitimate callers whose calls are blocked.

So, we know that the CAC has a great interest in helping us with our work on robo calls and has been very helpful in the past. So, we look forward to working with you as we move forward with this item.

The public version of the FNPRM calls for comments 30 days after publication in the Federal Register and reply comments 60 days from publication in the Federal Register.

We believe the clarification and the draft declaratory ruling and the proposals on the further notice will help us take an additional step forward in protecting consumers from unwanted and unlawful robo calls.

Thank you. I'm sorry I can't take your questions.

CHAIR POCIASK: Thanks, Karen.

All right, okay, so, that is our second item.

So, one more issue we want to talk about today is consumer education on TV broadcaster relocation.

For that, Jean Kiddoo.

(OFF MICROPHONE COMMENTS)

MS. KIDDOO: So, I know it's been a long morning, you've had lots of speakers and I know I'm sort of standing between you guys and lunch, so I'll try to make this short and also a little bit snappy. We have visual aids, so that's a good thing, something to look at and actually touch and feel.

I was here almost exactly a year ago talking about the incentive auction and what we were planning. Interestingly, at that session, Bohdan Zachary was a presenter talking about the experience that his TV station had had with the transition that it made to a new frequency and the consumer impact of that and the kinds of things his station did.

We learned a lot from that and we have incorporated a lot of that into our efforts on consumer outreach which I want to talk to you today.

At the time last year, the RAY BAUM'S Act had only recently been enacted, so we were scrambling to make use of the funding that it made available to us and to plan lots of different consumer activities that we hadn't had the resources to do.

We had already been doing a lot. We had done lots of stuff on our website. We had community partner efforts that our Consumer and Governmental Affairs folks were doing.

But we are now doing lots more so I'm real pleased to be here to tell you about that.

But, first, a little reminder on what the auction was all about and why we're doing all of this.

The incentive auction, for those of you who may not remember or know, was held to repurpose TV broadcast spectrum for wireless uses. And, we made 84 megahertz, a very valuable 600 megahertz spectrum available to wireless carriers in our auction.

To do that and to clear that spectrum for those uses, we are needing to reorganize TV station frequencies into a smaller, more efficient, compacted TV band for them. And, we call that repacking, because we're packing them in more tightly into a smaller TV band.

We're doing that. The auction closed, believe it or not, two years ago. And, we have started a ten-phase process that is a very choreographed process where stations are moving to new channels in very specific time frames. We have assigned each channel to a specific one of ten phases. And, that process is underway.

Currently, we're in phase three. That phase ends on June 21 and we'll move on to phase four.

And, to date, over 261 TV stations have already transitioned to their new reassigned channel. That doesn't include all of the channel sharing stations who were auction winners. I think, Bohdan, your station was an auction winner, and move frequencies to share with another station and there are at least a hundred if not more channel sharers as well as these 261 repacked stations.

So, a lot of consumers have already seen in their markets, TV stations who have moved frequencies and, if they watch over the air television with an antenna, either on their rooftop or indoor antenna, they've had to rescan their TVs to be able to find their channels on their new frequencies.

And, the -- so the impact on consumers is, as I said, if a consumer watches over the air free TV with an antenna, they will need to rescan their TV to reach that -- their local stations who are transitioning.

Stations who are -- consumers who are cable subscribers or satellite provider subscribers are not affected. Those providers are taking care of the changes in their networks. So, while they will see announcements from their TV stations on screen, because TV station goes to all viewers, not just the over the air ones, they won't have to do anything to take action.

Stations notify their viewers at least 30 days in advance of their rescan day. The particular day during our transition, we give them a window during which they need to make the change and vacate their -- they can test and vacate their pre-auction channel.

But the station itself decides what the day is in particular that they will rescan -- or the rescans have to take place. And, they are doing a good job. The stations are reports from consumers and from stations and others is that stations are really going above and beyond our minimum rules.

We require 30 days, many stations are doing more than that. They're doing a lot more than the minimum number of notices as well.

It's important to the stations that their viewers find them and be able to see them once the transition is made.

Rescanning, what is it? It's not a complicated process. It's the same process that viewers had to do when they set up their TV to get over the air channels in the first place.

You basically take your remote control. You go to the menu button, you do a channel search or an auto-scan. The only complicated thing here is that each manufacturer uses a different word to describe it. So, it's very hard for us to give specific instructions.

But you go to your auto-scan or auto-tune or channel search button, you push that, and the TV will scroll through the airwaves and find all of the channels that it can pull in.

Importantly, from a consumer perspective, the channel that the viewer sees in not changing. The channel will stay the same.

What's happening is the background. The TV just needs to know that when you tune to channel four, the TV has to go to a different place in the airwaves to find that channel. But the viewer will see it as channel four or whatever channel they're used to seeing. So, we've done that.

So, what have we done since I saw you guys last?

As I said, RAY BAUM'S Act which we like to call in the incentive auction context, the Reimbursement Expansion Act, provided consumer education funding.

It enabled us to augment our ongoing efforts to provide more resources and to leverage our relationships with community based organizations.

And, we were able to hire a public relations firm to make sure our messaging reached as many consumers as possible with messages that those consumers would understand and be able to take action based upon -- the firm, if you're interested, is Porter Novelli, and they've been very, very helpful to us in terms, as you'll see in minute, Chaz is going to show you some of the things that we've been disseminating.

