```
0001
1
 2
 3
 4
 5
     CONSUMER ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
 6
 7
     Federal Communications Commission
 8
           445 12th Street, S.W.
 9
                 Room TW-C305
10
               Washington, D.C.
11
12
           Friday, December 4, 2009
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
0002
1
                       ATTENDANCE
2
          AARP, Marti T. Doneghy
3
         Alaska State Department of Law, Lew Craig
4
          Alliance for Community Media, Gloria Tristani
 5
          American Council of the Blind, Eric Bridges
 6
          Appalachian Regional Commission, Mark Defalco
 7
          Benton Foundation, Charles Benton
8
          Communication Service for the Deaf, Karen Peltz
9
    Strauss
10
          Consumer Electronics Association, Jamie Hedlund
11
          Consumer Federation of America, Irene E. Leech
          Deaf and Hard of Hearing Consumer Advocacy
12
13
   Network, Claude Stout
          Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, Brandon Stephens
14
15
          Hearing Loss Association of America, Lise Hamlin
16
          National Association of Broadcasters, Ann Bobeck
17
          National Association of Regulatory Utility
18
    Commissioners, Commissioner Nixyvette Santini
          National Association of State Utility Consumer
19
20
    Advocates, Brenda Pennington,
21
          National Consumers League, Debra Berlyn (CAC
22
    Chairperson)
0003
          Northern Virginia Resource Center for Deaf and
1
 2
    Hard of Hearing Persons, Cheryl Heppner
 3
          Verizon Communications, Inc., Mary Crespy
 4
 5
 6
 7
 9
10
```

```
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
0004
1
```

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

0005

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

PROCEEDINGS

[9:10 a.m.]

CHAIR BERLYN: Welcome. I'm glad everyone could make it this morning. We still have a few to arrive, but we'd like to get started. We do have a full agenda, and we also will soon have a couple of our commissioners come to welcome us this morning. And so we do want to be timely with our agenda.

Why don't we start by going around the room and introducing ourselves this morning? I will start. Debra Berlyn, chairing the CAC with Consumer Policy Solutions. And on my left --

MS. CRESPY: Hello, this is Mary Crespy. I'm with Verizon Communications.

MR. STEPHENS: I'm Brandon Stephens with the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians.

MR. BENTON: I'm Charles Benton with the Benton Foundation.

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

MR. CRAIG: Lew Craig with the Alaska Attorney General's office.

1 2 3

MS. SANTINI: Nixyvette Santini with the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners.

MS. TRISTANI: Gloria Tristani, Alliance for

Community Media. MS. BOBECK: Good morning. I'm Ann Bobeck

with the National Association of Broadcasters.

MR. HEDLUND: Jamie Hedlund, Consumer Electronics Association.

MS. HEPPNER: Cheryl Heppner, Director of the Virginia Resource Center for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Persons.

MS. STOUT: I'm Claude Stout, and I'm with Telecommunications for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Consumer Support Group.

MS. HAMLIN: Lise Hamlin, Hearing Loss Association of America.

MS. STRAUSS: Karen Strauss, Communication Service for the Deaf.

MR. DeFALCO: And Mark DeFalco with the Appalachian Regional Commission.

22 MR. BRIDGES: Eric Bridges, American Council 0006 1 of the Blind. MR. WYATT: Thomas Wyatt, with the Consumer 3 and Government Affairs Bureau. 4 MR. MARSHALL: And I'm Scott Marshall. I 5 work for Thomas. 6 CHAIR BERLYN: Thanks, Scott. We will have 7 our usual rules here that when you want to speak, 8 remember to identify yourself first by raising your 9 hand so we can make sure that the mike is on for the 10 booth in the back. 11 Scott, do you have any general announcements 12 that you want to make? 13 MR. MARSHALL: I do. I do, I do, I do. CHAIR BERLYN: -- that you -MR. MARSHALL: -- I do, I do. Welcome, 14 15 16 everyone. Thank you very much for sharing part of your 17 busy month of December with us. 18 I wanted to ask those that are receiving a 19 travel stipend that some time during the day, could you please see Betty Morris, and she's got some paperwork 20 21 for you and wants to get your receipts, and so we can 22 get that long process underway as quickly as possible. 0007 1 And I think that's -- I think everybody knows where 2 the restrooms are by now? 3 And I want to just also thank all of our A/V 4 people that went through a lot of angst about our 5 equipment problems today. We don't have the usual 6 caption equipment on board, and they've been in early 7 this morning trying to make that all happen, so thank 8 you very much. 9 And we'll have the CART B- and the CART's not 10 working either. Okay, so they still have things to do. They're working on it says Dan the Man back there. 11 Okay. All right, thanks. All right, I think that's 12 13 14 CHAIR BERLYN: Lise? 15 MS. HAMLIN: Yeah, this is Lise Hamlin. While the CART's not up, I'm doing okay with hearing as long 16 17 as people speak directly into the microphone, although I missed, Scott, what you said about paperwork. I 18 19 don't know if it applies to me or not because I 20 couldn't hear what you said. 21 MR. MARSHALL: No, it doesn't. Lise, thanks. 22 MS. HAMLIN: Okay, thank you. 0008 1 CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you, Scott. One other 2 quick announcement. I wanted to thank Jamie Hedlund 3 and Consumer Electronics Association for our breakfast 4 and our lunch soon to come. Thank you very much for 5 doing that for the group this day. Thank you. 6 [Applause.] 7 CHAIR BERLYN: Our first order of business is 8 to welcome Commissioner Copps, a good friend of the

