

**STATEMENT OF
COMMISSIONER JESSICA ROSENWORCEL**

Re: *Cable Service Change Notifications*, MB Docket No. 19-347; *Modernization of Media Regulation Initiative*, MB Docket No. 17-105; *Amendment of the Commission's Rules Related to Retransmission Consent*, MB Docket No. 10-71.

Most consumers do not know the term retransmission consent. But they do know the frustration of turning on their television to watch the big game, the local news, or their favorite show and seeing only a blank screen. When that happens, they know something is wrong and the fact they can't watch is unfair.

They're right. To prevent these problems and keep consumers informed, the Federal Communications Commission has long had rules that require cable operators to tell their subscribers when carriage negotiations may go awry. So 30 days in advance of retransmission consent negotiations that could fail, a cable operator is expected to disclose to its subscribers that an ongoing carriage dispute might result in a loss of programming.

This approach has its merits. But it also leads to consumers getting more of these notices than necessary. They can be confusing. That's because many of these disputes are resolved before any channel falls off the line up and before any blank screens ensue.

So today we update our rules for the real world. We determine that instead of a strict 30-day notice of a dispute that could lead to a loss of programming, it is better if consumers are just notified that a blackout is likely as soon as possible.

This is a modern approach. It has my support. But one word of caution. This decision speaks at length about burdens on companies, but I believe the guiding principle here should be updating our policies for the benefit of consumers. In the end, I think the changes we make here do just that. However, if they are put in practice in a way that shortchanges consumers, we will need to revisit this approach.