And, I think we're really reaching quite a few.

So, our goal is really to augment what broadcasters are already doing. We did some research with consumers. It was pretty clear that consumers were hearing, they were aware that there were changes coming.

The stations were doing a good job making them aware.

So, what we've kind of focused on is ways to (a) make sure that that is the case and we are doing things after a station testing period is over so that in case a consumer missed the station announcements and forgot, if they noticed a channel is missing, we're there to try to tell them what they need to do to find that channel again.

But we're also wanted to make sure that there is help available to consumers who might need more help in finding how to rescan or knowing what to do.

So, we basically are focusing on both awareness and then on online and live resources for consumers to make sure that they have the tools they need to find their channels.

What kinds of things do we have? We have our website and we've been able to augment that. The website which I would recommend to you to take a look at is www.fcc.gov/tvrescan.

And, that landing page includes links to tutorials on how to rescan, a little bit -- some information on TV antennas, an interactive map where you can put your local address or ZIP Code in, see all the stations that an antenna should be able to pull up for you in that location.

And, what the timing is, if (a) it'll tell you if the station is a rescan, repack station, and (b) what the time frame is you should be looking for announcements to know what the rescan day will be.

It also has other information, you know, frequently asked questions and various other kinds of things in not only English and Spanish, but also Chinese, Vietnamese, Korean and Tagalog.

We also have set up through a third-party contractor a dedicated consumer call center with live representatives who can help in English and Spanish. It's open from 8:00 a.m. until 1:00 a.m. Eastern Time which means that consumers on all coasts throughout the country can reach a live person during TV viewing hours.

So, we didn't want it to just sort of 9:00 to 5:00 Eastern Time, weekdays. It's seven days a week, long hours so that basically a consumer, if you're watching a prime time TV show, you can -- and you're having -- and you can't find it and it's gone, that channel seems to be gone, you have somebody you can call and find it.

We're also doing a significant consumer education campaign through online and other media channels. We're doing paid media. We've got banner ads, online search, social media, newspaper, radio ads, digital radio, and podcasts, just to name a few.

Lots of different channels. We're finding they are very, very successful, I'll give you some stats in a minute. But we are getting lots and lots of hits on our website through these different channels and consumers are really obviously being able to find us and find the information.

Interestingly enough, I think that they're getting a lot of information from our website and we haven't seen as much activity at the call center as I thought we would. I think the online help is working.

And, you know, we don't see a whole lot of pick up at the end of each phase. We do see a spike in our call center as people have channels that have disappeared. We do see spikes in each phase. But really, our online hits are significant.

So, the stats, basically, we've done in our first two phases, 54 radio interviews nationwide. We're trying to geotarget these activities to the geographic areas where the phases are taking place.

So, in Washington, we haven't seen any yet because we haven't had any stations who have transitioned. So, if you want -- if you see all these things and you go, wait a minute, we haven't seen anything.

Well, that's because we haven't wasted our money on educating consumers too soon in Washington. We don't want them to worry about having to rescan and then rescan and not really think that they need to do anything later. They do.

When a station moves, they will need to take action. They need to pay attention.

And, we will have some in phase four. So, starting June 21st through August 2nd, we'll have phase fours testing period and there are a number of Washington, D.C. stations. So, hopefully, those of you who are local will start seeing those.

But our 54 radio interviews in the markets for phase one and phase two, we're at 732 radio outlets. We targeted a lot of rural and hard to reach areas in particular. And, the estimated audience was nearly at 1.5 million listeners.

We also saw that those radio stations, a lot of them, put information up on their own websites. We provided some information for them and they put it up. So, we're reaching through sort of secondary online resources, you know, on those station websites.

Our website visits on fcc.gov/tvrescan, we've had 470,000 in the first two phases in English and 80,000 in Spanish. That's a lot, a lot more than we were getting last fall.

And then, I was not familiar with this, online advertising term, but we've had over 74 million impressions, meaning that, 74 million viewers online had an opportunity to see our information in their Facebook feed, in a banner ad, something, it managed to hit 74 million people.

And, that was just in the geographic markets again, which are phase one and phase two. So, we really managing to really to try to leverage ourselves into as many eyeballs as we possibly can so people will be aware of what to do and know what to do if they need some help.

So, having said all of that, I'm happy to have some questions, but Chaz will show you a couple of show and tell things about the types of advertising that we're doing.

MR. EBERLE: Thank you.

And, so, yes, I'll walk you through, we just put together some examples of the work that Porter Novelli with our input has put together.

I'll also note that we brought up here, we've developed some hard copy materials as part of our consumer education tool kit that's a tool that's primarily being used by CGB and their staff as they head out on road trips and other consumer education events across the country.

They -- the full package that includes a few more documents comes together in a folder that they distribute to kind of what we loosely term community leaders and others in positions of influence to advise the target audiences.

And then, we also have individual documents that are leave-behinds for places like libraries, community centers, where people might come looking for information on the broadcast transition.

So, up on the screen, you'll see examples, I'll walk through several things here of the various materials that Porter has put together.

