# UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

+ + + + +

### CONSUMER ADVISORY COMMITTEE

+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

MONDAY SEPTEMBER 16, 2019

+ + + + +

The Advisory Committee met in the Commissioners Meeting Room, located at 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C., at 9:00 a.m., Steve Pociask, Chairman, presiding.

## COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

STEVE POCIASK, Committee Chairman
DEBRA R. BERLYN, National Consumers League
LEIGH FOLEY, National Association of Broadcasters
B. LYNN FOLLANSBEE, USTelecom
MATTHEW GERST, CTIA

- JONATHON HAUENSCHILD, American Legislative Exchange Council
- KYLE J. HILDEBRAND, serving individually as a
   subject-matter expert, Special Government
   Employee \*
- BRIAN HURLEY, America's Communications
  Association ACA Connects
- THADDEUS JOHNSON, National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates
- JOHNNY KAMPIS, serving individually as a subjectmatter expert, Special Government Employee ERIC KOCH, serving individually as a subject
  - matter expert, Special Government Employee

IRENE LEECH, Consumer Federation of America VONDA LONG-DILLARD, AT&T

RACHEL NEMETH, Consumer Technology Association SHIRLEY ROOKER, Call for Action

MICHAEL SANTORELLI, serving individually as a subject-matter expert, Special Government Employee

BARRY UMANSKY, Digital Policy Institute OLIVIA WEIN, National Consumer Law Center BRIAN YOUNG, National Consumers League BOHDAN ZACHARY, Milwaukee PBS

### COMMISSION STAFF:

SCOTT MARSHALL, Designated Federal Official CHRISTINE CLEARWATER, Deputy Designated Federal Official

PAM ARLUK
EDUARD BARTHOLME
KIRK BURGEE
DIANE BURSTEIN
ZAC CHAMP
MARLENE DORTCH
BARBARA ESBIN
GARNET HANLY
LORI MAARBJERG
JEFFREY PRINCE
KAREN SCHROEDER
SHERYL SEGAL
MARK STONE
PATRICK WEBRE

<sup>\*</sup>Present by teleconference

# CONTENTS

Welcome & Call to Order Steve Pociask, CAC Chairperson and Debra Berlyn, CAC Vice Chairperson5
Introductions & Meeting Logistics Steve Pociask & Scott Marshall, CAC DFO5
Remarks of Jeffrey Prince, FCC Chief Economist and Professor of Business Economics and Public Policy at the Kelley School of Business, Indiana University10
Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau Update Patrick Webre, Chief, CGB
Break
Ban on Malicious Caller ID Spoofing & Foreign Robocalls Presenter: Pam Arluk, Chief, Compensation Policy Division, WCB
Report on Deployment and Implementation of Call Blocking and Caller ID Authentication Presenter: Karen Schroeder, CGB71
Update on Digital Opportunity Data Collection Presenters: Kirk Burgee, Chief of Staff, WCB; Garnet Hanly, Chief, Competition and Infrastructure Policy Division, WTB97

Update on Pending Legislation of Interest to Consumers
Presenter: Lori Maarbjerg, Office of Legislative Affairs
Update on Electronic Comment Filing System Redesign
Presenter: ECFS Redevelopment Team133
Consideration of Robocall Blocking Recommendation Presenters: Brian Young, National Consumers League and Sam Brinton, The Trevor Project, Co-Chairs of the Robocall Blocking
Working Group149
Comments from the Public156
CAC Member Discussion & Next Meeting157
Adjournment 167

# P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 9:06 a.m. CHAIR POCIASK: Okay, well, let's get started. So I'm Steve Pociask. I'm with the

So I'm Steve Pociask. I'm with the American Consumer Institute and welcome, everyone, to the Consumer Advisory Committee meeting.

You know, before we get started here,
I want to just recognize a couple people in the
room. We have Scott Marshall, our trusted and
true contact here at the FCC. And also Christina
Clearwater, she's the new Deputy Designated
Federal Officer for the Communications Advisory
-- I mean the Consumer Advisory Committee.

So we're going to start off today's meeting with just introductions, and we'll go around the room. In addition to that, I have a sign in sheet if you could just -- we'll start this way, if we could just check your name if you're in. And then after we go through the room, I'd like to just see if there's anyone else on

1	the phone who is joining us as well. So with that,
2	let me turn it over to Debra.
3	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Good morning. Am
4	I on?
5	CHAIR POCIASK: No.
6	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Can't tell.
7	Good morning. Camera's on, voice?
8	CHAIR POCIASK: No.
9	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Action? Okay, we
LO	got it?
L1	CHAIR POCIASK: Yes.
L2	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Good morning. I'm
L3	Debbie Berlyn representing the National
L 4	Consumer's League and Vice Chair.
L5	MEMBER UMANSKY: Good morning as well.
L6	It's Barry Umansky with the Digital Policy
L7	Institute.
L8	MEMBER KOCH: State Senator Eric Koch
L9	of Indiana serving as a special government
20	employee and subject matter expert.
21	MEMBER HAUENSCHILD: Jonathon

1	Exchange Council.
2	MEMBER WEIN: Olivia Wein, National
3	Consumer Law Center.
4	MEMBER MORRIS: Steve Morris, NCTA.
5	MEMBER GERST: Matt Gerst with CTIA.
6	MEMBER ZACHARY: Bohdan Zachary,
7	Milwaukee PBS.
8	MEMBER NEMETH: Rachel Nemeth, CTA.
9	MEMBER SANTORELLI: Michael
10	Santorelli serving individually, but affiliated
11	with the Advanced Communications Law and Policy
12	Institute at New York Law School.
13	MEMBER JOHNSON: Thaddeus Johnson,
14	NASUA.
15	MEMBER LONG-DILLARD: Vonda Long,
16	AT&T.
17	MEMBER YOUNG: Brian Young with the
18	National Consumers League.
19	MEMBER HURLEY: Brian Hurley with ACA
20	Connects.
21	MEMBER FOLEY: Leigh Foley with the
22	National Association of Broadcasters.

1	MEMBER ROOKER: Shirley Rooker with
2	Call for Action.
3	MEMBER LEECH: Irene Leech
4	representing the Consumer Federation of America.
5	MEMBER KAMPIS: Johnny Kampis serving
6	individually, affiliated with the Taxpayers
7	Protection Alliance.
8	MS. CLEARWATER: Christina
9	Clearwater.
10	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. And then of
11	course, Scott Marshall. So let me
12	MR. MARSHALL: I'm asleep on the
13	switch.
14	CHAIR POCIASK: It's all good. So is
15	there anyone on the call who's joining us today?
16	MEMBER HILDEBRAND: Steve, Kyle
17	Hildebrand serving as a special government
18	employee.
19	CHAIR POCIASK: Anyone else?
20	MEMBER MCAULIFFE: Yes, hi. This is
21	Katie McAuliffe, Digital Liberty and Americans
22	for Tax Reform.

1 CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. Last call, anyone else on the line? 2 3 (No audible response.) So before we CHAIR POCIASK: Okav. 4 get started, too, I just want to recognize the 5 6 National Broadcast Association for providing us 7 with breakfast and lunch today, very nice, thank 8 you. 9 Also just a point of etiquette, too, 10 now and then, we all want to get an opportunity 11 to speak up. So just turn your cards up this 12 direction so you can be recognized rather than 13 just having a free for all. All right, so with that, I guess I'll 14 turn your attention to the agenda. We have a lot 15 of interesting things to do. We have some great 16 17 presentations. And in fact we have a recommendation 18 19 as well that would be introduced towards the end 20 of the day, so please stick around. That's an important vote, and it also reflects a whole lot 21

of hard work and commitment to, you know, sort of

a dedicated effort. And so we definitely want to 1 recognize that. 2 3 So anyway, with that, I'd like to get I guess, do we have our initial speaker 4 started. 5 here today? Okay. So with that, let me turn it over to 6 Jeffrey Prince. He's the FCC Chief Economist and 7 Professor of Business Economics and Public Policy 8 at the Kelley School of Business in Indiana 9 10 University. Did you have slides? Or you can join 11 us right up here. 12 DR. PRINCE: Yes, that'd be great. 13 CHAIR POCIASK: Just an interesting 14 fact, when we started the Institute, my cofounder was previously a professor from Indiana. 15 And yes, he happened to be a Chief Economist at 16 17 the FCC and the Wireline Bureau Chief was then 18 the Common Carrier Bureau as well. So welcome 19 aboard. I think Indiana's got a soft spot here 20 at the FCC. I think that's right. 21 DR. PRINCE: 22 And I think it was only five years that David Waterman was the Chief Economist here who is also -- he's emeritus now at Indiana, but yes, we have a longstanding tradition of involvement with the FCC.

So thank you for the opportunity to speak. So I think maybe the best thing for me to do just so you know kind of a little bit about me and my background and you know, how I might be of any use if you have anything you'd like to speak with me about is, you know, I'm an economist by training, of course.

I am an empirical economist, so I do a lot of data work, particularly with analytics, econometrics applied to industry analysis.

I've done lot demand And on analysis. I'm interested in things So like internet demand issues, provision issues. have done a lot of work on digital divide in the past and then demand for high technology products in the telecommunications space. So that's kind of where my research background overlaps a lot with some of the interests of the FCC.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I've only been here, this is now the beginning of my third week, so I don't want to pretend that I've got this all figured out yet. But I have been trying to talk around and get a sense for, you know, what are the key issues that the Commission is focused on, and where might I be the most useful.

As of right now, of course, this could change. As you all know, the kind of merger analysis says kind of move past the FCC. So in some ways this is good for me because it opens up a lot of kind of new opportunities rather than me coming in very late on that big task.

So some of the things that have caught there's biq ΜV attention, I know а data collection effort underway by the Commission. It's kind of an overlap between what everyone knows as the 477, but then there's now kind of updated information they'd like to get moving forward. But I think now has the acronym DODC, the Digital Opportunity Data Collection. can see myself getting involved with something

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

like that.

I know there's also the Rural Digital Opportunity Fund, which is a big project going on. I can see myself getting involved with that. I think, you know, there's a lot of ongoing issues there.

And then one other thing that got my attention at least in the early stages is a potential kind of I guess acceleration of the white papers that the FCC produces. I think there is a real comparative advantage for me coming from academia. This is what I do is research papers. And I think there's real interest at the Commission to try and produce more of these. And so I'd like to try and get that a little bit more formalized, kind of get the process in place and really try and get involved with that during my year here.

So encourage some of the younger staff to produce some and, you know, build on the ideas that they've already put forth. And you know, keep encouraging people to put out new ideas that

might have general benefit. 1 So that's kind of where I'm at right 2 3 now. There's certainly many other projects that the Commission has going on. I'm sure I'll get 4 involved a little bit with the C-Band issues, 5 6 things like that. But those are the ones where at 7 least as of right now I'm in the process of getting involved, and I can see myself having 8 9 long-term involvement some in those 10 others. 11 CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. Do we have any 12 questions? (No audible response.) 13 I do want to ask one 14 CHAIR POCIASK: 15 thing in regard to -- I know you do interesting a lot of the demand analysis and issues such as 16 17 Any consideration of like doing 18 consumer welfare measurements and things of that 19 sort as a sort of a test on how, you know, what's, 20 you know, a test on a public policy or --21 DR. PRINCE: Oh, absolutely. Yes,

that's consumer welfare issues have certainly

come into play in some of my work. 1 And to the extent that it would be relevant for policy 2 3 analysis, I'd certainly be interested in doing that type of work. 4 5 CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. Irene? 6 DR. PRINCE: Yes? 7 I'm wondering whether MEMBER LEECH: you have access to any kind of consumer complaint 8 data and if there are any trends and so forth 9 10 that you might be able to look at there, or if 11 there is any way to get consumers to tell you 12 things more often so that it could be more useful? 13 DR. PRINCE: So I mean, the short answer is I haven't seen it yet. I haven't really 14 gotten into -- through the data yet. 15 interested in that. 16 certainly be Τ could certainly be on the lookout to see if that might 17 opportunity for the Commission 18 be 19 looking at those kind of data. 20 CHAIR POCIASK: All right, Steven? MEMBER MORRIS: So the Commission in 21 22 the last year or so has created a whole bureau or

office of economic analysis. 1 CHAIR POCIASK: Raise your hand. 2 3 VICE CHAIR BERLYN: You're not on. In the last year or so 4 MEMBER MORRIS: the Commission created a whole office of economic 5 6 analysis. Do you have a sense of how that changes the role of chief economist, or whether it has no 7 How you might work with them? effect? 8 9 Yes, that's DR. PRINCE: а I mean, unfortunately, it's difficult 10 question. 11 for me to have ample perspective on kind of how 12 it was before other than just a little bit of 13 hearsay from a few that have been here for a while. 14 15 My sense is that there's a lot of enthusiasm about the restructuring. You know, I 16 17 think the -- I think Jerry Elliq did a piece on this, basically looking at where would economics 18 19 if be more effective you had economists 20 distributed across the different bureaus, or if 21 you had them concentrated as we do now. And it

seemed that the conclusion was that they would be

1	more effective in the current structure.
2	I obviously can't empirically give you
3	answer to that. But I can say that I think it's
4	actually made my life relatively easy to get
5	started because I kind of know who I need to be
6	talking to and I've already now met with a lot of
7	people, and I kind of understand what my role is
8	pretty quickly.
9	So that's been a positive thing for
10	me. And I'm ready to get my hands dirty and get
11	moving on things. But obviously the first few
12	weeks is kind of learning the lay of the land.
13	And I think the structure actually has made that
14	easier, at least from my perspective.
15	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. On the line,
16	Steve, Katie, anyone have any questions? Anyone
17	else in the room?
18	(No audible response.)
19	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. Thank you,
20	Jeffrey. I appreciate it.
21	DR. PRINCE: Thank you. I appreciate
22	your time.

1	(Applause.)
2	CHAIR POCIASK: All right. So moving
3	ahead on the agenda then, we're going to get a
4	briefing update from the Consumer and
5	Governmental Affairs Bureau.
6	(Off-microphone comments.)
7	CHAIR POCIASK: We're about five
8	minutes early.
9	Well, look, I mean, they're on the way
10	down, so they're supposed to be here in five
11	minutes. So if anyone wants to grab a cup of
12	coffee or anything, let's just get right back
13	real quick.
14	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
15	went off the record at 9:20 a.m. and resumed at
16	9:25 a.m.)
17	CHAIR POCIASK: All right, let's get
18	started.
19	All right, so now we're going to get
20	an update from the Consumer and Governmental
21	Affairs Bureau. And starting us off today will
22	be Patrick Webre, the Chief. Patrick?

MR. WEBRE: Thank you, Steve. Good morning, everyone, and welcome to the fall meeting of the Consumer Advisory Committee.

I know that this summer's been a very busy time for you on your critical call list, call blocking working group under the leadership of Brian Young of the National Consumers League and Sam Brinton of the Trevor Project.

Many hours were spent, and I know this firsthand from talking to Scott, many hours were spent developing a recommendation which the Full Committee will consider this morning.

June, the Commission asked for advice concerning how consumers should notified when their calls are blocked. sought input on the types of numbers that should a critical calls be included on list. Ιn addition, the Commission asked about how 9-1-1 numbers and government emergency numbers should be defined. The CAC's past work has been very helpful as we address the robocalls issue. we look forward to hearing more from you about --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

on this subject. Thanks, again, for all your work on the recommendation before you today.

I also look forward to the launch of the Caller ID Authentication Working Group, which will be coming up for our next meeting. They will develop a recommendation for your December meeting regarding consumer education surrounding the implementation of SHAKEN and STIR.

Turning to your agenda today, Karen Schroeder from CGB's Consumer Policy Division will be back to talk to you about a robocalls blocking report that the Commission's June order directed the Commission staff to prepare.

The Commission specifically cited the CAC's recommendation that urged us to study the effectiveness of call blocking services, methods, and technologies.

Karen will talk with you about how we plan to collect information for the first report that's due to the Commission in June of 2020. We will also have a second report due to the Commission in June of 2021.

