



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Eric Sorensen
U.S. House of Representatives
1205 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Sorensen:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Gabe Vasquez
U.S. House of Representatives
1517 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Vasquez:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Robert Garcia
U.S. House of Representatives
1305 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Garcia:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Hank Johnson
U.S. House of Representatives
2240 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Johnson:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Troy A. Carter
U.S. House of Representatives
442 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Carter:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Barbara Lee
U.S. House of Representatives
2470 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Lee:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Scott Peters
U.S. House of Representatives
1201 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Peters:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Rashida Tlaib
U.S. House of Representatives
2438 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Tlaib:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Jasmine Crockett
U.S. House of Representatives
1616 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Crockett:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Ed Case
U.S. House of Representatives
2210 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Case:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Chris Pappas
U.S. House of Representatives
452 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Pappas:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Salud Carbajal
U.S. House of Representatives
2331 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Carbajal:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Sharice Davids
U.S. House of Representatives
2435 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Davids:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Derek Kilmer
U.S. House of Representatives
1266 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Kilmer:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Ruben Gallego
U.S. House of Representatives
1114 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Gallego:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Seth W. Moulton
U.S. House of Representatives
1126 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Moulton:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Dan Kildee
U.S. House of Representatives
200 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Kildee:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Brittany Petterson
U.S. House of Representatives
1230 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Petterson:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Jahana Hayes
U.S. House of Representatives
2458 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Hayes:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Pat Ryan
U.S. House of Representatives
1030 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Ryan:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Josh Harder
U.S. House of Representatives
209 Cannon Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Harder:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Josh Gottheimer
U.S. House of Representatives
203 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Gottheimer:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Bill Pascrell
U.S. House of Representatives
106 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Pascrell:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Wiley Nickel
U.S. House of Representatives
1133 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Nickel:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Colin Allred
U.S. House of Representatives
348 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Allred:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Jim Costa
U.S. House of Representatives
2081 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Costa:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Jennifer McClellan
U.S. House of Representatives
2417 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative McClellan:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Nikki Budzinski
U.S. House of Representatives
1009 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Budzinski:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Juan C. Vargas
U.S. House of Representatives
2334 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Vargas:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Ann McLane Kuster
U.S. House of Representatives
2201 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Kuster:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Val Hoyle
U.S. House of Representatives
1620 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Hoyle:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Susie Lee
U.S. House of Representatives
365 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Lee:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Seth Magaziner
U.S. House of Representatives
1218 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Magaziner:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Greg Landsman
U.S. House of Representatives
1432 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Landsman:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Darren Soto
U.S. House of Representatives
2353 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Soto:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE
CHAIRWOMAN

November 14, 2023

The Honorable Kim Schrier
U.S. House of Representatives
1110 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Schrier:

Thank you for your letter regarding the effort to combat illegal robocalls and robotexts. Protecting consumers from illegal robocalls and robotexts is one of our top consumer protection priorities, and the Federal Commission is committed to using all of the tools it has to address these issues. Our approach thus far to this problem has been multi-faceted—through vigorous enforcement, through championing new technologies, and through closing loopholes wherever we can find them. But as you suggest, we would benefit from additional tools from Congress.

With respect to enforcement action, the agency has ordered substantial penalties against bad actors, acted swiftly and repeatedly to disrupt illegal traffic, and cracked down on providers that have failed to implement sufficient robocall mitigation plans. To date in this calendar year alone, the Commission has issued orders imposing more than \$500 million in fines against robocallers. At the same time, the agency has been able to block illegal robocalls before they even reach consumers by identifying a non-compliant gateway or originating provider responsible for the traffic and directing downstream providers to cut off the traffic from the non-compliant providers. This enforcement technique has delivered real results, including help cut down on auto warranty scam calls by 99 percent and student loan scam calls by 88 percent, according to third-party reports.

To further strengthen these ongoing enforcement efforts, I have expanded our partnerships with state, federal, and international regulatory partners. As a result, the Commission now has a memorandum of understanding with Attorneys General in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. These memoranda make it possible for our Enforcement Bureau to more easily share information and cooperate on investigations with their counterparts. In addition, the Commission recently renewed its memorandum of understanding a group of international regulatory and law enforcement authorities that are members of the Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network. This promotes cross-border collaboration to combat unsolicited communications. Across the board, these relationships matter. To point to just one example why, our collaboration with the Ohio Attorney General led to a record-breaking penalty of nearly \$300 million and helped put a stop to a large-scale consumer robocalling scheme.