First off, the banner ads which, of interest to us, have driven by far the most traffic to our website. All of the different tools we developed, we sort of rolled out in phases just kind of by nature the way it was developed.

The first thing we went up with was paid search so that when you just, you know, entered in Google or Bing rescan my TV, FCC rescan, things like that, our search result was elevated to the top.

Then social media, Facebook, Instagram came after that.

And then, banner ads. And, we could see in our weekly output that people clicking through on the banner ads which would just appear on a regular website you visit if you're in one of the geographically targeted areas, drove by a comfortable margin the most traffic, which was interesting.

And, you see, we -- everything has been in both English and Spanish. We work shopped several creative concepts with our PR firm. But you see the first, missing something? Using a TV antenna and then the missing something in Spanish as well.

And, these are, if you can imagine the banner on the sides of your screen, these would appear in three, you know, three screens, kind of a real live play or the ad would autoplay.

And, we found consumers are noticing these, clicking on them, and then, you know, as many of you may know from your own work, all the statistics we get about how long they spend on the website, bounce rate, things like that.

They do appear to be effectively directing consumers and answering their questions about the broadcast transition.

The next batch, similarly, you'll -- as Jean mentioned, phase four is the first phase that will impact the D.C. region. So, you could very well begin to see these in your Facebook feeds and Instagram feeds in the coming months after June 21st when we get into phase four.

Similarly, here, you can see what a Facebook ad looks like, disappearing channels, question mark. And then, a brief explanation and clicking through on any of these, I should say, by the way, takes the -- takes you to the fcc.gov/tvrescan which is our central landing page which has basics about the broadcast transition, FAQs, the video which we'll show you at the end of this presentation, and numerous links to other resources, but it's our one central landing page where all of these will take you. So, those are Facebook and Instagram ads.

Also, our friends in OMR have been working with us and promoting us steadily on -- through the Commission's Twitter feed.

I'm not recalling off the top of my head, but far more tweets than I realized, dozens, dozens have gone out. Always something along this line, remember to rescan. Have you noticed channels missing? Sort of incorporating our message.

And, each time they report we do get a decent number of click-throughs from the Commission's Twitter account and it's also being promoted for those who follow the Commission on Facebook and the like. It's truly blanketing all our online and social outlets.

Another feature of the work that Porter Novelli did for us, and this was of particular use for our -- from the get-go, we talked about harder to target populations, those populations that were really our focus for the messaging about the broadcast transition.

And, there was an emphasis on senior citizens, rural, low income, and non-English speaking communities.

These feature articles we're looking at here have been a particular focus in rural and non-English speaking or English second language communities.

These are effectively sort of pre-written features called a map release that Porter Novelli goes out and pitches to media outlets with a particular focus in these on small town, rural outlets, you know, the relative bang for your buck and everything you get by placing like something like this in the Los Angeles Times or The Washington Post, minimal compared to, you know, your smaller town local newspapers which also get a lot more of our target eyeballs, rural residents, seniors, things like that.

So, we've had good success placing these in newspapers across the country, again, targeted towards phase one and two and on a rolling basis, we'll continue targeting through the end of phase ten.

Similarly, so those and on more of what we refer to as the earned media front, we've also gone out and pitched local media outlets, you know, explaining to them what the transition is.

Would you like, you know, this is something you'd want to write a story on? We can make people available, provide you with information. And, we've seen a decent amount of up-tick, you see here, Green Bay, Huron, and El Mundo as well. A decent amount of earned media in both print and on radio running brief stories about the transition to inform consumer who may not otherwise -- who may not see other messages.

So, our attitude from the get-go has been a real blanket approach. The stations are putting up their own notices as required by the Act.

We are online, in print, on radio, making sure that as few as possible hopefully know viewers in a given market do not learn about it all and find their tails just go missing.

MS. KIDDOO: So, thank you, Chaz.

So, the things that we passed around are -- they're printed in our print center downstairs. We are having -- they are in the process of being professionally printed, but we wanted to give you some examples of the kinds of things that we are making available to community partners, consumer groups, senior community centers, library groups, other people to have and be able to hand out to their constituents locally.

So, we're making -- we're doing those a concerted effort to reach out to those kinds of community partners to help get the message out to their own constituents.

As Chaz said, you know, we really identified sort of senior citizens, lower income folks, rural folks who depend on -- more on over the air TV than some others. And, we want to make sure we -- and may not be as sophisticated at rescanning and knowing how to do these things as otherwise other groups.

And so, we're trying to target them and find ways to reach them.

I would also say that -- so, the other thing is, that the radio tour, so the radio ads that we'll do for phase three, we're doing the week after the end of that phase so that we're trying to catch the people who didn't hear the message and who didn't rescan so that they know that if they're trying to tune to their -- keep using channel four -- channel five, they're trying to tune to channel five and they can't find it, they're used to seeing it, they hear a message that says, oh, that might be it, here's where I get help. Here's what I'll Google. Here's how I'll do it.

So, we're trying to try to do things that the broadcasters can't do. But the National Association of Broadcasters does have a terrific website also with lots of information. It's tvanswers.org. And, that's another one which I think consumers are really finding and getting to and getting a lot of information from.

So, we're please and we've been working very closely to make sure that our messaging is consistent so consumers are hearing consistent terminology.