1.3

2.1

Affairs will provide a legislative update on robocalls and other consumer related topics like safeguarding consumer privacy. Staff from the Wireline Competition Bureau will discuss recent work regarding the banning of malicious caller ID spoofing and foreign robocalls -- robocalls originating from overseas.

You'll also hear about a new initiative, the Digital Opportunity Data Collection, which is a collaborative effort to provide more granular and accurate data regarding the availability of broadband services throughout the country.

And finally you will be briefed on the redesign of the Commission's Electronic Comment Filing System, or ECFS. The CAC's input was very helpful to us when we redesigned our online consumer complaint system and our consumer help center. We hope you'll be able to provide us with your valuable council regarding the ECFS redesign as well.

2.1

1	So that's it for me for now. Again,
2	I appreciate all of your hard work and I look
3	forward to your recommendations. As is the usual
4	custom here, CGB senior staff will provide you
5	with a short update concerning their respective
6	areas of responsibility. So we'll start that off
7	with Mark Stone who is a Deputy Bureau Chief. He
8	oversees our Consumer Policy Division. So I'll
9	turn it over to Mark.
10	Thank you.
11	CHAIR POCIASK: Thank you, Patrick.
12	(Applause.)
13	MR. STONE: Good morning, nice to see
14	all of you here for your second meeting. Since
15	your last meeting in June, we've been very busy
16	on robocalls policy and rulemaking.
17	As you're very aware, the Commission
18	just after your last meeting took strong action
19	to fight illegal robocalls by allowing voice
20	service providers to block certain calls on their
21	customers' behalf by default. In other words,

without their customers having to opt in to

blocking.

But seeking to balance the consumer desire to stop illegal robocalls with the desire to not block good calls, the Commission sought comment on how it might protect important calls so that critical calls aren't blocked. Now, we know you've been working hard on this issue to advise us, so we look forward to hearing your recommendation on that.

In that same June action, the FCC directed the Consumer Bureau, in coordination with some other Bureaus, to compile two reports on the state of robocall blocking tools amongst other things. Karen Schroeder, as Patrick mentioned, will be here to talk to you a little bit about that today, and we look forward to getting your advice on that.

Turning to another large robocalls project that I've mentioned before, the Reassigned Numbers Database. We continue our work on that project being advised by another advisory committee, the North American Numbering

Counsel. Once operational, that database which the Commission established in December of 2018 will enable callers to identify numbers that have been reassigned before they make calls so that they can determine the actual number, consumer they want to reach is at and avoid have received the reaching consumers who reassigned numbers, but don't want to receive that call.

So then Nancy is helping us work through technical and funding issues. We expect its recommendation in the next couple of months, at which point we'll seek comment on key issues and move towards a procurement for an administrator of that database.

Finally, I want to mention one area of CGB that we don't always highlight, and that's our Reference Information Center through the RIC, as we call it. CGB serves as the Commission's official records custodian and hosts a lot of different important records. As part of that role, the RIC, in coordination with our

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	Secretary's Office and our IT folks help manage
2	the Electronic Comment Filing System, or ECFS.
3	So we're glad our ECFS redevelopment team is here
4	this morning to talk to you about getting your
5	advice on upcoming improvements to this critical
6	system.
7	So with that, I'll turn it over to
8	Barbara. Thanks again for all the help you do,
9	all the help you give us.
10	CHAIR POCIASK: Thank you, Mark.
11	(Applause.)
12	MS. ESBIN: All right, there's more
13	than one.
14	Good morning, and again, welcome to
15	the second meeting. In June, I explained that I
16	oversee the governmental affairs portfolio in
17	CGB. And that involves the work of two different
18	divisions, the Office of Native Affairs and
19	Policy and the Intergovernmental Affairs Office.
20	So I'm going to start with ONAP, and
21	ONAP has been very busy throughout the summer.
22	Together with other Bureaus, it has continued the

Commission's outreach to tribes and tribal organizations, holding additional tribal workshops in Norman, Oklahoma, Billings, Montana, and two additional workshops planned for the fall.

The Commission uses these workshops to provide presentations on a broad range of important Agency programs and policies. That's deployment of communications infrastructure and services in tribal communities.

Recent and upcoming events include a heavy emphasis on the recently created Rural Tribal Priority Window for new licenses in the Educational Broadband Service portion of the 2.5 GHz band which has the potential to significantly increase the deployment and adoption of modern communication services on underserved and unserved tribal lands.

ONAP and the Wireline and Wireless
Bureaus will also be making several presentations
at the September 23rd to 24th National Tribal
Broadband Summit sponsored by the Departments of

Education and the Interior and the Institute for Museum and Library Sciences.

The Chairman will be making a keynote at this event as well I believe hosted September 23rd. It's been at the Department of Interior if any of you are interested, you can sign up and attend.

participated ONAP staff in and presented at multiple events held by external tribal organizations including the National Tribal Telecom Association held tribal а engineering and broadband summit this spring in Mascalero, New Mexico. They attended the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians midyear Spokane, Washington. Also this convention in summer the Midwest Alliance of Sovereign Tribes summer conference in Mount Pleasant, Michigan, and the Native American Development Corporation annual convention in July.

In terms of policy work, ONAP staff reviewed and made contributions to a variety of reports to Congress and federal rulemaking items

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

such as Report on Broadband Deployment in Indian Country, Report on Promoting Broadband Internet Access Service for Veterans, Spectrum Partitioning, Desegregation, and Leasing NPRM, Educational Broadband Service Report and Order, Connected Care Pilot NPRM, Rural Digital Opportunity NPRM, Digital Fund and the Opportunity Data Collection Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.

ONAP also oversees the Native Nations Communications Task Force, which has been busy in completing its first report to the Commission on Obstacles to Deployment of Broadband in Indian Country. We expect the report to be finalized early this fall. And the group will meet again by telephone September 24th, and in person here on November 5th to 6th.

The Intergovernmental Affairs Office has also been busy. And they've attended or presented at multiple events held by state and local government organizations, including the National Association of Attorneys General,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Consumer Protection spring conference, National Association of Counties annual, National Association of Regulatory Commissioners summer policy summit, and the National Governors Association summer meeting.

chair, like ONAP oversees an Advisorv Committee, the Intergovernmental Advisory Committee. They met here in June. They're finishing up their term which will end at the end of this month. And they're working on some finalizing some outstanding tasks. And these will include a report on How to Identify State, Local, and Tribal Regulatory Barriers to Telemedicine, Provision of recommend practices to ensure that non-English speaking communities receive emergency alerts multilingual alerting, recommend best practices for fine-tuning state, local, tribal coordination for disaster preparation, response, and practices restoration. and best for communications between state emergency managers and EAS state emergency communications committees

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	to ensure that EAS procedures, including
2	initiation and cancellation of actual alerts and
3	tests, are mutually understood.
4	So my people have been really busy.
5	It's been a long summer. And I will turn it over
6	to Diane Burstein.
7	CHAIR POCIASK: Diane Burstein, yes.
8	And she, too, is a Deputy Chief at yes, thank
9	you, Barbara.
10	MS. ESBIN: Thank you.
11	(Applause.)
12	CHAIR POCIASK: So Diane is also
13	Deputy Chief over at the Consumer Government
14	Affairs Bureau. Diane?
15	MS. BURSTEIN: Good morning, thank you
16	for having me back here today. I'm Diane Burstein
17	and in my role as Deputy Bureau Chief of CGB, I
18	help to oversee the Disability Rights Office. And
19	I'm happy to be here today to update you on some
20	of the developments since I spoke with you last
21	in June. And actually it was early in June.
22	Since then, there have been a number

that t.he ofdifferent meetings folks Disability Rights Office have attended as part of outreach effort to various different consumer groups. And one of the meetings occurred in June after this meeting where Chairman Pai announced the winners of the 2019 Chairman's Award for Advancement and Accessibility, also known as the Chairman's AAA.

It celebrates outstanding private and public sector ventures as part of the Commission's continuing efforts to facilitate ongoing exchanges among the telecommunications industry, assistive technology companies and developers, government representatives, consumers to share best practices and solutions for accessible communications technologies.

The winners this year were Cisco for text-to-speech functionality in their 8800 series phones and Microsoft, Tobii, and EyeTech which developed a USB human interface device standard for eye trackers. So nominations for this upcoming period in 2020 will be announced or the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

nomination period, so please stay tuned for that.

As far as the accessibility of FCC programs go, in August, we announced or issued a public notice seeking comments on the FCC's programs and activities, the accessibility of our programs and activities which federal agencies are required to do. Federal agencies and must make their programs activities accessible to people with disabilities in order to comply with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act.

And the FCC has to review its own programs every three years. So there is an update now to its Section 504 Handbook which contains quidance on the provision of accommodations for Commission's the programs and activities, securing procedures for reasonable accommodations, and information about disability and accessibility. Comments on that are due October 21st. Another -number of other а activities occurred in the emergency information area, as Barbara had mentioned, that the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Disability Rights Office was involved in.

On August 7th, FEMA had a nationwide EAS test conducted in conjunction with the FCC. DRO issued several reminders about the need to make that EAS test accessible to people with disabilities and also encourage the public to report back on any issues that might have arisen with that EAS test. So we're looking at that now.

Also in August, the CGB issued a public notice reminding video programmers and distributors about the need to make emergency information accessible to people who are deaf or blind or visually impaired or hard of hearing.

Emergency information is not the same thing as EAS. In fact, it's important critical details about ongoing emergencies that may not trigger the EAS system. And this issue took on significance with the arrival of Hurricane Dorian and various concerns about the large population living in its potential path.

Some other areas that we were involved in this summer was working on issues related to

hearing aid compatibility rules and some upcoming deadlines in that area.

September 3rd, wireless providers must post on their websites expanded information about their handsets hearing aid compatibility capabilities and retain certain And bv October, wireless records. providers must file their annual certifications compliance with the FCC's hearing of compatibility rules. A number of other items dealing with the telecommunications relay services came out this summer. On June 28th, CGB establishing the released an order permeant compensation rates to be paid for all TRS for the period July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020. order also established the total size of the TRS fund for the year and the contribution factor.

And in August, we issued a series of public notices seeking comment on a number of applications to provide Internet protocol caption telephone service. Comments on those are upcoming as well.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And the deaf/blind equipment distribution program, in mid-June CGB released a public notice that announced the allocation of funding for the National Deaf/Blind Equipment Program for the 2019/2020 fund year. And also which provides \$10 million for this program, by the way. And later, we released a public notice announcing the two new providers in Kentucky and Illinois where the existing participants had exited the program.

There are some upcoming deadlines for video programing area as well. In June, the media bureau released a public notice inviting comment on Pluto TVs request for a temporary waiver of the rules requiring closed captioning of video programing on the Internet on certain platforms in which users can access Pluto TV's content. Those comments are due October 24th, and replies are due November 7th.

CGB also released a public notice inviting public comment on a petition for declaratory ruling and rulemaking filed by a

1	coalition of consumers and academic organizations
2	regarding the quality of live captioning and the
3	use of automatic speech recognition technology.
4	And comments on those are due October 15th and
5	replies October 30th.
6	And finally we have an upcoming
7	meeting of the Disability Advisory Committee
8	which is September 24th. And the agenda for that
9	will be you can find that on the DAC's webpage.
10	Those are just a few of the highlights, and thanks
11	for letting me address you this morning.
12	CHAIR POCIASK: Thank you, Diane.
13	MS. BERNSTEIN: Next, I'll turn it
14	over to Ed.
15	(Applause.)
16	CHAIR POCIASK: And now, we have Ed
17	Bartholme. He's the Associate Chief at Consumer
18	and Governmental Affairs Bureau.
19	MR. BARTHOLME: Good morning,
20	everybody. To start off, I want to, again, thank
21	you, just reiterate how much we appreciate the
22	time that you share with us, the effort you put

into the thoughtful recommendations that you pass. And I know that many of you have been active over the last three months and have put a lot of time into the recommendation that'll be considered later today. So thank you for that.

We did have a busy summer in outreach and education. On the outreach front, we conducted one of our FCC rural tours through the Midwest with stops in Minnesota and Wisconsin. And that was in later June. And I'm actually leaving with some colleagues this evening for our next rural tour, which is through Nebraska and Kansas. And we'll start tomorrow and run through Saturday.

Hopefully, in the future, we can maybe talk about scheduling one of these meetings right at the end of a rural tour as opposed to like the day before we leave so that we can share -- tell you how great it went while it's fresh on our minds, but the timing has worked out that way for the last two CAC meetings.

In June, we also fully launched our

2.1

Supermarket Outreach Program. So we've partnered with NAAC and in California and Las Vegas, we have done Train the Trainer events with some volunteers that staff, what they call Hope Booths.

And if you think of a normal grocery store where there's a customer service kiosk, they've sort of ripped out that kiosk and filled it with volunteers with educational literature and consumer information. And we work with them to train volunteers so that they can answer questions about robocalls. We make our materials available in those booths in four of the most commonly spoken Asian and Pacific Island languages as well as Spanish and English.

And as Diane shared, we had a successful Chairman's AAA Awards event also in June. Another area of focus on the outreach front for us over the last few months has been enhancing our engagement with libraries. So in June, we displayed and spoke at the ALA conference, which was here in D.C. this year.

We've done a series of webinars with reference librarians to cover important consumer topics like robocalls. We've also teed up and shared information with them about the broadcast transition and the thought that, you know, if you can't find your TV station, you might pop in the library and say, hey, what happened to channel three or four or whatever. So they'll be ready to answer questions and help people navigate that situation.

We did do some lifeline awareness week messaging in September. And we are actually working more closely with USAC to develop some educational materials on the National Verifier as it rolls out to more states. And thank you to Olivia for teeing up that relationship there. We appreciate that.

On the education front -- actually one more thing on outreach. We did start earlier this month a series of monthly partner outreach calls. So it's basically an open phone bridge. Outreach staff is sending out an email to everyone on our

outreach list. So if you're not getting them, let us know, we're happy to add you. We're going to cover a different consumer topic each month and share some other updates. So this past month, we talked about communicating during an emergency which was very timely given things that were happening. And then, talked about the upcoming rural tour and things along those lines.

Exciting education project that we launched over the summer is our scam glossary. So if you go to the Consumer Help Center, you can find the link to the scam glossary, and it an alphabetical catalogue of some of the more common phone scams. If anyone has a scam that starts with Q or Z, I would love to talk to you. We do still have a few letters missing. Maybe we can run some sort of contest, although I think scammers might pick up on that and get the wrong intonation there.

So we're -- we've got what we think is a pretty good catalogue of stuff. If you find stuff that you think is missing, please reach out

and let us know. And we're -- all of those are short of short blurbs, and they link to other more detailed content, most of which is on our site, some of it's on our colleagues at the FTC's site.

And I want to acknowledge our stellar summer intern, Gus Menny who was the project lead on that and helped us get that out the door. So thanks, Gus. We also launched a new series of Consumer Help Center posts that detail a scam, break it down and include actual scam audio. So we're really happy that we're able to now let consumers not only read through and understand the scam, but listen to the scam so they can hear how that call will start.

Following after the June workshop that I think Barbara mentioned, where IGA and Public Safety talked about emergency alerting, we really ramped up our language efforts around our emergency communication tips. So they are now available in English, Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Tagalog, Vietnamese, and French. And those are

all audio, 30 second and 60 second PSAs. all been uploaded to NAB's PSA site. We also proactively have started reaching out to state broadcasters that are potentially in the path of a storm to remind them that these exist, to tell them where they can find them, and they can grab and play the languages that are relevant in their community, even if it's English language broadcaster, they may find use for playing Spanish of other or some the languages based on the situation.

And I also want to acknowledge the efforts and partnership with our colleagues in DRO, because in addition to all of those languages and audio, we have an ASL video that shares those communication tips as well. So that community can benefit from that information also.