Consumer Advisory Committee. It's a pleasure to have

you join us here once again this morning. I appreciate your coming, and it's great to have you come, and we are always appreciative of your remarks and your support for the work that we do. So thank you for coming.

MR. COPPS: Thank you. I am delighted to be here. I see some of my favorite people around this table. It=s always a pleasure to see you folks and to come down before this committee, which is certainly one of the most active, if not the most active. This is your like fourth meeting, or something like that I was told?

CHAIR BERLYN: Of this cycle.

MR. COPPS: Yeah, of this cycle. So that's quite a record. You ought to be proud of that. But that is really very fitting that the Consumer Advisory Committee should be meeting so often as we try to turn this agency into the consumer protection agency it was supposed to be in the first place, and I think we're getting back on that track. And I'm glad you're into the habit of meeting often because I think we have a really busy agenda coming down the pike when we get this broadband plan going and all of the spin-offs that will result from that. So I think this is going to be an even busier committee going ahead. But you really have an opportunity to play a truly formative role in decision-making around here in the months ahead.

Lots is going on around here. First and foremost is broadband, and we very much appreciate the guidance that the committee has provided on that. This is the greatest endeavor that I have been privileged to witness as a member of the FCC for the past eight and a half years now. Our plan is -- our charge is to write a plan to get broadband out to every American, no matter who they are, or where they live, or the

particular circumstances of their individual lives.

And to come up with that plan by the 17th of February, the chairman has launched what I think is a truly impressive proceeding to get this done. It's the most comprehensive one that I've ever participated in. He has brought some really good people in who are working with all of the good people that we have here at the Commission, so he's hired well. We've had any number of workshops that many of you have participated in, any number of hearings. There will be more to come. Lots of public notices out there. I think almost to the point of inundation right now. But you can't say they're not looking for information.

So it's a huge challenge. And, frankly, I think most of the big decisions are ahead of us yet.

So the next couple of months are going to be --

particularly the next month when we try to get the

parameters of that plan in view, and what's going to be

in and what's not, and what's on the table and what's

off the table, and how aspirational it's going to be,

those are all decisions that are still in the process of being made.

But here are a few pieces of the puzzle that you're going to hear me talking more about between now and February 17th. And at the top of that list will be to make sure that the plan has inclusion for those who are too often ignored and left behind. And that would certainly include minority groups, and disabilities groups, and Native Americans.

I think that any broadband plan, to be credible and to meet the promise of what it should be, is going to have to step boldly ahead on all of these fronts that I have just mentioned. And I think the plan should be in significant part judged by our success in being able to deal with that. And I think we are going to deal with those boldly. I think that's the path we're headed on.

I don't have to tell this committee about conditions in Indian Country and how deplorable they are for Native Americans, how unacceptable they are, and we really need creative new approaches here. We need to take that trust relationship and really build on and follow up on the work that really Bill Kennard began in 2000 when he was here, and Gloria worked on

that and others. And we haven't followed up on that in the years since like we should have. We need really to do that now. I'm happy to see more attention being paid. There was a major White House conference brought the leaders of the 564 or however many tribes it is to Washington a few weeks ago, and I look for this agency to really follow up boldly on that.