For example, there are things that are difficult about this process, explaining, as I said, channel numbers aren't changing, so we can't say, if you, you know, you need to change channels, because that actually confuses consumers as opposed to help them.

But we have -- so, we have to use this word that we typically wouldn't use in a consumer friendly way which is frequencies. So, we're trying to deal with kind of having to deal with a technical description of a challenge in ways that consumers can understand.

So, we're being very careful about sort of using the same terminology as NAB and so that we can kind of be consistent and try not to confuse folks.

So, if you hear things about frequencies, it's not because we're just spectrum geeks here at the FCC, it was actually intentional. We actually chose that word because it's really, we want to emphasize to consumers that their channels aren't changing, that this is all just something that's happening behind the scenes in the TV. Their TV just needs to be rebooted essentially to find the stations that they're used to.

So, that's what we're all about. We've done a lot since we were here last year. And, I dare say by next year, we're going to be telling you we're on the home stretch on consumers.

We have not heard a huge consumer outcry about this, which is terrific. It has not been something that consumers are letting us know that they're having trouble with.

CHAIR POCIASK: Video?

MS. KIDDOO: Oh, and so, we leave you with a video that we put up which actually is -- actually it had gotten the most congratulatory comments in terms of trying to take a complicated explanation and make it relatively comprehensible.

So, if we can run that, Chaz?

(Video played)

MR. EBERLE: We'll also have that -- that video will be up in Spanish as well.

MS. KIDDOO: That's right. So, any questions?

MR. EBERLE: Shortly, if not already.

MS. KIDDOO: So, do we have time?

CHAIR POCIASK: Yes, yes, we have time.

MEMBER KAMPIS: I'm just curious, when all is said and done, how many TV stations will have to repack?

MS. KIDDOO: It's about -- well, not about, it's 987. About half the stations nationwide are changing. So, it's quite a few.

CHAIR POCIASK: It's a big task.

MS. KIDDOO: Yes. But, and it's not the DTV transition. DTV ten years ago was one day, one-size-fits-all, everybody had to do it.

This is different times, multiple times, in different markets. It's not geographically, you know, we're not doing the Northeast and then the Southeast. It's kind of, because of interference constraints, it has to be the way it is.

So, it's more challenging that way. The good news is that consumers don't have to go out and buy a converter box. So, that is very good news. And, typically, there's a handful of folks who need a new antenna if you have a station who's going from UHF to VHF.

Bohdan's nodding his head yes. That was a challenge in his particular case because there are antennas out there that are UHF only and if you go to VHF, your antenna's not going to work. But, for the most part, that's unfortunately a small fraction of stations doing that and with that antenna.

For the most part, it is a simple rescan. And, consumers are apparently able to hear the message and are taking action.

CHAIR POCIASK: Any other questions?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR POCIASK: Anyone on the phone with questions?

MEMBER DAY: Not at this time, thank you.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. Well, I mean, thanks so much both of you. I really appreciate it. I mean, it just seems like there's a lot of hard work going on and diligence by the FCC and the broadcasters right now. And, just thank you all for doing that.

MS. KIDDOO: Thank you.

You know, it's important. I mean, it's very important. As I said, the stations are doing a great job because they don't want to lose the viewers that they have.

And, more and more people, it's a number that's going up, people are watching over the air TV with antennas. All the cord cutters are finding that they can get local news and local emergency alerts and other things on TV stations for free with an antenna and they're actually on the up-tick.

So we --

MEMBER ROOKER: What percentage are people --

MS. KIDDOO: That's a good -- Nielsen, I think, says it's somewhere between, you know, 12 and 20 percent.

MEMBER ROOKER: That's a pretty high number.

MS. KIDDOO: It's a high number and I think it varies per market. In some markets it's higher. But it's a lot.

MEMBER ZACHARY: If I could just add on to that. In Milwaukee, it's closer to 30 percent.

CHAIR POCIASK: I think it may have gone up. I'm just wondering because of the over the air?

MS. KIDDOO: Yes.

CHAIR POCIASK: So, people are -- some are disconnecting and so they want to have a little bit of both.

MS. KIDDOO: Right. It's a free service, it gets important local news, local, you know, local emergency alerts and other things.

CHAIR POCIASK: Yes, I meant over the top.

MEMBER ROOKER: And TVs are cheap.

MS. KIDDOO: Yes, you can do -- and it's HD, it's HD quality so I think you're seeing more. I think a lot of Millennial that I've talked to, some of the people who I've done the radio interviews and some of the interviewers are like, I didn't know you could do that. Yes, you can.

And, they're all -- and I say, do you watch over the air or you have cable? Oh no, I cut the cord. I said, well, how do you get your local news? And, they're like, huh? Don't know.

I said, well, you know, for $35 you can get an antenna. Anyway, but so they tend to think of free -- one of the things we learned in our -- we had some focus groups is that we started about talking about free over the air TV, and we thought free was something that would trigger in consumer minds what the difference was between that and paid TV.

Well, no, they -- because people aren't used to the notion of, you know, free versus paid. And, I think they were thinking free was something that, you know, was like stealing your parent's Netflix account number.