And today we are launching a consumer guide on phone port-out scams. This has been a very heavily covered in the news media over the summer. This is where people go into a cell phone service provider basically convince them that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

they're someone else and then get their phone transferred device in number to а their possession. This really plays on the rise and the two-factor authentications importance of financial access to accounts, social media There have been a number of stories accounts. where people have lost a significant amount of money as a result of this. So we've put out some consumer education to keep people on top of portout scams.

So we're educating people on how they can protect themselves. Another interesting thing that we've started to do over the summer is expand our printed materials to now include versions in Hmong. So that's another language where we've got some of our most popular scam guides that people can now order and we'll have at events as we travel. Since we met in June, I've also started to be more involved with our Consumer Complaints and Inquiries Division. I think I got that backwards, it's Consumer Inquiries and Complaints Division.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

But they are the people that staff the So when your call 888-CALLFCC, call centers. that's who you're talking to. They also take the online complaint forms that people submit through the fcc.gov/complaints. They are continuing to streamline internal processes as you all know, many of you have been on the CAC for a while. You've been instrumental in helping this CICD through staff to think changes, tweaks, welcome improvements. We that continued engagement, that continued interaction.

If you have ideas, if you have concerns, if you're hearing about things that you don't think we're covering from an education standpoint or that you think the complaint center might be hearing about, reach out. Let's have a conversation, and let's make sure that that's on our radar as well.

Stay in touch. If you're not already in touch, please reach out and get in touch. I know most everyone at the table, and I've enjoyed working with you, and I hope we can continue to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	do so. If you have events that we can support or
2	participate in, let us know. And if you have
3	ideas about future education topics, please let
4	us know. So thank you for your time this morning.
5	(Applause.)
6	CHAIR POCIASK: Thank you, Ed.
7	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: May I ask a
8	question?
9	CHAIR POCIASK: Yes, yes. Yes, just -
10	- yes, we're going to get questions at the end
11	
12	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Okay.
13	CHAIR POCIASK: but if you have a
14	quick one okay.
15	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Well, we could
16	he's going to start.
17	CHAIR POCIASK: Yes. Well, so let's
18	turn it over now to Zac Champ. He's the Chief of
19	Staff.
20	MR. CHAMP: Good morning, everyone.
21	My name is Zac Champ. Oh, I've got a placard,
22	nice. So you may not have met me in this capacity,

but I'm relatively new to the FCC, started this spring. I want to thank you all on the CAC for your time and effort and expertise.

A little bit about my role, just look at me as another point of entry to the Bureau. We heard great things from all of my colleagues about all the work they're doing. If you're a little confused where to go, who to reach out to, please see me as a resource for that. I'll make sure that you find the right folks if you're looking for meetings, those sorts of things in the Bureau, or if you have other questions about the FCC as a whole.

Beyond that, I just wanted to introduce myself. Thank you, again, for the work you're doing. Look at me as a resource, again. And as was mentioned, we are available for questions if you all have those. We're around, we can take those now as well.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. So yes, actually so now we have six speakers. So if you have questions on anything that's been presented

1 here, we have the experts in the room, we can 2 bring them forward. So all right. 3 Well, go ahead, Debra. VICE CHAIR BERLYN: I have a question 4 Calling Ed. So Ed, I'm interested in the 5 for Ed. 6 rural tour. And just wanted to know what you're 7 doing on the rural tour? And you know, are -maybe you can just tell us a little bit more about 8 9 --- I know your next one that you've got, but 10 maybe you can just tell us a little bit about 11 what you did on the previous rural tour? 12 MR. BARTHOLME: So it does involve a lot of driving. That might not surprise you. 13 14 (Laughter.) 15 MR. BARTHOLME: able We were identify a GPS inaccuracy when we were in Georgia 16 17 earlier this year that led us to a brick wall. And we were like, I don't know that that's a good 18 19 So lots of things. But mainly route to take. 20 what we try to do is reach out to and work with

partner organizations to establish local events

where we invite the community to come in. We talk

21

to them about pocketbook issues. As it might not surprise anyone, robocalls are a concern for people. So we hear about robocalls. And then we share with them ways they can protect themselves, things they can do, things that the FCC's doing to help protect them.

upcoming the tour that we're leaving on later today, we have some partner coordinated events. I don't think AARP is here this morning, probably because they're working hard to make sure this partner event we're doing with them is a success later this week. But we're doing an event with them on that'll also involve Wednesday the Nebraska Attorney General's Office, people from Nebraska Public Service Commission. And then on Saturday, we're doing an event with the Kansas Attorney General in Leavenworth, Kansas.

So things like that where we invite the community. And we do drop offs at libraries. So that's another reason why we work, you know, one of the things I did this summer was go to the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Association of Rural and Small Libraries to learn 1 2 more about how we can leverage those partnerships 3 and work with them to create events. It's a lot of interacting with, not 4 only consumers, but also local elected officials. 5 6 So hearing from the sort of local county run water 7 company about how scam phone calls are impacting them and their customers. 8 And then we bring all that back, share 9 it with Mark and the policy team and others here 10 11 in the building to try to inform the things that 12 we do moving forward. 13 VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you. So Ed, just to follow 14 CHAIR POCIASK: 15 up on that. So robocalls, of course, is the issue --- the one issue. But what are some of the other 16 17 issues that are being raised in -- that you see 18 sort of an area for more education and 19 outreach? 20 MR. BARTHOLME: Sure. So one of the things that we're definitely planning on covering 2.1

upcoming tour is the port-out

this

on

information. So that's a new thing for us to get some education out there about, and I think it's also for the small group of people that it is happening to, it can be incredibly impactful. So we want to make sure that people have tips on how to protect themselves from things like that.

We're going to cover other things about protecting your smartphone device, the FCC rules on slamming and cramming and what you can do if you think you've been a victim of that. We talk about the importance of the, you know, closing the digital divide and a host of other really pocketbook issues that affect people day to day.

And sometimes, it's one of those things where, and I -- many of you do this, but you get in a room and you've got a plan. And suddenly, the crowd takes everything in a totally different direction, and you're talking about the things that they are focused on and that they care about.

CHAIR POCIASK: Yes, yes, so I'm going

1	to go to Irene, but just to kind of go back on
2	that, you mentioned in your earlier presentation
3	that consumers have suffered losses as a result
4	of this porting scam. But if the carrier actually
5	is responsible for giving that call away to
6	someone else, who really should be liable for
7	that? I mean, is it
8	MR. BARTHOLME: So I am not going to
9	weigh in on liability. There are some
10	(Laughter.)
11	MR. BARTHOLME: the non-lawyer of
12	the bench can assess the liability question.
13	There's some active things going on out there
14	around that, and you can look into some articles
15	that have covered that.
16	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. So let me turn
17	it over to Irene Leech.
18	MEMBER LEECH: Ed, as you all are
19	doing your traveling, do you have anything set up
20	with the cooperative extension system and with
21	any of the local extension offices? Because
22	there should be one in every county you're

visiting.

MR. BARTHOLME: So we've worked with some of the coop providers, but I don't think we've worked -- and I realize there's a distinction there. I don't think we've worked with coop extension offices and that's a great flag for us as we're -- especially route planning and sort of just reaching out to get a sense of where we're going to be. And then also working with them to have events. So I thank you for that suggestion, and we'll definitely take that back.

MEMBER LEECH: Yes, because they can help you with finding locations for meetings as well as connecting -- because people in the community know them. And so as you're coming in, I would think that would be really good resource to look at.

And I wondered that audio of the scam, how are you letting educators who might be working with the public know that that's out there, and are there ways that you're being sure that consumers can access that, especially those

who may not use the Internet?

MR. BARTHOLME: So I'll ask for help on getting the word out. So they do exist. We started them in late August and the first week of September. We did two posts, one focuses on Medicare scam and what those sound like, and then Patrick actually did a blog post on some personal calls that came to his cell phone that were sort of different -- two different variants of a call back scam. So those are out there. We're adding more. We've got some SSA call audio that we're going to add to an existing SSA post that we did earlier this year.

So please help us spread the word. We're working with the Office of Media Relations to do, you know, social around this and to get the word out. You know, news coverage would also be helpful and that's something that we're coordinating with them to sort of push for a little more around these. But we would welcome your support in getting the word out as well.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. And Ed, we're

1	going to keep you in the chair for a little bit.
2	Shirley, you have a question?
3	MEMBER ROOKER: Ed, tell me, is there
4	really life after Call for Action?
5	MR. BARTHOLME: No, absolutely not.
6	(Laughter.)
7	MEMBER ROOKER: Anyway, it's nice to
8	see you here and an excellent presentation.
9	But what I wanted to ask you about is
10	if we can play, at Call for Action, some part in
11	helping you to get the message out through our
12	media offices, since we do have in Kansas and
13	where else are you going to? Wisconsin?
14	MR. BARTHOLME: And Nebraska on this
15	one.
16	MEMBER ROOKER: Oh, Nebraska?
17	MR. BARTHOLME: We did Wisconsin
18	before.
19	MEMBER ROOKER: Yes.
20	MR. BARTHOLME: And I did reach out to
21	Colin and other folks in Wisconsin
22	MEMBER ROOKER: Great.

1	MR. BARTHOLME: when we were going
2	through there.
3	But yes, I would welcome the help.
4	MEMBER ROOKER: Absolutely.
5	MR. BARTHOLME: And we should be
6	coordinating with you.
7	MEMBER ROOKER: We would be more than
8	happy to offer any help that we can. So anyway,
9	and thank you for an excellent presentation.
10	MR. BARTHOLME: Thank you.
11	CHAIR POCIASK: Thank you, Shirley.
12	Debra?
13	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Yes, I this is
14	repeating the same message, but I was just going
15	to say, Ed, that any organization that has access
16	to a membership should probably send out that
17	word that this is available. Because I think it
18	would be really great information.
19	MR. BARTHOLME: Yes, and you know,
20	another project we did over the summer was our
21	outreach team did sort of aggregate all of our

So we are going to be working on how do we leverage that better? How do we get things out through that network to better help promote and to better help plan activities and events?

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Yes, so anything we can do to help.

MR. BARTHOLME: Thank you.

CHAIR POCIASK: All right. Have another question.

This MEMBER LONG-DILLARD: is for anyone in relation to -- in CGB in relation to complaints, inquiries your consumer and complaints database. Is there some consideration about tracking? So say, the same person is filing complaints, but it could be over several years, couple years, or whatever, to track that person and the outcome of the situation? Because it could be within a different department within the So I'm looking to see tracking and the Bureau. outcome and how that's counted. That would be very helpful for those of us who are served with complaints.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MR. BARTHOLME: And we do internal
2	tracking on things like that, obviously. So you
3	know, if somebody submits a second complaint,
4	they're able to tie that back to that same
5	individual from previous complaints they've
6	reported.
7	But because of the sort of rules
8	around PII and things like that, that's not
9	something that we would as it pertains to an
10	individual would be able to make public. But it
11	is something that's done internally to ensure
12	that we're meeting needs and covering issues as
13	a program.
14	MEMBER LONG-DILLARD: Thank you.
15	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. Another
16	question?
17	MEMBER KOCH: Thank you, Steve.
18	Thank you, Ed, for your presentation.
19	Consumers often look to their state
20	legislators for help on these issues, even though
21	that's not really within the scope of what we do.
22	To what extent have you been able to reach out to

1 state legislators across the country through our organizations and let them know that you're 2 3 there, let them know their staffs, in particular, that these resources are there? Or if not, how 4 5 could we help? MR. BARTHOLME: Sure. I think I would 6 7 invite the how can we help. We have had some In Nebraska, we were able to success with that. 8 9 work with a state legislator who had pushed some 10 robocall related legislation through the Nebraska 11 state process. 12 And we would welcome that opportunity 13 in other places. We also do work pretty well with the public service and public utility commissions 14 15 which is our normal sort of touch point for and things like that at 16 referrals the state 17 level. MEMBER KOCH: And thanks, Ed. 18 And 19 just a follow up. Not so much legislation but 20 educating our staff on the consumer protection resources that are out there. 2.1

MR. BARTHOLME: Sure, sure.

MEMBER KOCH: And we can make sure we 1 the right place for this 2 get consumers to 3 information. MR. BARTHOLME: Right. 4 And I don't want to create the impression that we're working 5 6 with state legislators on legislation. My way of 7 using that example was that we were able to identify this individual because of their heavy 8 9 involvement on a robocall related bill. 10 was sort of a, hey, reach out to this person, let 11 them know we're coming to town. There's going to 12 be an event and then they can help work with us to do consumer education. 13 But yes, definitely to the extent that 14 should have a conversation about how that 15 would make sense to do that. 16 CHAIR POCIASK: Okay, well, thank you, 17 Eric. 18 19 So since we have Ed on the seat right 20 now, let me just check the phone lines to see if there's any questions. Anybody out there have a 21 22 question for Ed at this time?

1	(No audible response.)
2	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. Just just a
3	little bit of education for me. What exactly is
4	the AAA Awards event? I heard that mentioned and
5	I wasn't sure what that was.
6	MR. BARTHOLME: So this is probably
7	where yes, you want to take this one?
8	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay.
9	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Diane?
10	CHAIR POCIASK: All right, Diane
11	Burstein.
12	MS. BURSTEIN: Hi, thanks. It's an
13	annual event that's been going on for a couple of
14	years now where various different providers of
15	accessible equipment might, or services, might
16	apply and get recognized by the Commission for
17	their work in this area.
18	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. Was there
19	anything like notable like new initiatives, or
20	are these like equipment manufacturers and
21	service providers?
22	MS. BURSTEIN: Well, this year, there

1	Cisco was one where they had introduced an
2	Enterprise phone that was accessible to blind
3	people, I believe was the advancement there.
4	And then eye tracking technology,
5	which was a group of people who also had submitted
6	applications in that area.
7	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. That's very
8	helpful.
9	MS. BURSTEIN: Yes, it's great stuff.
10	CHAIR POCIASK: Yes, absolutely.
11	So we had six presentations. Were
12	there other questions that people had of the
13	earlier presenters? Anything else?
14	(No audible response.)
15	CHAIR POCIASK: Anyone online have a
16	question? Steve or Katie?
17	MEMBER HILDEBRAND: No.
18	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay.
19	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Can I say
20	something?
21	CHAIR POCIASK: Yes.
22	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: I just want to

1	thank the Bureau for giving us so much time today
2	and for the leadership you provide for consumers.
3	So thank you so much. Thank you all, great staff.
4	(Applause.)
5	CHAIR POCIASK: All right, so we're
6	back to a break time. So yes, so we'll be back
7	at 10:30. But come back early in case we start
8	early because we have a little bit of time here.
9	So, we'll see you then.
LO	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
L1	went off the record at 10:09 a.m. and resumed at
L2	10:31 a.m.)
L3	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay, well, let's get
L 4	started here in just a couple seconds. Everyone
L5	take a seat.
L6	First, let me just start with a couple
L7	administrative things. If does anyone need
L8	cups for water? I just wanted to make sure we
L9	have some bottles coming shortly.
20	Also, just a reminder, in addition to
21	raising your tent card if you have a question,
22	when you begin, please announce your name and

1	organization. It's sometimes helpful because we
2	are keeping a transcript just so we can follow
3	what's happening there.
4	Also, just another administrative
5	item, if, for some reason, you don't have an
6	agenda, it's on the back table if you want extra
7	copies. There's you might also find some of
8	the presentation PowerPoints back there as well.
9	So, if you want to grab that real quick.
10	Also, I just want to just stop as we
11	start here just to stop for a second now. I just
12	want to just thank Catherine Langston who's been
13	doing a lot of the planning to make things go
14	smoothly, the logistics, the food arrangements,
15	and things such as that.
16	So, Catherine, thank you very much for
17	doing that.
18	(APPLAUSE)
19	CHAIR POCIASK: So, let's start off
20	now.
21	So, we're going to get a presentation
22	here on the Ban on Malicious Caller ID Spoofing

1	and Foreign Robocalls. This will be a very good
2	presentation brought to you by Pam Arluk.
3	She's the Chief, Competition Policy
4	Division. So, Pam, it's over to you.
5	MS. ARLUK: Great, hi. Can everyone
6	hear me? Great. Okay, thank you. So, thanks,
7	everyone.
8	So, as everyone knows, robocalling has
9	been just a huge issue at the Commission and for
10	everyone. I think it's one that everyone can
11	relate to.
12	And, you know, American consumers, we
13	continue to be plagued by nefarious schemes that
14	manipulate caller identification information to
15	deceive people about the name and phone number of
16	the party that is calling in order to facilitate
17	fraudulent and harmful activities.
18	In just the first six months of 2019,
19	the Commission received over 35,000 consumer
20	complaints about caller ID spoofing. It's the
21	number one complaint that the FCC gets.
22	So, on August 5th, 2019, the

Commission released the second report and order that revised the Commission's Truth in Caller Identification rules to implement the amendments to Section 227(e) of the Communications Act which was adopted by Congress last year as part of the RAY BAUM's Act.