Disabilities communities is another area that I just mentioned that's very important. We've had a number of workshops, a lot of folks here have worked on that. Karen and Claude and others. A huge priority as many of you know. It was B- the first speech I ever gave at this place was to the deaf and hard of hearing, and I've tried to keep it a priority ever since then.

We had a good hearing a few weeks ago at Gallaudet College. Marlee Matlin was there to give it a little bit of visibility, which helped, and delivered some, I thought, eloquent testimony. I think the -- maybe the most moving thing she said -- and some of you were there, I guess, when she was testifying -- was when she got the Oscar for Best Actress back in the early 1980s. And the next day she picked up the

newspaper and some reviewer had said, well, the only reason she won was because it was a pity vote. And that was really just such a overwhelming statement. But her work and her hope and her optimism just kind of radiated through the crowd, and that's the kind of attitude that we want to see.

And, you know, not only do we have the opportunity in the broadband plan to do something here,

but we've got the anniversary coming up next year of the Americans with Disabilities Act, and that's another good opportunity for the Commission to try to move substantively forward.

There's one other part of this broadband plan that is necessary, that I'm going to be looking for. And we'll really be working to make sure it's included, and that's to make sure the plan conveys our understanding of how broadband is really going to be the primary conduit for how we as a people communicate with one another. It's going to be the conduit for civic engagement in this country. It's going to be the conduit for our democratic dialogue. Some of these things are intangible. You can't put a cost on them.

You can't turn it in terms that Wall Street or the investment community understands, but they are no less important because of that lack. And they're every bit as real, if not more real, and certainly more important to the future of the country.

So I want a plan that realizes that news and information and our knowledge of the issues and our knowledge of the -- of one another really is going to depend on our success with broadband and getting it out, and making sure that everybody has access to it, and that everybody knows how to use it.

This is an old problem for the United States of America, and you can go back and make an analogy between now and Thomas Jefferson's time. I guess newspapers were the information conduit back then, and everybody remembers that famous quote about Jefferson saying, "If it was just left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without government, I'd take newspapers without a government." But he went on there to say, "By that I mean that every person should be -- should receive those papers," get that infrastructure out

there, "and be able to read them." So he was talking about adoption and deployment too back then with newspapers. And I think it's an interesting quote to think about right now. So we need to come to terms with all of that.

Our traditional media's going to be with us a long while still, I believe. I don't think we should forget about those while we contemplate new media. We've got to step up to the plate on present media. As we saw yesterday, president -- present media is still alive and well. The thrust of media consolidation has certainly not run its course in this country, and I think when the economy turns around, we'll probably see more of that sort of thing.

But we've got to have the discipline to make sure we're talking about old media and new media, and it's really kind of seamless. It's not one or the other. We've got to be talking about both things and dealing with both things. And we need to make sure

that new media doesn't have visited upon it many of the sins that were visited upon old media through a combination of hyperspeculation in the market and some 0016

bad business plans from the private sector standpoint, and through horrendous decisions and all the deregulating public interest that the government policy and public policy visited upon media too.

So I'm going to be insisting that that plan really -- we're not going to be able to solve all these problems between now and February 17th, or come up with a strategy that you can cross all the T's and dot all the I's. But I want that plan to send the message that the FCC understands the importance of what I've just talked about, and that we are committed to doing something about it, and get the ball rolling. And get out and go around the country and really try to get a handle on this, and come up with some policies that can make a difference and set us in the right direction. And it sounds like a very time consuming process.

The bad news is we don't have a lot of time to do all of this. We have this sort of window of opportunity that's open now with a new political environment in Washington, D.C. How long that window stays open, how far it's open -- you've heard me say this before -- I don't know, but I don't want to be

sitting around here addressing this committee a year from now and saying, oh, goodness, why didn't we do this last year while we had the opportunity to do it? So that's why I've got some sense of urgency about all that.

So I probably talked long enough. If you've got some time I'm happy to take a couple questions or hear any suggestions or comments that you've got. Thank you.

CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you. That's great. [Applause.]

CHAIR BERLYN: Do we have any questions for the Commissioner? Oh we do. We have cards. Thank you for remembering that.

Brandon, we'll start -- well, we'll just go around -- Brandon, Charles, and Irene. So Brandon?

MR. STEPHENS: Okay. Thank you,

Commissioner for coming down. We always enjoy bearing.