So, they think it's slight illegal to watch it, right? So, the Millennials don't want to watch it because it's like not legal. It's perfectly legal, it's perfectly free.

So, anyway, it's an interesting thing to find out what consumers are thinking out there and we're trying to address these things as we go along. So, it's fun.

CHAIR POCIASK: Thank you.

MS. KIDDOO: Thank you.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay, so I guess we have one other item here we need to tackle is, is sort of getting to the meat of all this on the development of working groups and how recommendations and those sorts of things work.

Just sort of as a quick overview and, you know, Debra and Scott may want to chime in, but in a very general sense, so we're starting off with two working groups.

And then, what we'll do is we'll begin developing the members of those working groups and what they do is they work independently and collect information and begin formulating ideas for recommendations.

And, if they choose to vote those out, then they can come to the full CAC for consideration and then where they'll be voted up or down.

And, that's the very high level process on how that's going to work.

If you remember earlier today, Paula, the attorney over at the Office of General Counsel, she spoke a little bit about how the rules to some of these things work.

And, one of them was that you can't have a working group that's bigger than half of the CAC.

And so, with only two items, we'll have to do a little tight rope here and so, assuming that Debra and I operate here sort of, you know, like an ex officio manner, through my math, if we have 27 groups, we could put 12 on one and 13 on the other with us out as just sort of observers, if that works.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Ex officio whatever we call it.

CHAIR POCIASK: Right. And so, that's one way to do it. So, what I was going to suggest doing is I can send out an email and ask of you which ones would like to -- ask to take, you know, issue number one versus issue number two.

Or, if you're, you know, you're good either way, then just indicate that because that will allow me some flexibility to make sure that I don't have force somebody from one group into the other.

And, as a bonus, if you are flexible as the next issues come up, I'll gladly put you on the first one to decide that as a priority.

So, that's one way I think we might be able to get ourselves operating in that manner.

And, so, the way things will probably be working as differently than in the past is, in the past, some of us would get together and we'd come up with some ideas.

I think, one time, I chaired the IP Technology Transition Working Group. And, we went on for a couple years and really didn't do much. Right?

And so, instead of doing that, what we want to do this year is sort at the direction and approval of the Commission is to take issues that they really want to have us look at.

So, there will be limited time. So, some of these working groups may operate for two, three, maybe a year, who knows, two, three months. But I don't know, but they'll be quick. It'll probably be longer than that, but there'll be limited time and the topics in that sense will be sort of limited as well.

So, that's kind of how we're going to operate rather than establishing these groups that will kind of just look for issues. We'll be focused and targeted on specific issues.

Did I kind of capture that well?

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Yes, I mean, so, keep going.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. So, I mean, that's pretty much, you know, what we're going to do.

And so, again, the working groups will be limited time, they'll be issue specific. I'm going to send out an email and I'll begin starting with the groups that you want to be in.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: So, do we know what the issues are, Steve?

CHAIR POCIASK: The issues that are -- would be the -- on the end of the day, we had the call authentication issue.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Oh, so caller ID authentication?

CHAIR POCIASK: Right. And, that's more of an education angle.

And then, the second one is the robo call blocking item. And, that one is I guess by the time we get started, we'll have already had the Commission meeting on that.

MR. MARSHALL: Assuming that that passes, that's correct.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay.

MEMBER ROOKER: Do you want to see a show of hands on which ones we're interested in right now? There's only two of them. I mean, it won't be the total membership, but I mean, you could do that.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: I think it might be easier for us to just do it via email.

CHAIR POCIASK: Yes.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Let people give a -- so, I have a question, Steve.

CHAIR POCIASK: Yes?

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: So, is the idea to actively come up with recommendations then, you know, in these working groups, recommendation and then, you know, if they're sort of, they have shelf life and so, therefore, we're driving towards a recommendation for each of these working groups?

CHAIR POCIASK: Yes, or recommendations, right.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Or recommendations, therefore, you know, I mean, before we had working groups. We could float around for a long time discussing them, coming up with new --

CHAIR POCIASK: They were like standing committees.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Right.

CHAIR POCIASK: Yes.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: But here, we are driven towards action towards a recommendation and that's pretty much what we're driving toward?

CHAIR POCIASK: Right.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Okay.

CHAIR POCIASK: And, in the short term, I guess we'll be looking for, and I'll talk with you offline, too, but that what, you know, the next issues will be.

MR. MARSHALL: Right.

CHAIR POCIASK: Or we'll be soliciting ideas for those next issues?

MR. MARSHALL: Absolutely. And, we'll have a handle on the timing issue, too, from talking with Karen offline, the robo call blocking thing might be the one that you will want to tackle first or respond to first.

I think she's thinking about they'd like to have some kind of a reaction back from us by our September meeting.

And, we're thinking about, by the way, we'll talk about this more a bit later on, too, is a September meeting and then a December meeting.

And, Karen seemed to think that it would be particularly useful to have something back on the robo call blocking stuff by September.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. And, that's probably early September?

MR. MARSHALL: Early, mid-September.

CHAIR POCIASK: Early, mid, okay.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: I think if you're going to try and get recommendations, I wouldn't drive us toward a heavy August work --

MR. MARSHALL: No.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: -- point. So, you might want to --

MR. MARSHALL: That's always problematic.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: -- work a little towards a meeting in September that's not early September.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Because of that reason.