So, I mean, the main thing, the second report and order that we adopted in August, it's actually a pretty narrow order. It mainly -- it implements the amended Section 227(e) and it continues the Commission's multi-pronged approach to protecting American consumers from illegally spoofed robocalls.

The main thing that the order does is it revised the caller ID spoofing rules to cover communications that originate outside the United States directed at recipients within the United States.

So, those communications are now banned by the Truth in Caller ID rules. And then, the Commission expanded the scope of communications covered by the Truth in Caller ID

2.1

rules beyond the telecommunications services and interconnected VoIP services to include text messaging and alternative voice services such as one-way VoIP services.

And so, in doing that, the Commission revised -- one of the big things the Commission did was revised the definition of text message and, in doing so, the Commission adopted a definition that pretty much mirrors the statutory language of Section 227(e).

The Commission also clarifies that the definition of text messaging includes messages sent to or from a person or entity using common short codes. Short codes are a five or six digit codes, typically used by enterprises for communicating with consumers at high volume.

The Commission also incorporated the exclusions from the definition of text message from Section 227(e) which include a real-time two-way voice or video communications and a message sent over an IP-enabled messaging service to another user of the same messaging service

2.1

Τ	except for an SMS or MMS message.
2	The Commission also modified the
3	definition of voice services which was consistent
4	with the new statutory language.
5	So, for the purposes of the new Truth
6	in Caller ID rules, the Commission interpreted
7	the term voice service to be more expansive and
8	to include one-way VoIP services and any similar
9	IP-based or other technology-based calling
10	capability that furnishes voice communications to
11	an end user using resources from the North
12	American Numbering Plan or any successor to the
13	North American Numbering Plan adopted by the
14	Commission under Section 251(e)(1).
15	So, that is pretty much what we did in
16	August. If anyone has any questions, I am happy
17	to answer.
18	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay, let's open it up
19	then for questions. Anyone?
20	(NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE)
21	CHAIR POCIASK: Anyone on the phone?
22	(NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE)

1	CHAIR POCIASK: Well, I think that did
2	it.
3	MS. ARLUK: Great, awesome. Well,
4	thank you so much.
5	CHAIR POCIASK: Thank you, Pam.
6	(APPLAUSE)
7	CHAIR POCIASK: All right. So, we
8	have Karen Schroeder here? All right, so let's
9	just take two minutes if anyone wants to just
10	stretch or refill and we'll be right back.
11	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
12	went off the record at 10:39 a.m. and resumed at
13	10:39 a.m.)
14	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: You mic's not on
15	yet. Raise your hand.
16	MEMBER ROOKER: These are wonderful
17	words, you need to hear them. Good lord.
18	Now, there you go, okay. I just had
19	gotten an email the other day and it had to do
20	with where the calls are going what carriers
21	are being used.
22	And, it turns out that this survey by

the Transaction Network Services, I don't know 1 who they are, it's just something that I had 2 3 gotten and some information. Anyway, they said that we are now 4 5 receiving 200 million calls a day, consumers, a 6 Now, what the point I wanted to make was, 7 of the six major carriers, their survey says that the six major carriers provide 70 percent of the 8 9 service. But only 12 percent of these fraudulent calls are going through these major carriers. 10 11 they are hitting the So, smaller 12 carriers in other parts of the country where you 13 may also have a more vulnerable population. 14 Ι just thought that was very If anybody wants, I can send them a 15 interesting. link to the article. Does that startle anybody? 16 17 It startled me. CHAIR POCIASK: Yes, and, you know, 18 19 I'm not sure that even when a lot of the robo 20 blocking rules take effect that much of that will change because a lot of those are still on an old 21

POTs networks and not IP.

1	MEMBER ROOKER: Right, right. But
2	that's the point the article's making is how much
3	can we do with because the smaller carriers
4	are probably not going to have the resources to
5	put in place all the sophisticated technology
6	CHAIR POCIASK: Well, send the article
7	around, Transactions Network Services is a major
8	
9	MEMBER ROOKER: Are they a major
10	player?
11	CHAIR POCIASK: network. It's a
12	major network of like credit card transactions.
13	MEMBER ROOKER: Okay.
14	CHAIR POCIASK: So, that I don't
15	know what else they do but
16	MEMBER ROOKER: I thought it was I
17	thought the study was the survey was
18	fascinating.
19	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Yes, that would be
20	helpful to see that.
21	MEMBER ROOKER: You want to see it?
22	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Send it around.

1	MEMBER ROOKER: I'll send it to you,
2	Steve.
3	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Send it to Scott.
4	MEMBER ROOKER: I'll send it to Scott.
5	We send everything to Scott. Okay, I'll send you
6	the link to it, Scott.
7	MR. MARSHALL: Okay, great and I'll be
8	sure everybody gets it.
9	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay, okay. So, with
10	that, let's keep we'll just move ahead here.
11	So, we're going to hear now from Karen
12	Schroeder. We're going to hear a report on the
13	Deployment and Implementation of Call Blocking
14	and Caller ID Authentication. So, this is the
15	next big issue here for our working group.
16	MS. SCHROEDER: Hello, everyone.
17	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Hi.
18	(OFF MICROPHONE COMMENTS)
19	MR. MARSHALL: Can someone back in AV
20	board there could help? Steve or Jeff or Greg?
21	CHAIR POCIASK: Yes, we need help with
22	the slide deck.

1	MR. MARSHALL: Maybe they could help
2	with the deck. You shouldn't have to struggle
3	with it.
4	MS. SCHROEDER: Right, they put the
5	spotlight on me.
6	MR. MARSHALL: Sorry.
7	MS. SCHROEDER: No, it's all right,
8	I've dealt with things oops, something's
9	happening.
10	So, it's the presentation entitled
11	Call Blocking Report if anyone back there hears
12	me. Looks like this.
13	CHAIR POCIASK: There are a few copies
14	on the back table. Here we go. Now the much
15	awaited report.
16	MS. SCHROEDER: Good morning, sorry
17	for the confusion. I'm an attorney in the
18	Consumer Policy Division in CGB and I'm here to
19	talk about a call blocking report that I think
20	we're going to be asking you for some help with
21	which makes sense because it was originally your
22	idea.

So, CGB has been working on the first of two planned staff reports on call blocking. In June of this year, the Commission directed us to prepare these two reports in consultation with WCB, Wireline Competition Bureau and with Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau.

And, the purpose of the report is to study the implementation and effectiveness of blocking measures. And, as I said, the report is based, in part, on the CAC's recommendation regarding unwanted call blocking from September of 2017.

So, the report covers several topics. And, in red are the two that we think you might be able to help us with. The first of those is availability of call blocking solutions and the second is effectiveness of call blocking solutions.

The report also covers the impact of FCC actions, the deployment and impact of SHAKEN/STIR, the impact on 9-1-1 and public safety, and anything else, any other information

that may inform the Commission's analysis of the state of deployment of advanced methods and tools to eliminate illegal and unwanted calls.

So, we expect that we'll be working with you on a formal request for those two in red. But one of the things I was hoping to talk to you about today is, I'm going to go through each of these and get you started on thinking about what you might have to offer on any of them with an emphasis on the first two.

availability of call blocking So, solutions. We're wondering if the CAC has any data or other information on the availability of call blocking solutions offered to consumers, what solutions are available? Are they opt in or they opt out? Are they network level? third-party fees that charged for are the How many consumers are subscribing? solutions? Either in terms of proportion or a number? information on blocking just general call solutions that are out there.

And then, the effectiveness of those

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

solutions. Wondering if the CAC has data or anything on the number of -- total volume of robocalls transiting our phone system, how that number might be determined? We get different estimates of that from different sources.

How effective the solutions are at blocking illegal and unwanted calls? Does the solution send an intercept message for blocked calls? If so, how many does it send? What's the rate of false positives? What's the rate of false negatives? And, how many calls does the solution block?

And, the other areas that you may or may not have information on, is the impact of the FCC actions that we've taken to date. Back in November of 2017, we issued the call blocking order which allows the voice service providers to block calls in certain specific instances, namely Do Not Originate calls where the originator of the call has said, I only use this number to receive calls, I never send outbound calls.

Also blocking invalid, unallocated,

2.1

or unused numbers that can't be making calls. 1 We've also issued a declaratory ruling 2 3 back in June in the same item that produced the request to do this report that lets voice service 4 default people into call 5 providers blocking solutions so that people can opt out of them 6 rather than having to proactively opt into them. 7 So, we're wondering, you know, 8 9 effective were these measures? What's being done 10 in response to them? How is that going? 11 Another topic is the deployment and 12 impact of SHAKEN/STIR. We have an open rulemaking on this. We did an NPRM so that if -13 - suggesting that if voice service -- if the major 14 voice service providers haven't implemented by 15 the end of this year, we positioned to require 16 17 it. 18 We know industry has made progress on 19 SHAKEN/STIR and we're curious for an update on 20 the progress made. And then, very important impact on 9-21 22 1-1 services and public safety. We definitely

want to make sure that any call blocking does not 1 block calls to or from emergency numbers. That's 2 3 a critical area of public safety. So, we wanted to know if there's any 4 information on whether calls are being blocked in 5 6 error and then how that blocking is reported and resolved, hopefully, quickly. And, hopefully, 7 not at all, if it's at all quickly. 8 9 And then, what's happening with public safety entities? Are they experiencing unwanted 10 11 or illegal calls coming in that are interfering 12 with their mission? finally, if 13 And then, you have anything that I haven't already asked for that 14 may inform our analysis on this topic, we would, 15 of course, welcome it. 16 So, we're going to be issuing a public 17 notice to seek input on this. We're also probably 18 19 going to be asking you for your help, as I've mentioned. 20 We recognize that some of what we're 21 22 asking for is competitively sensitive. So,

1	anyone wants to aggregate information so it's not
2	attributed to specific organizations, we welcome
3	aggregated information, if that's the way we can
4	get it.
5	And, we're looking for both current
6	data and projected data through July 2020, if
7	it's available.
8	Does anyone have any questions?
9	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. So, let's open
10	it up. Do we have any questions in the room?
11	Shirley?
12	MEMBER ROOKER: I'm supposed to be on
13	that group that and, truthfully, I'm sitting
14	here listening to you and I'm thinking, I don't
15	have a clue where to start.
16	Does anybody else who's going to be on
17	this call can't even say it feel the say I
18	do as to how do we even start on something like
19	this?
20	I mean, to me, the questions that you
21	asked are the essential ones. But where does the
22	data come from? Where does the information come

1	from? How do you accumulate it? Those things
2	come to my mind when I'm sitting here listening
3	and thinking, these are the things that we need
4	to know but how in the world do we get it?
5	CHAIR POCIASK: Karen, do you have
6	thoughts on that?
7	MS. SCHROEDER: I have a few thoughts.
8	I confess, I had the same thought when I was
9	tasked with this.
10	MEMBER ROOKER: Thank you.
11	MS. SCHROEDER: We need to I
12	recognize that some of this data is difficult.
13	For example, the volume of robocalls across the
14	network. We just did a quick internal analysis
15	and you get numbers on that that are orders of
16	magnitude different, depending on what exactly
17	you call a robocall, what network you're looking
18	at, that you're going to get data from different
19	perspectives that's going to differ.
20	So, I think what we're probably going
21	to have to do with this report is gather the data
22	that we can find, recognizing that we're probably

not going to have a definitive answer for every 1 2 question. 3 What we can do is we can say that, you know, this industry group estimates this. 4 5 this industry group estimates this. And, 6 hoping that the public notice will give us a good 7 range of organizations responding with those different perspectives. And then, we can give 8 9 give different ranges and we can those 10 perspectives in the report. 11 CHAIR POCIASK: Shirley? 12 MEMBER ROOKER: Did you hear, by any 13 change, were you in the room when I was mentioning 14 earlier about study, survey by а а 15 Transaction Network Services that they found that receiving about 200 million 16 consumers are 17 And, that of those, robocalls a day? only 12 18 percent of them come from the top six carriers, 19 through the top six carriers. 20 They were saying that the majority of them come through the smaller carriers. 2.1

Now, I'm not that familiar with what

1	that actually means, but to my mind, it says it's
2	going to be awfully hard to get real information.
3	I sent Scott a link to the article
4	that I'm referring to, the survey. And, Steve
5	says that these this company is a known player
6	so that we can put some validity, Steve, would
7	you say that, to what they're saying?
8	CHAIR POCIASK: Well, yes, they're a
9	main player in
10	MEMBER ROOKER: Okay.
11	CHAIR POCIASK: credit card
12	transactions
13	MEMBER ROOKER: Okay.
14	CHAIR POCIASK: for like point of
15	sales and things like that. So, they have their
16	own they have a network. But I don't know the
17	
18	MEMBER ROOKER: Well, we don't know -
19	_
20	CHAIR POCIASK: methodology of the
21	survey but
22	MEMBER ROOKER: Right, we don't know

1	exactly how they came to all these figures. But
2	it was certainly startling to me when I saw it.
3	And, that's why I wanted to bring it to everyone's
4	attention today.
5	I've shared this with Scott and I'm
6	sure he can share it with you, Karen, just take
7	a look at it and see what you think about it.
8	MS. SCHROEDER: I'm familiar with TNS
9	and the report. I'm trying to remember how they
10	defined robocall because that's one of the not
11	all robocalls are bad.
12	MEMBER ROOKER: Right.
13	MS. SCHROEDER: If you get account
14	balance reminders, appointment reminders, things
15	like that.
16	MEMBER ROOKER: Let me see if they say
17	that.
18	MS. SCHROEDER: Things like that.
19	Those some organizations consider those to be
20	robocalls, others do not include wanted calls in
21	their data. So, that's part of that discrepancy
22	in the numbers I was telling you about.

1	MEMBER ROOKER: They say unwanted
2	robocalls.
3	MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.
4	MEMBER ROOKER: Now, I don't know how
5	they define that.
6	MS. SCHROEDER: That's a difficult one
7	to define.
8	MEMBER ROOKER: Well, actually they
9	talk about scam and fraud robocalls.
10	MS. SCHROEDER: So, scam and fraud can
11	be more narrow but, again, that is one of the
12	issues that we've been having with the data is
13	exactly
14	MEMBER ROOKER: I understand.
15	MS. SCHROEDER: what are you
16	measuring?
17	MEMBER ROOKER: Sure.
18	MS. SCHROEDER: Which is I can't
19	speak for the Commission's final determination on
20	this report. But in the past, what we've done is
21	give a range, give the different data points that
22	we get, what we know about what they're

1	measuring. And, that sheds some light on the
2	situation.
3	So, I think there's value in pursuing
4	this even if we don't get the answer.
5	MEMBER ROOKER: Oh, agreed.
6	MS. SCHROEDER: But I understand your
7	concern with how do you provide that information?
8	MEMBER ROOKER: Oh, I'm quite
9	interested in how we approach this.
10	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. Did we have
11	other questions?
12	(NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE)
13	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. So, and also,
14	was there anyone on the phone who has a question?
15	(NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE)
16	CHAIR POCIASK: So, with that, Karen,
17	thank you so much.
18	MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you all. I
19	really appreciate it.
20	(APPLAUSE)
21	MEMBER ROOKER: Thank you.
22	CHAIR POCIASK: So, is Kirk here?