Commissioner, for coming down. We always enjoy hearing you speak to us. You and, of course, Commissioner Adelstein, of course, you went over to Agriculture, and we've enjoyed your consultation with us.

And particularly I also appreciate your

comments about Native American communities. The one issue that we would probably ask because there are over 500 different communities -- actually there are more than that because they=re state recognized, as well as a federally recognized tribes -- regardless they are Native Americans.

But one of the big issues is just in

developing broadband planning for Native America is basically consultation, and that's what we'd really like to ask, is because they are different. They're -- each one of them are like fingerprints. That consultation is so important because the needs are so different in many different areas from the Pacific Northwest. It's just different communities all over.

The second issue that I'd just like to say to you too. We have appreciated the care that the FCC has given to Indian Country, especially in consumer and governmental affairs. Mr. Wyatt here has done an excellent job with working with us, and also down through Shana Bearhand, who is -- who's going to be leaving the FCC in a couple of weeks. Before her, Jeffrey Blackwell did a great job. And we hope that in

that position as a senior attorney and Tribal liaison position, that that continues to work well. I know that -- is it Mike McConnell, or what's his name? The gentleman who's --

VOICE: Connelly.

MR. STEPHENS: -- yeah, Mike Connelly there, who's going to be her interim replacement. We hope that you guys are diligent and shrewd with that position to help us with that continued consultation in Indian Country. And I appreciate your assistance.

MR. COPPS: I want as much visibility for Native Americans and for the disabilities communities in this Commission as we can get. I know we've had people that work -- had worked extraordinarily hard on it, but I think the message has to come from the Commission itself that this really is a priority.

I know if we look at some of the recent submissions that Native Americans have made to the broadband docket -- they have suggested things like a broadband task force for openers and maybe a -- an independent -- some kind of an office -- Indian Affairs office just like folks have suggested -- disabilities -

-- I hope we will be paying serious attention to that.

And I couldn't agree more on the consultation. I don't know -- I know there are 564, I think, recognized. I don't know how many others there are, if you would say, the non-recognized, of how many tribes that actually all comes up to. Do you have a number?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ STEPHENS: I believe that there -- I've heard from the various agencies that there's over 1,000.

MR. COPPS: Is that right?

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah, there's over 1,000. And just to dovetail -- and I don't want to take up too much more time from the discussion around the table, but in this case I think you do raise an interesting point.

For Indian Country particularly, because there are so many different interests around the table

here that developing Miss Bearhand's office into an agency that works well, just talking with her and -- is it -- I can't remember the other chief that works there

22 0021 1

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

0022 1

3

4

5

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

5

19

20

21

VOICE: Mr. Kwon?

MR. STEPHENS: Mr. Kwon. Mr. Survivor there -- yeah. The -- anyhow, the -- that -- I hope that there are plans there to help augment and aggrandize that area.

MR. COPPS: The Chairman has an obvious interest in this. And when I went out to Pine Ridge a month or maybe two months ago now, Eddie Lazarus, our Chief of Staff who has a deep knowledge of this, has actually written a book, as you know, on some of the U.S. and Indian disputes and all that over the years. So I think we have that kind of interest, and we want to translate it into -- to something positive.

CHAIR BERLYN: We will take very quick questions. Charles, I'm sorry. Charles and Irene, if you could very quickly because we need to move on. Thank you.

> MR. COPPS: But you=d like quick answers too. [Laughter.]

MR. BENTON: Commissioner Copps, we greatly admired your leadership in the digital transition at the end of the extended time when you were chairman.

And this was a -- this was an enormous service at the end of a long road. But as you kept reminding us and as you told us this morning, this unfinished business with the old media. And we did pass some resolutions about the public interest obligations at the -- and I'm wondering if it would be useful to remind the Commission. If we brought those resolutions back again and resubmitted them because in the old regime, when we submitted resolutions, we got no response at all. And I'm just wondering if that would be helpful to you in reminding the Commission in general about the

unfinished business in the digital transition.