We also are ensuring that providers are living up to their commitments and obligations under the TRACED Act, especially with respect to new technologies. Using this law, the agency

now requires that all providers, regardless of size, implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication protocol in the Internet Protocol portions of their networks. This helps reduce spoofing and assists the Commission's enforcement efforts by making it easier to traceback illegal calls.

Recognizing that we need to stay on top of new technologies, last month I partnered with AARP to announce a Commission inquiry into how artificial intelligence will affect illegal robocalls and robotexts. This inquiry, which is slated for a vote at our November meeting, will explore emerging challenges with voice cloning and how pattern recognition facilitated by artificial intelligence may help protect block unwanted robocalls and robotexts.

In addition, the Commission has focused on updating its rules and closing any loopholes it finds. For instance, earlier this year we unanimously adopted our first rules specifically focused on illegal robotexts. They require carriers to block text messages that appear to come from phone numbers that are unlikely to lawfully transmit text messages, including invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. They also require carriers to block text messages from numbers where the subscriber to the number has self-identified as never sending text messages and numbers that government agencies and other well-known entities identify as not used for texting. On top of this, in a related rulemaking we have proposed to require carriers to investigate and potentially block texts from a sender after receiving notice from the Commission that the sender is transmitting suspected illegal texts. This proposal is based off of a framework we use to require carriers to stop the transmission of illegal voice calls that originate overseas. As part of this effort, we also sought comment on how to close the lead generator loophole, which permits companies to use a single consumer consent to deliver robocalls and text messages from multiple marketers, often well beyond what a consumer reasonably believes he or she may have signed up to receive. Also, as you inquire about in your letter, we sought comment on new methods to authenticate text messages and reduce spoofing. We will keep you informed as we continue to explore these matters in our rulemaking and work to identify how authentication technology could be helpful in this area.

In a later rulemaking, we also proposed new rules to strengthen consumers' ability to revoke consent to receive both robocalls and robotexts. In many cases, when consumers sign up for a service or product they provide their number and indicate that they will accept robocalls and robotexts. But even if they do so, it is essential that they have the ability to stop those calls and texts when they no longer wish to receive them. Our proposal would require that these revocation of consent requests are honored within 24 hours of receipt.

Finally, as I indicated up front, I believe that in several key areas the Commission needs additional authority to combat robocalls and robotexts from Congress.

First, the decision by the Supreme Court in *Facebook v. Duguid* narrowed the definition of autodialer under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. This means those sending junk calls have the ability to evade this law if they use technology for their calls that comes from lists but does not feature random number generation. This needs to be fixed. In addition, the *Duguid* decision may also impact the Commission's ability to enforce consumer protections under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act with respect to texting. The Commission has long treated text messages as "autodialed" calls for the purposes of applying the law's protections against unauthorized messages to consumers. Trends indicate that more and more scammers are turning

to text messages as a vehicle for their malicious schemes. Accordingly, updating the definition of autodialer and giving the Commission clear authority to combat robotexts will allow us to continue to fight robocalls and to tackle the growing problem of junk texts.

Second, as noted above the Commission has issued more than \$500 million in robocall fines this year alone. However, the process of collecting these penalties is cumbersome. While thanks to the TRACED Act, the Commission can speed the enforcement process by seeking forfeitures without first issuing citations, the process gets bogged down when it comes to holding bad actors to account. That is because under the Communications Act, when a party does not pay the penalties that the Commission issues, the agency is required to send the case to the Department of Justice to litigate and collect these fines. Giving the Commission its own authority to pursue these cases in court would improve the chances of collecting the penalties we impose.

Third, the Commission would benefit from authority to access Bank Secrecy Act information. This would help us identify more quickly the financial records of our targets without giving those targets suspected of scams a heads up that they are being investigated. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Department of Treasury to acquire the access to this information. If we are able to access this information, it would allow the Commission to obtain evidence that can help identify who is actually responsible for scam campaigns, and to prevent scam artists from registering new entities under new names after enforcement actions shut their prior activities down.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Rosenworcel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessica Rosenworcel