1 Okay. (OFF MICROPHONE COMMENTS) 2 3 CHAIR POCIASK: Yes, so, we're -- yes, we're running early again. All right, so ---4 (OFF MICROPHONE COMMENTS) 5 6 CHAIR POCIASK: So, you know, while we 7 do that, yes, what I was saying is they're one of the major players that do the transactions for 8 credit card verification. 9 And, so, I'd 10 interested and look at the methodology to see the 11 extent that maybe the fraudulent calls are 12 actually going, you know, trying to make, you know, trying to make, you know, credit sales and 13 14 things such as that. MEMBER ROOKER: I don't know. 15 Τ haven't read it that much, I just saw it the other 16 17 day. And, I thought, gosh, a point we're going talking about It'd 18 be here. be 19 interesting to know what they're saying, 20 just read it. 21 And so, anyway, Scott can share it 22 with everyone and whether or not you want to read

1	it, that's up to you.
2	CHAIR POCIASK: Yes, Debbie?
3	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: So, I assume the
4	questions
5	MEMBER ROOKER: You're not on.
6	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: I'm not on? I
7	think I'm on now.
8	I assume the questions that the
9	working group will need to address will be
10	provided to them, you know, some of the issues
11	that the questions that she brought up will be
12	provided in a very specific way for the working
13	group so that they'll have that direction.
14	CHAIR POCIASK: Scott?
15	MR. MARSHALL: Yes, am I on here? Am
16	I on? I'll check, oh okay. Here we go.
17	Yes, we will the report topic is
18	not currently a working group, but will likely
19	become one. And, we are working on providing some
20	specifics on what the CAC could provide,
21	realizing that it may be a question of leveraging
22	information that our members or that some members

around the table here have that we certainly, we being CAC, don't have any independent research capability.

So, this afternoon at 1:30, there's going to be a group down the hall here in 402, 445, anybody that wants to talk about this, kick it around a little bit, you're welcome to do that.

The Caller ID Authentication Group has been already established. Many of you are on it.

And, that's a sort of a different topic than what we're talking about in the report.

Because what the Caller ID group has been charged to do, and there's specific language in your packet of what that charge is and the questions being asked is to look at what kind of consumer education challenges or strategies surround educating consumers about the implementation of SHAKEN/STIR.

when they see the SHAKEN/STIR symbol on the telephone screen, what does it mean exactly? And, well, I'll stop there. I have a story about an Uber driver who found out that I

1	work for FCC and went on to say, and this was
2	about a major carrier that was sending out
3	messages that meant nothing to him about whether
4	one said likely scam. Another one said block.
5	But those terms didn't mean anything.
6	So, one of the things that the Caller
7	ID Authentication Group, that's Michael and
8	Thaddeus, under their leadership, will be doing
9	is trying to figure out how to message all that.
10	Does that help?
11	MEMBER ROOKER: Yes.
12	MR. MARSHALL: Okay, cool.
13	MEMBER ROOKER: I know nothing, so
14	anything helps.
15	MR. MARSHALL: Oh, stop it. Now, stop
16	it.
17	CHAIR POCIASK: So, at 1:45, is the -
18	_
19	MR. MARSHALL: 1:30.
20	CHAIR POCIASK: Oh, 1:30 is
21	MR. MARSHALL: 1:30 these
22	CHAIR POCIASK: The Caller ID

1	Authentication will also
2	MR. MARSHALL: Well, the Caller ID
3	group, whether that makes it easier to say,
4	right?
5	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Yes.
6	MR. MARSHALL: That will meet here in
7	this room.
8	MEMBER ROOKER: I wasn't aware of
9	that.
LO	MR. MARSHALL: And, then, the
L1	discussion on the reporting requirements that
L2	Karen talked about
L3	CHAIR POCIASK: Is that a break out?
L 4	MR. MARSHALL: that's a break out
L5	session down the hall here. You go down the
L 6	corridor as if you're going outside and then 402,
L7	445.
L8	CHAIR POCIASK: What is it? What
L9	room?
20	MR. MARSHALL: Room 402, 445.
21	MEMBER ROOKER: Which one is going
22	down the hall and which one is staying here?

1	MR. MARSHALL: The Caller ID
2	Authentication is here.
3	MEMBER ROOKER: Okay.
4	MR. MARSHALL: And, the one that you
5	know you're on is here.
6	MEMBER ROOKER: That's it?
7	MR. MARSHALL: Yes.
8	CHAIR POCIASK: And, Karen's data
9	requirements then is the break out.
10	MR. MARSHALL: Discussion, that'll be
11	the break out and we'll show you where that room
12	is. It's very nearby.
13	MEMBER ROOKER: But the thing that
14	Karen just talked about?
15	CHAIR POCIASK: Yes.
16	MR. MARSHALL: Yes.
17	MEMBER ROOKER: But she just talked
18	about blocking and ID.
19	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: It's a discussion.
20	MR. MARSHALL: It's a discussion.
21	It's not a working group yet.
22	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: It's not a working

1	group.
2	MR. MARSHALL: It'll be to talk about
3	what Karen
4	CHAIR POCIASK: So, we may create a
5	new working group as a result of this?
6	MR. MARSHALL: Right.
7	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay? Yes, so the
8	MR. MARSHALL: There's too many
9	authentications in the room.
10	CHAIR POCIASK: Right, right. So
11	MR. MARSHALL: I understand it. I
12	understand perfectly.
13	CHAIR POCIASK: So, the current
14	working group the current ID working group
15	that will be here, they'll be kicking off because
16	they're under a tight deadline to move up
17	MR. MARSHALL: Yes, they are.
18	CHAIR POCIASK: and to report
19	potentially a recommendation by December.
20	MR. MARSHALL: And, they've got a
21	messaging task, really, to figure out how to
22	message what the little SHAKEN/STIR emblem,

1	whatever they use
2	MEMBER ROOKER: Let me just
3	MR. MARSHALL: means.
4	MEMBER ROOKER: I hate to be redundant
5	
6	MR. MARSHALL: Sure.
7	MEMBER ROOKER: but are you telling
8	me that the call blocking and caller ID
9	authentication, which is the other working group,
10	as I understand it or is going to be, I think
11	that's where I asked to be.
12	MR. MARSHALL: That's where you are.
13	MEMBER ROOKER: That's going to meet
14	today?
15	MR. MARSHALL: Here.
16	MEMBER ROOKER: At 1:30?
17	MR. MARSHALL: Yes, ma'am.
18	MEMBER ROOKER: And, how long are we
19	scheduled to meet?
20	MR. MARSHALL: From about 1:30 to
21	about 3:00. It's totally flexible in terms of
22	how much discussion you want to do. Part of the

1	activity will be to develop a work plan.
2	MEMBER ROOKER: Okay.
3	MR. MARSHALL: In terms of how much
4	time you want to spend on this topic and how many
5	meetings.
6	MEMBER ROOKER: And, who's leading
7	that?
8	MR. MARSHALL: The first speaker will
9	be Ed Bartholme who spoke earlier.
LO	MEMBER ROOKER: Well, he doesn't know
L1	anything.
L2	MR. MARSHALL: And, he's a
L3	(LAUGHTER)
L 4	MEMBER ROOKER: You can tell him I
L5	said that.
L6	MR. MARSHALL: And, who's actually
L7	leading that, it's Thaddeus and Michael.
L8	MEMBER ROOKER: So, he'll be here at
L9	1:30?
20	MR. MARSHALL: Ed will be back at
21	I promise you, yes.
22	MEMBER ROOKER: Okav.

1	CHAIR POCIASK: Right here.
2	MEMBER ROOKER: All right.
3	MR. MARSHALL: Yes, right here in this
4	very room.
5	MEMBER ROOKER: So, I just have to
6	make a change in my schedule of travel today.
7	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay.
8	MR. MARSHALL: Okay.
9	CHAIR POCIASK: And then, Karen's
10	issue will be in the break out.
11	MR. MARSHALL: Yes.
12	MEMBER ROOKER: Okay.
13	MR. MARSHALL: Does that help?
14	MEMBER ROOKER: No, but I'm still
15	yes, thank you. You remember now, you have to
16	keep it for the slowest people in the group.
17	MR. MARSHALL: Oh, stop it.
18	MEMBER ROOKER: So
19	CHAIR POCIASK: Yes, Matthew?
20	MR. MARSHALL: Hey, Matt. Somebody
21	just left the line, too, is what it sounds like
22	it.

1	CHAIR POCIASK: There you go.
2	MEMBER GERST: At the risk of asking
3	an ignorant question, I don't recall that this
4	afternoon's meetings were noticed. So, some of
5	us actually have conflicting arrangements. Was
6	this sent out, these meeting notices?
7	MR. MARSHALL: Yes.
8	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Yes.
9	MEMBER GERST: They were?
10	MR. MARSHALL: Yes.
11	MEMBER GERST: Does anybody
12	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: As part of the
13	agenda.
14	MR. MARSHALL: Right. As part of the
15	agenda. The in my cover, you know, email also,
16	talked about the break out groups. I'm sorry if
17	we didn't make the message clear enough. But
18	they, you know, certainly if you can't meet
19	make this meeting, there are others that will be
20	forthcoming, especially on the Caller ID
21	Authentication group. They're just getting
22	started today.

1	MEMBER GERST: Oh, I see. There was a
2	sentence that said
3	MR. MARSHALL: And, I forgot, there
4	was one member that couldn't attend is calling in
5	to the Caller ID Authentication group.
6	CHAIR POCIASK: All right. So
7	MR. MARSHALL: And, there's also a
8	mailing list for that Caller ID Authentication
9	group, the Caller ID group just like we have for
10	the phone CAC. And that will be that's
11	operational, too. And, we have sheet this
12	afternoon about how to post messages there as
13	well.
14	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay, so, if there's
15	nothing else, then, let's move ahead on the
16	agenda.
17	We're going to hear an update on
18	Digital Opportunity Data Collection and the
19	presenters will be Kirk Burgee, Chief of Staff
20	and Garnet Hanly, she's the Chief at Competition
21	Infrastructure Policy Division.
22	So, with that, let me turn it over to

1	those folks for the presentation. So, we need to
2	restart? Do you have a PowerPoint?
3	MR. BURGEE: No, we just
4	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay, good.
5	MR. BURGEE: Good morning, everyone.
6	So, we're going to talk about the item
7	that the Commission adopted on August 1st which
8	did a number of things. I'll be talking about
9	the fix side of that.
10	So, on August 1, as some of you, I'm
11	sure, know, the Commission released a report and
12	order and a further notice of proposed rulemaking
13	concerning broadband data collection.
14	So, one of the most significant
15	aspects of that was the creation of the Digital
16	Opportunity Data Collection which is a new
17	broadband deployment data collection separate
18	from the Form 477 data collection which will
19	continue to go on at least for the near future.
20	The Digital Opportunity Data
21	Collection will collect broadband deployment data
22	from all providers of fixed broadband deployment

services in the form of geospatial files which will show on a geographic basis the specific areas where they are providing coverage.

This is a change from what the Form 477 does which collects by census blocks which has its limitations as I'm sure many of you know. So, we see this as a significant improvement in terms of the granularity and the precision and the usefulness of the broadband deployment data that we'll be collecting.

Another aspect of the DODC is that we will establish a platform for the submission of data from stakeholders, including consumers and governmental entities who can dispute the deployment data that is submitted by providers. This is also a new feature that we think will greatly improve the quality of the data that we have available to make determinations about policy and we'll be available to the public as well.

The Universal Service Administrative

Company will be tasked with administering this

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

platform and much of the day to day work associated with the collection of the data and the reporting will be subject to the close supervision of the FCC in that process.

So, the initial filing in the DODC

will be six months after the FCC releases a public notice that the platform is available. Providers, filers will have an opportunity to file any time after that public notice. But not later than six months after the public notice.

And then, after that, providers will be obligated to report revisions that would affect the accuracy of their data on file within six months of any change that results in that.

And then, there will be an annual certification required every June 30 by every provider that will certify to the accuracy of their data as of the prior December 31st.

So, in the second further notice which was also adopted on August 1st, the FCC asked a lot of questions about how to implement this. One of the key features is whether or not we should

establish technical parameters for the submission of the deployment data. That is, should we specify how providers -- what they report based on features of their network or other technical specifications.

We also ask a number of questions about how to establish the consumer -- the crowd sourced platform that I referenced earlier. There's a number of issues surrounding how -- what would be the appropriate way to affect that.

And, the FCC is also looking at the next phase of deployment data which would be the establishment of a location fabric database which would establish a database that consists of every broadband serviceable location in the country. So, we would -- this would be a layer or ultimately be a layer of the broadband deployment data reporting that would establish where the locations actually are with geographic precision so that this would be ultimately added to the coverage reporting to establish a full picture of broadband deployment on the fixed side.

1	We also ask in the second further
2	notice whether what we should, at some point,
3	sunset the Form 477 deployment data reporting
4	once the DODC platform is up and running and
5	established as a useful tool.
6	So, comments on the issues raised in
7	the second further notice will be due on
8	September 23rd and reply comments will be due on
9	October 7th.
10	MS. HANLY: Good morning, everyone. A
11	couple familiar faces.
12	So, I'm going to talk a bit about the
13	mobile side in the August 1 item. So, in the
14	report and order section, the Commission decided
15	to take steps to improve some of the existing 477
16	collections. And, also, to eliminate some of the
17	data required that the Commission believed was
18	unnecessary.
19	So, first, the Commission had decided
20	that it was necessary to make clear that the
21	wireless speed data was no longer going to be

deemed confidential. So, it made clear that the

1	Commission would publish provider-specific
2	coverage maps on speed for and it would be
3	based on the technology used.
4	So, provider-specific maps with speed
5	and the coverage for LTE, GSM, CDMA, and 5G.
6	So, the in addition to that in the
7	report and order, the Commission recognized that
8	we were collecting some data on technology codes
9	that it deemed was no longer necessary like EVDO,
10	Rev-A, you know, various versions of 3G and so
11	forth.
12	And so, we streamlined that process.
13	We made clear that the service providers would
14	submit 5G NR which is the new technology for 5G.
15	And, R stands for new radio, LTE, CDMA-based,
16	GSM-based technologies.
17	So, there would be provider-specific
18	maps with speed for those different technologies.
19	In addition to that, in the report and
20	order, we the Commission took steps to provide
21	more granular data on subscriber data.
22	Previously, it was done at the state level. And,

the Commission decided it was necessary to have
more granular data.

And so, we're now going to require
that the service provider submit wireless data at

that the service provider submit wireless data at the census tract level. And, this will be based on the subscribers place of primary use for postpaid subscribers and that pre-paid subscribers will submit data based on the telephone number.

So, in addition, we -- the Commission decided that it was going to eliminate the collection of mobile retail availability data. Previously, service providers would submit a list of census tracts where they were offering service.

This was a requirement that had been in place for many years. And, really, it was somewhat duplicative of requiring the deployment data. So, the Commission decided it would eliminate this requirement and look more towards improving the deployment data.

So, in the further notice, the Commission did ask a lot of questions about

improving the collection of mobile coverage data.

The Commission decided it wasn't time yet to transition the mobile coverage data to the DODC or Digital Opportunity Data Collection Fund, as Kirk had described. There were still a lot of things that the Commission needed to understand.

You know, the Commission did Mobility
Fund Phase II, Universal Service Collection, and
it's still learning from that. And, we recognize
we probably needed to refresh the record on these
issues.

Given the complexities with collecting mobile coverage data, the Commission asked a lot of questions. In particular, it asked comments on standardizing the parameters for coverage maps. In the Mobility Fund Phase II Program, it did standardized parameters.