So, I have a question. I mean, we've got -- so, we've got these two working groups. What's the process for the CAC, looking at issues outside of these two issues?

So, if we have, you know, good consumer issues that we want to push forward, what do we do with those?

CHAIR POCIASK: I'll leave that to you.

MR. MARSHALL: As we have done in the past, we have always entertained suggestions on issues. And, I see no reason why that couldn't continue.

Any issue ideas that anybody has should really provide that info to Steve and Debbie and I. And, then, we can take that proposal up to management at the FCC and find out whether or not the Chairman's Office feels it's a good idea for us to use our Committee resources on that particular topic.

And, that's pretty much the way it's been previously. As Paula said, the DFO sets, as the ultimately authority, that's me, on what the agenda will be for this meeting, for example, what will be considered, what won't be.

But, of course, I'm working at the behest of the Chairman. It's not just what Scott Marshall might be interested in, for example, that we would be working on.

But, and that's the way it's been, you know, from the get-go because that's part of the FACA rules.

And, I think what we're doing now is trying to make that clear, too, and is making that clear -- the Chairman's Office is making that clear to all the Advisory Committees as this is the way -- the best way to operate.

CHAIR POCIASK: But it sounds to me, though, like then the other working groups, as they're created, they really are to be short term focused.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, all of them are.

CHAIR POCIASK: So, we -- so that's the mind set we have to have.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

CHAIR POCIASK: So, after we create these first two, then maybe the next thing to do is for me to go out and solicit through email ideas for sort of what other short term projects --

MR. MARSHALL: Sure, suggestions.

CHAIR POCIASK: -- things that have to be dealt with right away and maybe we can begin, you know, sort of see among ourselves which ones are the -- pop up more frequently and begin maybe circulating those and get back to you with one or two ideas for additional working groups.

MR. MARSHALL: Sure. And then, the three of us will then take it to the FCC management --

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay.

MR. MARSHALL: -- and get their reaction and approval on whether we can include that on a future agenda.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. Is there something -- anything else that we're missing from that?

By the way, since Catherine's in here, I just want to recognize you for your help today. Thank you so much --

MR. MARSHALL: Absolutely.

CHAIR POCIASK: -- for everything you've done.

MR. MARSHALL: She does most of the work around here. So, I'm very grateful, too.

CHAIR POCIASK: Catherine Langton.

MR. MARSHALL: Thanks, Catherine.

CHAIR POCIASK: So, does --

We have a question?

MR. MARSHALL: Oh, we have a question, okay, I was going to make a comment, too.

CHAIR POCIASK: You have to raise your hand.

MEMBER GERST: Matt Gerst, CTIA.

So, a couple questions about the working group. I think you said that we can't have more people on the Committee than on the working group, correct? So, we're going to have to split up --

CHAIR POCIASK: No, on the -- you can't have more -- it's the other way, on the working group. So, you can't have a quorum essentially.

MEMBER GERST: Right, right, okay.

So, just judging from the topics, my expectation is that CTIA's member companies are interested in both. So, is there -- so, two questions.

One, is there a synopsis of what or charter of what each subcommittee is expected to work on that could be provided before you ask for who, you know, who wants to be on which subcommittee?

Because it's a little hard to tell, you know, if I have to choose -- if CTIA has to choose between one, which one we have to choose.

CHAIR POCIASK: Yes.

MEMBER GERST: But an alternative question is, if we have an alternate, can the alternate serve on the subcommittee so you can have the main person and then the alternate serving on both?

CHAIR POCIASK: I think they can, just not voting, no, right?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, sure. Sure, one vote, but sure, you can have --

CHAIR POCIASK: Yes, you can have an alternate participant.

MR. MARSHALL: -- your alternate on the other working group.

MEMBER ROOKER: If you have a voice in the meetings?

CHAIR POCIASK: Right.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: And they can participate.

MEMBER ROOKER: But not in the voting in terms of anything that came out of that meeting?

CHAIR POCIASK: Right. So, in other words, you're right, have your alternate participate on the other and then, but at the very end, when you have recommendation, they just won't have a vote.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: At that small group level, but they --

CHAIR POCIASK: Would that -- how does that -- can you clarify that?

(SIMULTANEOUS SPEAKING)

MR. MARSHALL: Well, if, again, one organization, one vote. If, well, to use Matt's example, if CTIA had one of its -- had its alternate on Working Group A, that person could represent CTIA fully on that group and could vote a recommendation out of that group.

Again, though, once we got it to the full Committee, there would be only one vote for CTIA.

MEMBER GERST: Correct.

MR. MARSHALL: Does that answer the question?

MEMBER GERST: But wouldn't --

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Okay, I'm a little confused.

CHAIR POCIASK: No, I'm confused then because then, aren't you allowing -- then you could actually have a quorum then because you're allowing them to participate on two groups.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Yes, they can't participate on both.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, we can't have more than 13 in each subcommittee or in each working group.

CHAIR POCIASK: Right.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Right. So, if the alternate's on --

MR. MARSHALL: If an alternate is going to be on the other one, that may be an unlikely situation, depending upon how many people we have to work with.