The Commission requested detailed information about what the industry and outside parties have learned from that process is to inform the Commission for future data collection and, you know, that the Commission, on an ongoing

2.1

1 basis should require. So, it asked a lot of questions about 2 3 It asked about the format, what kind of GIS polygon data it should request. 4 It also asked for questions about 5 whether the Commission could -- should consider 6 7 collecting infrastructure information, whether that would help provide more granularity for the 8 Commission in analyzing wireless coverage data. 9 10 And also, as Kirk had explained, the 11 Commission asked a lot of questions about what we 12 refer to as crowd sourcing data, whether it's, 13 you know, consumers doing speed test apps and submitting that data or whether it's drive tests 14 on the ground data. 15 On drive tests, we ask questions about 16 drone data and whether that would help enlighten 17 the Commission in better -- providing more 18 19 verification and accuracy of wireless coverage 20 data. The Commission had noted that after 21

the hurricanes in Puerto Rico, the Commission did

some drive testing and drone testing data, recognizing that drone testing data is new in the industry and, you know, it's especially helpful in areas where you can't take a car.

And, you know, there are some unique factors that the Commission needs to consider because of drone testing. But wanted to seek comment on those type of issues as, you know, a tool that the Commission could use to further verify accuracy of wireless coverage data.

In addition to the requests for information about improving wireless coverage data, the Commission also asked further questions about getting more granular subscriber data from service providers.

More specifically, the Commission asked about breaking out some of the subscriber data by, you know, who the service provider serves, enterprise, wholesale, government, prepaid, post-paid. So, the Commission sought comment on getting, you know, whether it should consider requiring some of that more detailed

subscriber data.

And then, finally, the Commission also sought comment about sun setting Form 477 data and transitioning it over to the Digital Opportunity Data Collection, similar to what Kirk had talked about that USAC is start -- well, it's putting up this new system to collect the fixed data.

So, those are some of the issues that the Commission both addressed in the report and order and teed up for further notice on wireless coverage data and subscriber data.

The comment cycle is the same for the mobile side as it is for fixed. So, I guess we're going to receive comments in the next week and a half. And, I think from the wireless bureau's perspective, we certainly encourage as much, you know, outside input on these issues.

We recognize, you know, wireless coverage data is extremely difficult because of the uniqueness of wireless, the fact that, you know, just even coverage and speed data can

1	differ depending on who's on the network, the
2	topography, when the leaves are the tree, it
3	could impact, you know, the speed and coverage
4	and so forth and signal strength.
5	So, we recognize there's a lot of
6	complexity with the probabilistic nature of
7	wireless and the networks. So, we encourage a
8	lot of input on that as the Commission moves
9	forward in, you know, setting new parameters
10	around collection of wireless coverage data.
11	So, that's all I have. And, open for
12	any questions that anyone has.
13	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay, thank you.
14	Well, wait, I have some questions.
15	MS. HANLY: Oh, sure.
16	CHAIR POCIASK: So, you mentioned the
17	speed accuracy issue like as it relates to
18	MS. HANLY: For wireless?
19	CHAIR POCIASK: For wireless.
20	MS. HANLY: Sure.
21	CHAIR POCIASK: And, I guess it could
22	be for other networks as it relates to that

1	are subject to congestion. How do you envision
2	something like that being reported? I mean, I
3	can tell you what my maximum might be, but if
4	everyone's hitting carriage return at the same
5	time, you know, the network, you know, slows
6	down.
7	And so, how do you what were you
8	thinking how would something like that work?
9	MS. HANLY: Well, currently, right
10	now, the requirement for the submission of speed
11	data is based on minimum average or expected
12	speed.
13	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay.
14	MS. HANLY: So, if parties have
15	suggestions of different ways that we should
16	better seek information from service providers on
17	how to calculate, you know, at the end of the
18	day, what consumers could reasonably expect in
19	terms of speed.
20	But to keep in mind, again, it's
21	nothing's going to be perfect when it comes to
22	the wireless because of the, you know, the

1	uniqueness of wireless and all the different
2	factors that could impact speed at certain times
3	of the day.
4	So, right now, again, we go back to
5	minimum advertised or expected speed, which is
6	what is currently required. And, if parties have
7	suggestions of better ways to get at what
8	consumers could reasonably expect and how we
9	should collect that information, then we
10	encourage folks to submit that to us.
11	CHAIR POCIASK: And, just a quick
12	follow up, too, and like in regard to small
13	providers, WISPs and others
14	MS. HANLY: Yes.
15	CHAIR POCIASK: are there
16	exemptions that say a certain size, is there
17	are they exempt from reporting requirements or
18	does everyone
19	MS. HANLY: Everyone has to submit.
20	CHAIR POCIASK: Everyone will, okay.
21	MS. HANLY: That's under current
22	requirements.

1	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. All right.
2	So, we have a question over here.
3	Irene?
4	MEMBER LEECH: As a consumer who has
5	to get broadband wirelessly, and that's the only
6	option, census tract is an awfully big
7	measurement level.
8	MS. HANLY: Are you talking about for
9	calculating subscriber data? Because that's for
10	subscriber data. Because the ultimate goal is,
11	if you have a coverage map that the map has the
12	capability to zoom in within addresses and so
13	forth.
14	But when I talked about census tract,
15	that was on subscriber data.
16	CHAIR POCIASK: So, it'll be block
17	level potentially?
18	MS. HANLY: Well, I mean so, again, I
19	think the ultimate goal is to have maps that could
20	zoom in within like if you have an address.
21	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay.
22	MS. HANLY: I mean, it's I mean,

1	currently, service providers have on their
2	websites maps that you typically can put in your
3	address and zoom in. And, I recognize your
4	smiling and saying, but you're not sure how
5	accurate those are.
6	MEMBER LEECH: Correct.
7	MS. HANLY: But then, that goes
8	towards
9	MEMBER LEECH: Based on my experience.
10	MS. HANLY: I recognize. And, the FCC
11	doesn't necessarily know the methodologies that
12	the service providers are implementing to create
13	those coverage maps. But the FCC has sought
14	comment on setting standardized parameters of the
15	methodologies that service providers will
16	implement to submit the shape files or polygon
17	GIS polygons that they will submit to us.
18	And, that might not necessarily
19	represent the same methodologies they use to
20	create the coverage maps on their websites.
21	So, we will decide the standardized
22	parameters and that's what we have sought comment

1	on.
2	CHAIR POCIASK: But it'll provide in
3	that manner, it'll provide a common format across
4	different providers so we can, you know, there's
5	basically, we're talking one definition one
6	language?
7	MS. HANLY: That's correct. We're
8	talking standardized methodologies. Because,
9	currently, under the 477 requirements
10	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay.
11	MS. HANLY: the service provider
12	has the discretion to decide the methodology of
13	how they submit the shape files to us. And, we
14	ask for a brief description of how they do it,
15	but they have the discretion right now. And, we
16	have sought comment on standardizing those
17	methodologies.
18	Because we recognize that is a way we
19	can improve the accuracy of the wireless maps.
20	CHAIR POCIASK: All right, thank you.
21	So, we have another question from

Vonda.

1	MEMBER LONG-DILLARD: Okay. I'd like,
2	if you could, please, describe to me more about
3	the DODC, the Digital Opportunity Data
4	Collection. You said geospacial and something
5	else. I'm very interested in a little bit more
6	about that, please?
7	MR. BURGEE: Okay. So, what the
8	providers will be submitting to the FCC are
9	essentially maps of coverage. So, it's a very
10	precise and specific method of conveying
11	coverage.
12	And, our intention is to make this
13	beg your pardon?
14	MEMBER ROOKER: I said that sounds
15	like it would be much better data.
16	MR. BURGEE: We think it will be. We
17	think it's going to be a big improvement in the
18	sense that you'll be able to look at the display
19	of the data and it will show you where coverage
20	is and isn't in a very specific way that isn't
21	available now.
22	MEMBER LONG-DILLARD: Using

1	satellites? Or, I'm aware about shape files and
2	census tract.
3	MR. BURGEE: It would shape files,
4	that's another way to say it.
5	MEMBER LONG-DILLARD: But using
6	satellite imagery or
7	MR. BURGEE: No, it's the providers
8	will determine the shape of their coverage based
9	on the characteristics of their networks. They
10	may use satellites in that process, satellite
11	information, but they will be based on the
12	information on the ground.
13	MEMBER LONG-DILLARD: Okay. I know
14	that there can be bleed over because sometimes if
15	someone's on the border, you as a service
16	provider may provide coverage to those people
17	over your border, network border.
18	So, but this, you all feel this will
19	be more accurate?
20	MR. BURGEE: Absolutely.
21	MEMBER LONG-DILLARD: Okay.
22	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. Irene, did you

1 want to get one in here? MEMBER LEECH: There are two more 2 3 things I wanted to ask about. With the -- we have what's known as fixed wireless. And, very often, 4 our speeds and so forth vary. 5 6 But it's not at all unusual for say, 7 10:30 in the morning in a very rural area or 10:00 to 11:00 at night, to be low times which makes no 8 9 sense to us because we don't think those are times 10 in the area that there would be lots of usage. 11 But just be aware that there are these 12 drops and it can go for 30 minutes to an hour. I don't know what's going on, but I know we can't 1.3 -- are having trouble with that. 14 15 The other thing, as you're talking about the maps, and with the wireless, I used to 16 17 be able to use my cell phone consistently on a 13-mile drive that now drops calls five or six 18 19 times in between there. 20 And, I think that whole area is shown as served and yet, it's not, you know, something 2.1

we can count on.

MS. HANLY: Sure. In regards to the, 1 you know, the --2 3 MEMBER LEECH: Time of day? MS. HANLY: -- the time of day issue 4 and so forth, I mean, so, we have -- we recognize 5 6 that having, you know, outside sources come in 7 and tell us where they think the coverage isn't accurate and so forth. 8 sought 9 So, we have comment on 10 utilizing crowd sourcing data. And, again, I say 11 crowd sourcing data, maybe it's more like a term 12 of art within the industry. But it's basically 13 getting input from whether it's local governments 14 or state governments submitting data saying, you know, this company's coverage data is inaccurate. 15 It says on their map on their website that they're 16 17 serving, but that's not consistent with what the 18 constituents are saying. 19 And, so, we are seeking comment having a process so that outside parties have an 20 2.1 opportunity to submit data to us indicating that

these coverage areas are inaccurate.

1	So, we recognize the things that
2	you're raising and we're seeking comment on how
3	to create a resource for third-parties to come in
4	and let us know where the coverage is inaccurate.
5	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. Let me see,
6	Johnny?
7	MEMBER KAMPIS: I was just kind of
8	curious what the map would look like. Would it
9	be a single map showing both wired and wireless?
10	Like if I punch in my address, is it going to
11	show me every provider that provides service
12	alphabetically by speed or what's the map or maps
13	going to look like?
14	MR. BURGEE: So, right now, the DODC
15	will just be the fixed side of the equation which
16	will include fixed wireless but it will be fixed
17	technologies.
18	We have there's a lot to be decided
19	about the map. We want to try to make as useful
20	as possible to as many stakeholders as we can.
21	I think the things you described, it's
22	pretty reasonable to think we would put those

1	features into it. But that's something we're
2	still looking at and working on right now.
3	CHAIR POCIASK: All right, Johnny,
4	does that help?
5	Is there anyone online that have any
6	questions? Anyone on the phone?
7	(NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE)
8	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay, well, thank you
9	very much. That was very informative.
10	Let me just ask you before you leave,
11	if you want to just wrap through what the
12	progression, the time deadlines are for, you
13	know, what's happening in terms of the notice.
14	It might be helpful just to get a
15	quick update on that before you leave.
16	MR. BURGEE: Sure. So, as I
17	mentioned, the comment deadline is coming up.
18	It's September 23rd. And, then, after that,
19	reply comments will be due on October 7.
20	There are no fixed time frames after
21	that that I'm aware of. We'll have to go through
22	a Paperwork Reduction Act process that will last

1	about six months I think.
2	MS. HANLY: Yes.
3	MR. BURGEE: And, we'll be working to
4	create these platforms and we're very interested
5	in doing it quickly, but there's quite a bit to
6	it. It's a very complicated process, as you can
7	probably imagine.
8	So, I'm afraid it's not as a most
9	satisfying answer, but we are trying to get it
10	done as quickly as we can.
11	CHAIR POCIASK: Thank you very much.
12	Thank you both.
13	Okay, is Lori here? Excellent. So,
14	now we're going to get an update on pending
15	legislation of interest to consumers.
16	So, our presenter today is Lori
17	Maarbjerg. She's with the Office of Legislative
18	Affairs. Lori?
19	MS. MAARBJERG: Hi.
20	CHAIR POCIASK: I'll turn it over to
21	you. I glanced ahead on this and this is a pretty
22	interesting slideshow. So, thank you for being

1 here.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

MS. MAARBJERG: Good morning. How's everybody? I'm great for a Monday morning. The sun is shining, it's still 90 degrees in Washington.

I'm from Legislative Affairs, as they said. deal with consumer and governmental I affairs bureaus, media bureau, and international bureau issues. So, my main focus is keeping track of what Congress is doing in helping congressional offices answer questions from their constituents when they have issues with the Commission.

And so, I'm here to talk to you about the consumer related bills. I'll go in great more specifics about the robocall bills, the Senate bill and the House bill. And, I also have in my slides information on all the privacy bills that are making their way around the Senate.

I know you all are probably interested in those. While they don't have as much to do with the FCC, there's a brief description of each

1	of them and I can give you some general background
2	on where they're at and what Congress is thinking
3	of doing in those areas.
4	But, first, we can talk about the
5	TRACED Act. So, this is the bill that Senator
6	Thune introduced. It has passed the Senate
7	pretty overwhelmingly, 97 to 1.
8	It is specific in that it requires the
9	FCC to implement SHAKEN/STIR, call
10	authentication, and that has to be done within 18
11	months.
12	We have to report to Congress on the
13	implementation within one year of enactment and
14	then we have to give Congress an assessment every
15	three years.
16	It would require the creation of an
17	interagency working group, so it would require
18	the FCC to work with other government officials
19	to come up with a way to that, again, just to
20	talk as an entire government of how to deal with
21	the robocall problems.

It also increases the forfeitures for

intentional violations. So, it would take the base forfeiture currently in the statute and, for intentional robocall violations would require an additional \$10,000 forfeiture on top of that.

The bill also increases the statute of limitations to three years for intentional robocall violations from the current one year statute of limitations. That would give the FCC more time to investigate and go after intentional robocallers.

It requires the FCC to start a rulemaking on spoofing protection within one year of enactment. And, requires the FCC to start a rulemaking on access to a number of resources within a 180 days of enactment.

And then, finally, there's an annual report on TCPA enforcement. So, the Senate bill, like I said, moved pretty quickly through the Senate and is currently awaiting -- we'll get to that, but the staffs are talking with each other.

Because they have to negotiate with the House side now. So, the House has their own

version of the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act. Again, it passed on suspension on the House back in July overwhelmingly, 429 to 3. So, it's a bipartisan effort, moved pretty quickly, again, once they figured out what they wanted to do.

It is a bit different than the Senate bill. As you can see, there's a few more bullets on this slide. They make us do a few more things, more reporting it seems.

But the -- one of the major differences between the two bills is that the House bill doesn't dictate what type of call authentication technology the Commission is required to implement. And so, they kept it more technology neutral. They wanted to give the FCC the ability to decide what would be best.

We would have to enact within one year. And then, require the providers to implement to consumers within six months after we establish our rules. So, it's along the same sort of time frame they believe as the Senate bill, just in a different way of getting there.

1	It requires the same interagency
2	working group creation. So, it's the language
3	is virtually identical, so that shouldn't be an
4	issue going forward.
5	It also increases the forfeitures for
6	intentional violations, similarly to the Senate
7	bill.
8	On statute of limitations, there's a
9	few differences here. The House bill gives a
10	three-year statute of limitation for general
11	robocall violations, and it gives a four-year
12	statute of limitation for intentional violations.
13	And then, it also provides at a four-
14	year statute of limitations for caller ID
15	spoofing violations, which is something that
16	would be helpful to the Enforcement Bureau here.
17	It requires annual reports on
18	enforcement, annual robocall report on the status
19	of private led efforts on trace back.
20	Requires the FCC to establish a
21	process to streamline voluntary information
22	sharing. And, requires us to take final action

within one year of enactment on free robocall blocking services. So, that's, again, a big difference between the House bill and the Senate bill.

And, requires the FCC to start a proceeding on one-ring scams within a 120 days of enactment. And, we have to report to Congress within one year.

So, those -- that's just -- those are the major sort of things. There might be a few other minor things here and there between the two bills. But, right now, the staffs are talking with one another, the Senate and House staff. So, they're trying to figure out how to move forward.

It was reported I think at the end of last week that they believe those talks are going well. Again, like I said, the biggest difference between these two bills is the requirement to, on the one hand on the Senate bill to implement SHAKEN/STIR having general versus а more requirement for the FCC to implement call authentication technology.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And so, it'll be interesting to see 1 what -- which way they end up going, if they're 2 3 going to get to a final agreement. of limitations, while it 4 Statute 5 shouldn't be an issue to resolve those given that 6 the Senate didn't have the same exact language, 7 they would have to work through those as well. So, we're kind of in a wait and see 8 mode to see where the staff come out and then, 9 10 ultimately, what type of language is going to 11 result that they might be able to act on. 12 There's great incentive for them to do They want to do it. So, we fully anticipate 13 it. that they're going to continue to work towards 14 that goal. But there's not any clear indication 15 of when that actually might happen. 16 17 All right. I know y'all wanted to talk about Senate privacy bills or just 18 19 privacy bills in general. So, I've taken a few 20 pages in my -- there's 12 Senate privacy bills.

And so, this, again, it's a big issue that

everybody is interested in.

21

While we here in legislative affairs, we're monitoring this, virtually all of these bills are pointed towards the FTC. There's not an FCC role here. So, we are just kind of in a monitoring situation where we keep track of them.

The reason why a lot of bills have been introduced is because there isn't one framework that they've settled on yet. Now, Senator Wicker, the Chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee is very interested in getting a national privacy frame work bill completed.

He has said in the past that he wanted to have a bill done and out for public consumption by Labor Day. But, again, at the end of last week, he's reported as saying that, well, they're probably not going to make that deadline. So, yet to be seen what is going to happen with that.

We have, you know, again, reporting indicates that they had a bipartisan working group of several Senators that had been earlier this year. They've held hearings and then, earlier this year before August recess, the talks

had then just resulted between Senator Wicker and Senator Cantwell. And so, they are trying to focus on getting a bill done.

I understand that Senator Cantwell wants to have a private right of action included in any bill. So, again, that might be one area where it would take a little bit of negotiating between the two sides.

Also, recently reported that Senator Blumenthal and Senator Moran are working on their own bill. So, they were part of the bigger working group earlier in the year and they are still working towards having something as well.

Again, like I said, I won't run through all of the specifics of all these bills because you have copies of it. But a lot of it just is focusing on notification to consumers, you know, a lot of the different bills, notification to consumers is the biggest issue, getting their consent as well.

Some of the bills talk about having the consumers right to get their data back and

delete their data. A lot of them talk about having options or preferences that consumers can establish for their privacy and their data online.

Like I said before, most -- virtually all of them, except for one, are going to be implemented by the FTC.

There is one that's towards the back here, the DASHBOARD Act. That one's the only one that's been referred to a different committee. It's been referred to the Senate Banking Committee because there's SEC rules involved as well. Because it's -- they're tying it back to how the data's being collected and how it's being used for profit. And so, that's why it's been referred to a different committee on the Senate side.

So, there's lots of activity on the Senate side. Many bills. We'll see how many of these different aspects -- I think everybody's introducing their own bill to kind of lay their marker down and to see if they can make it into

a larger framework bill that's being worked on. On the House side, not quite as much 2 3 So, we've got two bills, two major bills that are introduced. One of them is a companion 4 bill to one of the Senate bills, that's the -- I 5 6 can never say it -- the Clarke bill, we'll just 7 say H.R. 2231. So, that deals with the algorithms and 8 9 that's a companion bill to Senator Wyden's bill 10 in the Senate. 11 And then, the only other like major 12 privacy bill has been introduced by The, again, talks about 13 Representative Delbene. 14 opt in consent for the collection, storing, 15 processing, selling, or sharing of sensitive data. 16 17 Representative Delbene is not on the Energy and Commerce Committee where it's been 18 19 referred to. So, that might have an impact on 20 its -- on whether or not there will be hearings. But I think that's it. It's pretty 21 22 much what I have to say. Anybody have

1	questions?
2	CHAIR POCIASK: Questions, anyone?
3	(No audible response.)
4	CHAIR POCIASK: Online, on the phone,
5	any questions?
6	(No audible response.)
7	CHAIR POCIASK: So, the prospects, I
8	mean, there's a lot of things out there but, I
9	mean, it doesn't look like much will happen this
10	year.
11	MS. MAARBJERG: They want well,
12	they want to do a bill. So, but again, the time
13	line, given that Senator Wicker said that his
14	time line has kind of shifted, so he's not going
15	to make his original goal of Labor Day. Unclear
16	as to when they'll they might have something
17	done.
18	But there's a lot of Senators who are
19	very interested and so they'll keep on pushing.
20	But not clear.
21	CHAIR POCIASK: Great, thank you for
22	the update. Anyone else? Any questions?

1	(No audible response.)
2	CHAIR POCIASK: Lori, thank you so
3	much.
4	MS. MAARBJERG: Thanks.
5	(Applause.)
6	MR. MARSHALL: Thank you very much.
7	CHAIR POCIASK: All right, so let's
8	turn our attention to the next item on the agenda.
9	So, what we'll hear now is an update
10	on the Electronic Comment Filing System, ECFS and
11	its redesign. The presenter will be Marlene
12	Dortch. Is it Sheryl or Marlene?
13	MS. DORTCH: It's Marlene.
14	CHAIR POCIASK: Marlene? Okay.
15	Marlene Dortch, how about that?
16	It seems like I write to you so many
17	times but
18	MS. DORTCH: I know, I'm so popular.
19	CHAIR POCIASK: So, all right.
20	(Off-microphone comments.)
21	CHAIR POCIASK: So, she's on the
22	redevelopment team. So, all right, well, thank

1	you Marlene. I'm glad you could come.
2	MS. DORTCH: So, thank you. I feel so
3	special, I'm excited to be here, too.
4	So, I'm here to talk to you today
5	about what's new with the Commission's Electronic
6	Comment Filing System. And, I also have here with
7	me today Sheryl Segal who is the Associate
8	Secretary for Information Resources.
9	So, for those who I'm not sure who
10	is or is not familiar with the Electronic Comment
11	Filing System, or ECFS, as we call it here at the
12	FCC.
13	But it's actually just what it says,
14	the Comment Filing System. And that allows
15	people to submit comments electronically to the
16	FCC. And it's also used internally as well by
17	the bureaus and offices here at the Commission to
18	access filings before the Commission.
19	So, previously, we've upgraded the
20	system. But this time, we are actually going to
21	create a newly developed system. So, it will be
22	tailored to current concerns and issues. And so,

1	rather than just upgrading something that's old,
2	we're going to redevelop a brand to develop a
3	brand new system. And, we're really excited
4	about that opportunity because that really is
5	what it is, a great opportunity to use technology
6	to develop a new system.
7	So, what you can do with ECFS, for
8	searching databases, for filings within
9	proceedings, you know, we're going to improve
10	with the current demands.
11	And so, we think that this will be a
12	significant upgrade from where we are currently.
13	So, even though we are fixing some of
14	the issues that occur, right now, our focus is on
15	developing a brand new system.
16	So, where are we? So, for the last
17	year or so, the Office of the Secretary, the
18	Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau and
19	Information Technology, we've collaborated in
20	what we call our discovery phase.
21	And it's really a term of art for
22	analyzing and documenting in detail all the

1 things that we use ECFS for to accomplish our work here at the FCC. 2 3 So, that includes all the bureaus and offices here in the Commission and we've worked 4 5 together to kind of incorporate any suggestions 6 and to make sure that we document how people 7 internally use the system. And, we've incorporated all of those 8 processes and suggestions. We've included the 9 10 Inspector General's Office, the General 11 Accountability Office, and really had a clear 12 understanding of our core functions. 13 So, that's -- we can make sure that we 14 have everything incorporated in the new system. 15 So, and that has, you know, taken an extended amount of time. So, where we are now in 16 17 discovery is we're working on our second phase. And, that includes our external stakeholders. 18 19 And so, once we've completed 20 determining all those issues with the external 2.1 stakeholders, we think we will have a system that would allow us to best serve the public. 22

So, what types of improvements have we already thought about? So, we focused on various areas. There's the authentication and roles. And so, that would be similar to like a commercial user, like online shopping where a user can interact with the system, either as a registered user or as a quest.

The idea being it will be convenient for people who frequently file, but would also not require those people who aren't -- really don't want to register. So, making it convenient for all types of users.

Security of incoming filings and processes. We plan to use CAPTCHA or something similar, a software to distinguish from machine input or spam in ECFS which has happened in the past. And so, we're looking to make sure that we avoid those types of issues that have happened in the past and to keep pace with technology.

We also have looked at the petition for rulemaking and docket creation, docketed and nondocketed filing process, how we can make those

processes easier for both internal and external users and much more automated than it has been in the past.

And, another area we've looked at is reporting and analytics. They're -- we have a lot of data and valuable data in our system. And so, how can we provide software that's used to access that data in a way that makes it easier to offload and so that internal and external users can more easily, you know, analyze the data according to whatever needs you have.

I think our idea basically is, how can we make it more user friendly with this data that we collect every day?

So, how do we plan on doing external outreach? While we will be hosting in October and early November a roundtable session, several roundtable sessions because we really do value the input from external stakeholders. And we want to have a comprehensive approach, and so we need your feedback to help us make the system the best it can be.

2.1

1	And, we want it to be as helpful as
2	possible and so we need your input to do that.
3	So, if you are interested in attending a
4	roundtable session, we would love to hear from
5	you and we're here today to take any suggestions
6	or questions that you might have.
7	So, thank you.
8	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. Do we have any
9	questions from the floor here?
10	Johnny?
11	MEMBER KAMPIS: I was going to say if
12	you're doing the security, I don't know if this
13	counts as CAPTCHA or not, but you're doing a thing
14	where you've got to identify the cars in the
15	photos, don't do that. It's always like, is that
16	a car in the background? Those things are
17	impossible.
18	MS. DORTCH: I know what you mean.
19	CHAIR POCIASK: Anyone else in the
20	room? Anyone on the phone, any questions?
21	(Off-microphone comments.)
22	CHAIR POCIASK: Yes? Yes. Yes,

1	identify yourself, please.
2	MR. MAKE: Hi, everyone, I'm Jonathan
3	Make in the Communications Daily. Obviously,
4	we're, you know
5	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: We can't hear you.
6	MR. MAKE: Hi, everyone, Jonathan Make
7	at Communications Daily. Obviously, we're always
8	interested in ECFS enhancements.
9	I just wanted to ask Marlene or
10	Sheryl, when you talk about automation, could
11	that also or will that likely also include OIOA
12	filings to be posted more in real time like EDGAR
13	is an example at the SEC where there doesn't
14	necessarily have to be staff intervention, staff
15	can still see the filings and, you know,
16	manipulate and sort them but don't necessarily
17	need to, you know, trigger them to be posted. So,
18	I was just curious about that.
19	CHAIR POCIASK: So, the redesign
20	about the redesign, you know, will things be
21	posted? I mean, how will that, more timely, how
22	will that be affected?

1	MS. DORTCH: I appreciate your input
2	and I didn't quite hear exactly what you said,
3	but I know that that is something that we do now.
4	And that we will definitely take down what you've
5	said and make sure that we consider that in our
6	development process.
7	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay.
8	MS. DORTCH: So, we do have currently
9	we have a two-hour delay. And, the delay is for
10	support to those who do file to make sure that we
11	post what is accurate.
12	So, yes, sometimes, a filer may have
13	made a mistake. Sometimes, every now and then,
14	so we want to make sure that we are timely, but
15	that it gives the filer the opportunity to file
16	what they intend to file.
17	CHAIR POCIASK: So, there's a buffer
18	there.
19	MS. DORTCH: Right.
20	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay, Christina, you
21	have a
22	MS. CLEARWATER: Oh, ves. Marlene, is

1	this on? Yes. So, my question to you is about
2	the consideration of a verification process so
3	that, are you guys considering looking at any
4	kind of enhanced verification process so that
5	there is a way to authenticate that the filer is
6	actually the filer of the particular document?
7	Are you guys exploring that at all?
8	MS. DORTCH: Yes, we have, if you want
9	to elaborate on the technology?
10	MS. SEGAL: There's a balance between
11	authentication and free allowing people to
12	freely file without having a chilling effect.
13	So, we have to be careful not to inhibit people
14	from filing and that sometimes means that we get
15	filings that are perhaps frivolous, to be kind.
16	And, we rely on the discretion of the
17	attorneys who analyze the incoming filings to
18	differentiate. But we also are looking at the -
19	- we are hoping that the roles that we establish
20	will help minimize those kinds of filings.
21	MS. CLEARWATER: Thank you.
22	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. Vonda, do you

1	have a question?
2	MEMBER LONG-DILLARD: Hi, this relates
3	to searchability. Do you expect improvements to,
4	say, you know, Rulemaking can be extremely long,
5	over a year's time.
6	So, if something if one pulls up,
7	you know, an order or an NPRM and an FMPRM, and
8	it goes back, so they know the most current one,
9	but it may have started, say, in 1998. Will there
10	be some kind of branch association with all of
11	this?
12	I'm not speaking to the comments,
13	because that would be extremely difficult. But
14	just associate a given rulemaking documents that
15	the FCC releases would be great, all of them.
16	MS. DORTCH: Thank you for that
17	suggestion.
18	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay.
19	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Steve, I've got a
20	
21	CHAIR POCIASK: Yes.
22	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: I think my

1	question was even more basic than that, Vonda.
2	Mine was just am I on?
3	CHAIR POCIASK: No.
4	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: No, I'm not on.
5	CHAIR POCIASK: There you go.
6	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Now I'm on.
7	My question was even more basic about
8	improving the search capabilities. And, I didn't
9	know if that was part of what you were also
10	working on was helping consumers to be able to
11	search for filings and by subject matter, which
12	is sometimes very challenging. So, I wasn't sure
13	if that was part of this as well.
14	MS. DORTCH: Again, thank you for the
15	suggestion. Yes, that is what we are looking at
16	how we can use technology now that, you know,
17	before we did the best we could with what we had.
18	So, I think with technology now, we can certainly
19	improve on our search capabilities and that is
20	one of the major focuses of what we hope to do
21	with this new system.

CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. We have another

1	question? Yeah.
2	MEMBER WEIN: Hi, Olivia Wein,
3	National Consumer Law Center.
4	I just wanted to know a little bit
5	more about the next step processes. So, if groups
6	or stakeholders were interested in providing
7	input and sort of what are these entry points?
8	So, will there be a notice sent out
9	about the October, November roundtables? Will
10	there be particular questions you're interested
11	in feedback on?
12	And then, sort of post roundtable
13	discussions if there are outside groups that
14	would like to provide some input. What would be
15	their best avenue into providing them, you know?
16	MS. DORTCH: I think our next phase is
17	the external stakeholder meetings. And, we will
18	be sending out invitations to external groups who
19	are and if you are interested, please let us
20	know and we will make sure that we reach out to
21	you specifically.