I would think, Steve, you would decide that if we had too many people on one group, we're not going to want the same member being in both groups necessarily.

CHAIR POCIASK: And, but the same organization in the same group?

MR. MARSHALL: The same organization.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: So, clarifying, so maybe we're getting confused because, is the number or is it the CAC representatives?

If it's the CAC representatives, then we're okay if others participate. But if it's, you know, if it's the number, which is it? Is it CAC representatives per?

MR. MARSHALL: No, it would be members of the -- these working groups cannot exceed 13 members and we count here -- of the 27 of you, most of you are organizational members with one vote.

We have four individuals serving in their individual capacity.

So, it does boil down to a particular organization on a particular subcommittee.

CHAIR POCIASK: So, I think, just to clarify, I think as long as we only have two working groups, we're going to have a problem. You can have -- I think your alternate can probably be present on the other group. I just think we have an issue about having you vote on one group and your alternate vote on the other group.

MEMBER ROOKER: No, I thought we were saying that the alternates can't vote. They don't have a vote in the regular meeting. What would be wrong with having the alternate, if they want to sit in --

CHAIR POCIASK: Nothing's wrong with that.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: I guess what Steve --

CHAIR POCIASK: That's what I just said.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: That's what he just said.

MEMBER ROOKER: Right, exactly.

MR. MARSHALL: And, that's what I said earlier, too. It's an unlikely situation we're going to have to have a particular organization be in both groups.

They can sit in certainly.

CHAIR POCIASK: That's my point.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Yes, right.

CHAIR POCIASK: But so, they won't be voting then?

MEMBER ROOKER: No, they just don't vote. Right, makes sense.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Right.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: We're all agreeing.

CHAIR POCIASK: All right.

MR. MARSHALL: Okay. We do have some tools --

MEMBER GERST: So, I'm sorry.

MR. MARSHALL: -- that the folks can use.

Was there a question?

MEMBER GERST: Well, I just didn't get an answer to the first question which was will a synopsis or some description of what each group is expected to be working on provided before we can choose -- we are asked to choose which one to participate and spend our time on?

CHAIR POCIASK: Yea, I mean, I guess we can put something together. It's essentially, it's --

MR. MARSHALL: We could --

CHAIR POCIASK: -- this --

MR. MARSHALL: It's essentially what we reviewed today.

CHAIR POCIASK: It's the update.

MR. MARSHALL: And, we will have a transcript in ten days of what transcribed -- what, you know, transacted here. And, the audio archive should be even available more quickly than that.

Let's see what we can do in terms of trying to synthesize maybe a little bit the two issues. I don't know, Steve, when we sent out the email? We can provide a little information about each topic?

CHAIR POCIASK: We can try to do that.

MR. MARSHALL: We can try to do that if that would be helpful.

MEMBER GERST: Thank you.

MR. MARSHALL: But I think, Matt, you've seen it all as far as what, you know, what each group is going to be asked to look at from the presentations that were given here today.

MEMBER GERST: Well, I think that's certainly true of the call authentication. I think I understood that that was going to be about educating consumers.

CHAIR POCIASK: Right.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

MEMBER GERST: I'm not totally sure I understand what the call blocking working group will be looking at. Is that -- because if --

CHAIR POCIASK: But I think we may know that after the meeting on the 6th.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, yes.

MEMBER GERST: I'm still not -- even with the meeting on the 6th where the Commission is going to adopt a declaratory ruling and NPRM, presumably, we don't know yet, but I'm still not sure what the subcommittee is being asked to do off that.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, I think some of the topics that were --

MEMBER GERST: Which is why it would be just helpful to understand what the action item is for that group.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Is it possible that the Commission will have any specific requests of the CAC after June 6th? Do you know?

MR. MARSHALL: It's possible, I suppose we could further refine the ask. What I was going to say a minute ago is that I think some of the issues that you heard today are the issues that would be relevant like how should that critical calls white list work?

How do we prevent or what the remedy should be of a call that is erroneously blocked?

That kind of thing. And, I think what we -- what would probably be valuable for the group to even do is go down through the NPRM and see if you all decide there is another consumer issue that maybe we didn't even discuss today or another consumer aspect that deserves some attention.

MEMBER GERST: As an offshoot of this?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, as an offshoot of the discussion here.

MEMBER GERST: Okay.

MEMBER LONG: This is Vonda.

CHAIR POCIASK: Hi, Vonda.

MEMBER LONG: So, I guess it bears asking, are you -- once you choose a working group, are you compelled to stay there or, at some point early on, can you say, oh, you know, I think I should be on or I'd like to be on the other working group and do some kind of adjustment?

So, are you compelled once you choose, are you basically, you're imprisoned?

(LAUGHTER)

CHAIR POCIASK: Well, hopefully --

MR. MARSHALL: Hopefully not.

CHAIR POCIASK: Yes, hopefully we're going to have additional working groups.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

CHAIR POCIASK: And then, we're going to require people to fill those. So, you can certainly then take on multiple working groups or you could always transfer.

MEMBER LONG: Okay.

MR. MARSHALL: We don't want to enslave anybody into something they don't want to do.