And, that's our next phase. And, as

1	each as we move forward, we will determine
2	what the phase after that will look like. So,
3	but in each process, making sure that we get input
4	from as many people as possible, groups as
5	possible.
6	CHAIR POCIASK: Yes, thank you,
7	Olivia. Just Scott?
8	MR. MARSHALL: Yes, it's Scott
9	Marshall.
10	And, I'm here hopefully. Marlene, we
11	have an electronic distribution list for CAC.
12	So, if you have a notice about these external
13	meetings that you're inviting people to, I'd be
14	happy to send it out.
15	It would not be a CAC activity because
16	we have to, as you probably know, post in the
17	Federal Register when we meet and all the rest of
18	that stuff.
19	CHAIR POCIASK: It's informational.
20	MR. MARSHALL: As you well know, but
21	it's informational and individual members of the
22	CAC can, as they have done in the past,

Τ	participate in roundtables and provide you with
2	the information you need and do it quite quickly.
3	MS. DORTCH: Thank you, that's very
4	helpful.
5	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. So, just let me
6	check the phone if there's any questions?
7	(No audible response.)
8	CHAIR POCIASK: And, hearing none,
9	thank you Marlene and Sheryl. I appreciate you
10	coming out and giving us an update on that.
11	MS. DORTCH: Thank you and thank you
12	for your input.
13	(Applause.)
14	CHAIR POCIASK: So, we have another
15	item here on our agenda is the consideration of
16	robocall blocking recommendation.
17	Before I turn it over to Brain Young,
18	Sam's not here today, so it'll be up you. But I
19	just wanted to note, again, up front that the
20	Robocall Working Group has done an incredible
21	job, put in a lot of hard work, two calls a week.
22	Just been a dedicated effort to meet

1	a very, very short timeline and thanks to
2	everyone in that working group for contributing
3	and participating and work.
4	And, thank you and Sam for the
5	leadership in getting this done. So, we've come
6	up with a the working group has come up with
7	a recommendation on the robocall blocking.
8	And so, at this time, let me call on
9	Brian Young to explain the recommendation to the
10	CAC.
11	MR. MARSHALL: And, Brian will also
12	move adoption for the working group and we'll
13	need a second to get discussion started.
14	MEMBER YOUNG: There we go. Thank you
15	for those am I on? Yes. Thank you for those
16	kind words, Steve.
17	Good afternoon, as Steve mentioned Sam
18	is unavailable to join. He's in London
19	experiencing some technical difficulties in
20	joining the bridge.
21	But the Robocall Working Group was
22	tasked with determining how consumers should be

educated about the types of calls that may be blocked, how providers could notify consumers that calls have been blocked, what types of calls should be included on the critical calls list, and how the Commission should define outbound numbers of 9-1-1 call centers.

Now, over a period of eight weeks, the working group met 11 times and solicited feedback from several CAC members that were not serving on our working group to ensure that all perspectives could be included in this document.

Now, you all have the recommendation in front of you so I won't bore you by going through it line by line. But generally, our recommendation suggests that service providers clearly disclose the types of calls that can be blocked as well as the risks that a legitimate call could be blocked as well.

Now, this information should be followed with clear instructions on how to opt out if the consumer should choose to do so.

Similarly, the recommendation

2.1

suggests that consumers should be able to manage their choices through a customer portal of some sort via trained store employees or other options that are provided by the provider.

The recommendation also suggests that once the opt out program is introduced, that consumers should be notified of its presence at the point of sale, in consumer bills, online, by mail, as well as other means that the provider chooses.

The recommendation also suggests that consumers should be appropriately notified when a call is blocked and have access to a blocked call log or a similar tool that consumers can access at will to find out if calls intended for them are indeed blocked.

Similarly, the recommendation states that consumers should have options to easily report numbers that have been erroneously blocked.

Now, the working group felt the FCC has a role to play in educating consumers. As

such, the Commission should collaborate with the Federal Trade Commission, consumer groups, industry, state attorneys generals, libraries, broadcasters, as well as to utilize social media methods to help ensure that the word is getting pushed out about the types of options consumers have as well as the rights to opt out if they should choose to do so.

After much deliberation, the working group determined that critical call lists should possible remain as narrow as and include numbers only with a few carefully government considered exemptions for genuine emergency calls.

The list should include outbound numbers employed by public safety answering the backup PSAP points, or PSAP well as as Department Homeland numbers, FEMA, the of Security, as well as all government numbers used to make emergency calls regarding threats to physical safety or that are needed for benefits and government services.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	We believe that the list should be
2	reviewed periodically and to add new numbers and
3	to remove redundant numbers.
4	During the review process, we urge the
5	Commission to remember that the FCC is to remain
6	cognizant to that as the lists the size of the
7	list increases as does its potential to become
8	more vulnerable to fraud and abuse.
9	Further, it is our suggestions that
10	the operators of the critical calls list should
11	rely on emergency entities themselves to report
12	the relevant numbers back to the database and
13	then that the database operator must employ a
14	vetting process to ensure that the numbers fall
15	into one of the categories I listed above.
16	And, that, in brief, is our
17	recommendation. So, are there any questions?
18	CHAIR POCIASK: Well, before we do
19	that, the working group should move to adopt
20	them.
21	MEMBER YOUNG: And, with that, I move
22	to that the full CAC adopt the recommendations.

1	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay, now, we have a
2	second?
3	MEMBER UMANSKY: Second.
4	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay, with that, now
5	let's open it up for questions, discussions, and
6	amendments or whatever, if we're ready to go.
7	Anyone have any questions?
8	(No audible response.)
9	CHAIR POCIASK: Or any discussion?
10	This is well vetted I think.
11	Anyone on the call still?
12	(No audible response.)
13	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay.
14	MEMBER HILDEBRAND: No questions.
15	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay, no questions, no
16	discussion, no amendments?
17	(No audible response.)
18	CHAIR POCIASK: Shall we call for a
19	vote?
20	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Call for a vote.
21	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay, So, with
22	that, do we yes, all in favor, say aye.

1	(Chorus of aye.)
2	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. Those opposed,
3	nay?
4	(No audible response.)
5	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. And,
6	abstentions? Any abstentions?
7	(No audible response.)
8	CHAIR POCIASK: Unanimous.
9	(Applause.)
10	CHAIR POCIASK: Wow, so with that
11	MR. MARSHALL: Congratulations,
12	everybody.
13	CHAIR POCIASK: Yes, so, with that
14	then, we have adopted the recommendation that had
15	come out of the Robocall Block Working Group.
16	And, that recommendation will be I will file,
17	you know, with the FCC and send it to the
18	Commissioners for their attention.
19	So, thank you everyone for your hard
20	work.
21	Before I do anything else, let me just
22	give Debbie the microphone for a second.

VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Yes. I'm glad I can say this after it passed unanimously rather than during the discussion time, I just want to pour many accolades on this working group for all the hard work that went into producing an excellent document in record time.

It was a group effort but I also want to thank my colleague, Brian Young, National Consumers League Alternate on this working group for stepping up and leading and ably partnered with Sam for this great effort.

So, you know, thank you so much, Brian. Sam's not here today to also get the thanks, but thank you so much for everything that you did to make this a superb effort.

You know, I also want to thank a couple of other members of the working group who participated with writing drafts and, you know, stepped up to volunteer to do that. So, it was a great group effort. So, thank you everyone in this working group for the great product that you produced.

1	CHAIR POCIASK: Yes.
2	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: It's honestly
3	wonderful, so thank you.
4	CHAIR POCIASK: Here, here.
5	(Applause.)
6	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: And a great
7	presentation, yes. Thank you, well done.
8	CHAIR POCIASK: Yes, thanks so much.
9	So, with that, as we wrap up, I just
10	want to, first, let me just open it up, see if
11	there's any comments from the public.
12	(No audible response.)
13	CHAIR POCIASK: And, hearing none, let
14	me just note that the CAC next meeting will be
15	December 9th. Okay, and just a reminder as well,
16	that at 1:30, we'll have a private working group
17	meeting on the call authentication issue as well
18	as the robocall reporting requirements.
19	So, the authentication ID will be in
20	this room. Okay? And then, the robocall
21	reporting requirements will be in Conference Room
22	C, 402, 445.

1	MR. MARSHALL: And I will show you
2	where it is.
3	CHAIR POCIASK: So, and, I'll have an
4	announcement in just a second, but, yes, Steven?
5	MEMBER MORRIS: Just one question
6	about the possible new working group. Will there
7	be a process for volunteering? If I can't go to
8	the meeting you're having at 1:30.
9	CHAIR POCIASK: Yes. The answer is
10	yes, there will be a process for volunteering for
11	that.
12	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: What is the
13	determination for whether or not that becomes a
14	working group?
15	CHAIR POCIASK: I'll let you do that.
16	MR. MARSHALL: Okay, sure, sure. I
17	think it will become a working group. As we did
18	for the previous two working groups, Patrick will
19	send you and Steve a letter with the charge, with
20	the questions to be considered for the working
21	group. And, I think you should have that probably
22	this week. It's in the works.

1	And then, we will go on to do the
2	volunteer solicitation
3	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: I see. Got it.
4	MR. MARSHALL: for whether people
5	want to work on that group or not.
6	But the other group, the caller ID
7	group, that's already established, ready to go
8	and has its 13 members, that's as many as we can
9	have on a working group, by the way.
10	And they're going to launch today.
11	But, and we'll get the other group up and running
12	as quickly as possible and the idea there also is
13	to ideally have a recommendation of for the
14	December 9th meeting.
15	But we realize that may not be
16	possible, but that's the goal.
17	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay.
18	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Okay. Michael has
19	a question.
20	CHAIR POCIASK: Michael?
21	MR. MARSHALL: One of the co-chairs of
22	the caller ID group. Hi, Michael.

1	MEMBER SANTORELLI: Okay, well, thank
2	you.
3	So, Thaddeus and I are co-chairs of
4	the working group as was mentioned. First of all,
5	we look forward to hopefully hearing from Brian
6	and Sam offline as to best practices for getting
7	this done because I think we have a similarly
8	compressed timeline.
9	But we were just curious as if it
10	makes sense to maybe see who in our working group
11	is planning to join us today, just given the
12	confusion around the meeting time, wondering if
13	folks could indicate if they were planning to
14	stay.
15	And, if we don't have a
16	CHAIR POCIASK: Yes, a show of hands.
17	Let's do that.
18	MR. MARSHALL: You also have one
19	person who's going to be calling in on the phone
20	that I'm aware of.
21	MEMBER SANTORELLI: Okay, great.
22	So, is that

1	(Off-microphone comments.)
2	MEMBER HILDEBRAND: Kyle Hildebrand
3	will call in.
4	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: How many?
5	MR. MARSHALL: Hildebrand and another
6	one, Brian Hurley will call in.
7	(Off-microphone comments.)
8	MEMBER SANTORELLI: Okay. So, I'm
9	wondering if we might do this remotely then,
LO	given that only less than half of the members are
L1	would be able to join or
L2	MR. MARSHALL: So, yes, if there's not
L3	enough people, you don't think it would be
L 4	valuable
L5	CHAIR POCIASK: Well, let's see,
L6	Thaddeus, you had a comment?
L7	MR. MARSHALL: Thaddeus, go ahead.
L8	MEMBER JOHNSON: Yes. So, what was
L9	the final number of people? Did we have six
20	people?
21	MR. MARSHALL: Thirteen you have in
22	the group.

1	MEMBER JOHNSON: Thirteen? And, a
2	total of six people today were able to make it?
3	Seven?
4	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: I saw six hands.
5	MR. MARSHALL: Yes, that's a quorum.
6	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: I saw six hands
7	myself. I don't know. How many people are here
8	well, we don't have to go through it. We've
9	got to do this differently.
10	CHAIR POCIASK: So
11	(Off-microphone comments.)
12	MEMBER JOHNSON: Okay, so maybe we'll
13	chat among the group members immediately
14	afterward and see what everyone's schedules are.
15	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Can I ask how many
16	people are planning to stay for the discussion on
17	the other discussion?
18	CHAIR POCIASK: So, on the caller ID
19	authentication?
20	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Caller ID
21	authentication, raise of hands, how many are
22	planning to stay for that?

1	MR. MARSHALL: The reporting
2	requirements you're talking about?
3	CHAIR POCIASK: Yes, yes.
4	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Not the caller ID,
5	I'm sorry, not that. The name of the other one?
6	CHAIR POCIASK: Oh, reporting
7	requirements.
8	MR. MARSHALL: Reporting
9	requirements.
10	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: What are we
11	calling that one?
12	MR. MARSHALL: Reporting
13	requirements.
14	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Reporting
15	requirements, thank you. We need a new name.
16	Okay, reporting requirements.
17	MR. MARSHALL: That's what you can
18	call it, you can come up with a better name than
19	that.
20	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Yes, we need a
21	good name for that.
22	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay.

1	MR. MARSHALL: All right.							
2	(Off-microphone comments.)							
3	MR. MARSHALL: It's what Karen was							
4	talking about, Karen Schroeder.							
5	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: How many are							
6	staying for that? One, two							
7	CHAIR POCIASK: Two, three							
8	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Three, four. One,							
9	two, three, four, five.							
10	CHAIR POCIASK: Six.							
11	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Five, six.							
12	CHAIR POCIASK: I make seven.							
13	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: I may stay. Okay.							
14	MR. MARSHALL: So, we'll continue to							
15	do it or are we postponing things?							
16	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Lunch is not here							
17	is it? I don't see lunch.							
18	MS. CLEARWATER: Not yet. It should							
19	be here about in about 20 minutes.							
20	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay. Well, I mean,							
21	maybe it's just worthwhile, you know, if we want							
22	to, we can just have an informal discussion and							

1	then talk about, you know, maybe setting up, you
2	know, a next call or something like that just to
3	kind of get things moving.
4	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Is it possible to
5	start this now?
6	CHAIR POCIASK: We could.
7	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Instead of waiting
8	until 1:30? It's 12:30.
9	CHAIR POCIASK: Right.
10	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: It's 12:20, why
11	are we waiting until 1:30?
12	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay.
13	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Anybody want to do
14	that?
15	MEMBER SANTORELLI: Well, I think the
16	working group sessions are private. They're not
17	public, so.
18	MEMBER ROOKER: I've already called my
19	driver twice.
20	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Well, we need to
21	know when we're starting in order to know when we
22	stop.

1	MEMBER ROOKER: When it's going to							
2	end? Can we just kind of get something here so							
3	that							
4	CHAIR POCIASK: How about let's							
5	just do this then, then if							
6	(Simultaneous speaking.)							
7	CHAIR POCIASK: If we're set today							
8	with the full, you know, CAC, then why don't we							
9	move to adjourn and then we'll continue							
10	discussion as break out groups so we can keep							
11	things private?							
12	MEMBER ROOKER: Well, how long are we							
13	going to do that is what I'm asking?							
14	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: No, your point is							
15	well taken, let's adjourn.							
16	MEMBER ROOKER: We adjourn and then							
17	we'll have the discussion group, the one that							
18	we're going to do the ID							
19	CHAIR POCIASK: We'll go immediately							
20	after and we'll just see if it has legs, we'll							
21	continue with it, or we'll just, you know.							
22	MEMBER ROOKER: That doesn't help me							

1	in terms of when I'm leaving because I've got an								
2	appointment to get to.								
3	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: But, Shirley, his								
4	point is let's adjourn and have it and then								
5	continue the discussion on logistics.								
6	MEMBER ROOKER: I understand that. I								
7	understand that, okay, never mind.								
8	CHAIR POCIASK: Okay.								
9	MR. MARSHALL: We're scheduled to								
LO	originally								
L1	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: Ask for a motion								
L2	to adjourn.								
L3	CHAIR POCIASK: All right, so, let's								
L 4	ask for a motion to adjourn.								
L5	VICE CHAIR BERLYN: So moved.								
L6	CHAIR POCIASK: And second.								
L7	And, with that, this session has								
L8	ended.								
L9	MR. MARSHALL: All in favor?								
20	CHAIR POCIASK: All right. All in								
21	favor?								
22	(Chorus of aye.)								

1			CI	HAIR	POCI	IASK:	Ì	And,	we	have
2	adjo	urnec	d.							
3			7)	Whereu	pon,	the a	above-	-enti	tled	matter
4	went	off	the	recor	d at	12:22	2 p.m.	.)		
5										
6										
7										
8										
9										
LO										
L1										
L2										
L3										
L4										
L5										
L6										