(LAUGHTER)

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. So, I mean, is this then something -- should I wait on the email then until after the 6th?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, because we really don't know whether this is going to happen until after the 6th.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay, so we'll wait a few days then on this and then we'll revisit it. And then, I'll circle back with Debbie and Scott. And, if you want, we can discuss this, too, if you have ideas.

So, I just -- and then, we can circulate, you know, sort -- maybe we can put together a couple sentences sort of describing the direction.

I mean, the working group, there should be enough flexibility in that so we're not going to say, hey, I want you to decide one specific thing.

MR. MARSHALL: Right, right, we don't want --

CHAIR POCIASK: There should be -- you should have some flexibility in deciding that there's something else that you want to do, you want to look at some default blocking thing or, you know, whatever the issue might be, I don't know.

So, it may not -- you know, we don't want to pigeonhole it either.

MEMBER GERST: Thank you, a couple sentences of your expectations would be very helpful.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay, so that -- is there any other questions or anyone on the phone who has a question?

MR. MARSHALL: Joslyn's really been a trooper hanging in there on that phone. It's no easy job.

MEMBER DAY: I miss you guys a lot, but it's been a great meeting.

MR. MARSHALL: Sorry you couldn't be with us.

MEMBER DAY: And questions answered.

MR. MARSHALL: For those of you who are new, I will mention we work our -- the working groups operate electronically. I will set up an email discussion group for your particular use for each working group.

And, your meetings would be by teleconference, which, again, I can arrange for you once the time frame is established for your work.

And, a leader of the working group has been appointed by Steve and Debbie.

So, those are the primary tools that we use to develop the recommendation before it then goes to the full Committee for final action before it's conveyed to the Commission.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. So, we're finished with this section then and I'll move on.

MR. MARSHALL: Unless anybody has got another question. You know --

MEMBER ROOKER: Can I ask a question?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes?

MEMBER ROOKER: You're talking about emails between the working group itself. Can we share those emails with the other working group so that they know what's going on in both sides? Is that a possibility?

CHAIR POCIASK: I think you can, there's not a problem.

MR. MARSHALL: No.

MEMBER ROOKER: Well, I'm just thinking that since many of us are interested in both subjects, I certainly would like to know what the other group is working on as well as what my group's working on.

CHAIR POCIASK: I've always done that before when I was with a working group.

MEMBER ROOKER: Okay.

CHAIR POCIASK: There would be somebody else and sometimes we were stepping on the, you know, we'd be doing one thing and it was partially into USF and we would share emails, at least I would share it with the chair over there.

And, by the way, too, when we do go out with an email, I also will ask people if they'd like to chair a particular working group as well because I'll need to fill that.

Anything else? Any last questions?

MEMBER LONG: Are we to use this distribution contact that was in the -- how to use various emails?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, that's in your packet. That's the instructions for using these lists. Right now, we have a master list already set up for the full Committee which is named CAC 2019.

We'll come up with something that's not too many characters to type for the other two working groups. And once the membership has been established, you'll be automatically subscribed to each one of those which ever working group you're a part of.

CHAIR POCIASK: Yes, so, then you can communicate to the whole or to the specific working group.

MR. MARSHALL: It's like the old listserv, but that's a trademark name and I got in trouble calling it a listserv once. But you basically send out an email to a robot here at the FCC and it relays it to the entire group.

CHAIR POCIASK: And there's a two hour delay.

MR. MARSHALL: And there's a two hour delay. Or it could be a two hour delay, depending upon how much traffic is going on on our servers or the cloud or whatever.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Did anyone ask this yet, not to sound too bureaucratic, but are we going to have chairs of these working groups as we've done in the past?

CHAIR POCIASK: I just mentioned that.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Oh, I'm sorry.

CHAIR POCIASK: Yes, no, yes, so, you know, that will be something else I'll mention in the email when we get out just when we get preferences in return, hopefully some people will say, yes, hey, I'm willing to chair or vice.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Otherwise, you'll have to assign someone, right?

CHAIR POCIASK: And, I can do that.

So, if there's nothing -- is there anything else that -- on the phone, any other questions, anyone else?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR POCIASK: So, with that, well, we'll turn it over to comments.

MR. MARSHALL: Comments? Any comments from the public?

CHAIR POCIASK: From the public?

MR. MARSHALL: And, then we'll adjourn and invite you to join us for a boxed lunch here. We have to vacate the room by 2:00.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay.

MR. MARSHALL: But you're welcome to hopefully stay with us and enjoy it. Or, if you need to take it away, we won't hold that against you.

And, that boxed lunch, by the way, unless it looks like we've got a whole lot of extras to cut the cost down to our benefactor, we're limiting the lunch to the primary reps or the individual -- those serving in an individual capacity.

If you need to go to our cafeteria, Catherine or I can show you there?

(OFF MICROPHONE COMMENTS)

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. So, do we have any comments from the public?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR POCIASK: Seeing none, before I adjourn, I just wanted to also thank Steve Morris again from NCTA for the refreshments this morning.

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIR POCIASK: And, for the lunch, so thanks again. I do appreciate that.

So, unless we have anything else, then I'd like to call for adjournment.

MEMBER ROOKER: So moved.

MR. MARSHALL: Enjoy the good food.

CHAIR POCIASK: All right, thank you.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, everybody.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 12:42 p.m.)