MR. COPPS: Oh, I -- absolutely. I think that's 100 percent correct. I would urge you to do that. I am still mightily interested. Before I leave the Federal Communications Commission, that we would have a licensing regime for our broadcast stations that would have public interest guidelines in it. I see that as kind of a down payment really on substantive media reform. And I understand that when you get into structural rules and things like that, we have a quadrennial review that's out there, and then that's

0023 very important. And I hope you all will participate in that. But we don't need to be waiting around for a quadrennial review to do public interest quidelines for licensing. We have the authority to do that, and we've got the record I think that that would support our taking action there. So anything you folks can do to

7 move that along with my colleagues at home would be 8 most appreciated. 9 MR. BENTON: We'll take it up. Good. Thank 10 you. 11 MS. LEECH: I just wanted to thank you for 12 your comments and to just emphasize that in addition to 13 the particular populations you mentioned, that one of 14 my big concerns about broadband is that our current 15 policy of letting the providers decide where they want 16 to serve is meaning that we're leaving some pockets 17 unserved. They're in many cases not very big and often 18 in rural areas, but the same thing is happening in 19 urban. So it's really not absolutely a rural issue. 20 But I hope that you'll come up with some incentives and 21 some ways to -- I heard you say everybody needs access 22 and so forth, but those communities that don't have 0024 1 that are really hurting on economic development and 2 education and everything else. And so I hope that 3 we'll be aggressive about that and not let us have 4 haves and have-nots as we do today. 5 MR. COPPS: Right. Well, our charge from 6 Congress is to get broadband out to everybody ubiquitously. So that's I hope where our focus is 7 8 going to be. And like you, I hope it doesn't 9 degenerate into some kind of a rural/urban controversy, 10 or even underserved versus unserved. I think you can make the argument that most of the United States is 11 12 underserved to begin with. So I think we go forward 13 with the goal clearly in mind that everybody needs to get this. And if they don't, then you end up with 14 15 larger gaps relatively speaking than we have right now. 16 You'll have worse rural/urban gaps, worse gaps for 17 disabilities community, worse gaps for Native 18 Americans. So it's more important then ever that we 19 make sure the tools of communication are distributed on 20 a ubiquitous fashion. 21 Thank you for having me down. I appreciate 22 it. 0025 1 CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you so much, 2 Commissioner Copps. A pleasure as always. Thank you 3 so much. MR. COPPS: All right. Take care. 4 5 [Applause.] CHAIR BERLYN: And --6 7 MR. COPPS: Can I do one more thing? 8 CHAIR BERLYN: Absolutely. 9 MR. COPPS: I wanted to introduce Josh 10 Cinelli, who's B 11 CHAIR BERLYN: Oh. 12 MR. COPPS: -- joined my office here, and I 13 hope you all were -- will get to know him, and you 14 already know B- he's been doing outstanding work here 15 for many, many years. And I have had the benefit now 16 of -- I have the honor now of working with both of them, and I hope you will get to know Josh too going 17

18 ahead. 19 CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you. Thank you very 20 much. And now I'd like to welcome Commissioner Baker. 21 I think this is also a repeat visit for you here at 22 the CAC. You may have addressed our group at one time 0026 1 on the digital television transition. 2 MS. BAKER: I think that's right. 3 CHAIR BERLYN: And which we can look back at, 4 I think B 5 [Laughter.] 6 MS. BAKER: Not quite, but almost. Almost. 7 CHAIR BERLYN: Almost look back at. The 8 transition itself, now being the -- I think a success 9 for our nation in the fact that we did actually do it. And that this committee had a role to play in working 10 11 with NTIA at that time when you were there and 12 following the progress that NTIA made under your 13 leadership, which was fantastic. And now we welcome 14 you as a commissioner here at the FCC. And we're so 15 pleased that you're here. So thank you so much for 16 joining us this morning. 17 MS. BAKER: Well, thank you, Debbie. It's great to be here. It's great to see so many familiar 18 19 faces. Many of you who did help out in the transition 20 so much. And also, of course, always love to -- lovely 21 to see Gloria Tristani. It's nice to see her in this 2.2 building, isn't it? 0027 1 So I really just wanted to take a few minutes to talk with you guys today to tell you how important I 3 think the work that you do is and to really express my gratitude. I'm happy to be "Mike Copps." 5 CHAIR BERLYN: No, you have your own card. 6 MS. BAKER: I'm really -- I do, I think that 7 this committee really plays a critical role at the 8 Commission. And you tell us where we are falling down, 9 both in the industry and in the government. And you 10 tell us what we should know, and you should know that 11 we're listening. We really are. And I just applaud 12 all of your dedication and willingness to serve. It's a very important job, and the role that you play is 13 14 very important. 15 I know that you all have a full agenda today, 16 so I don't want to take too much of your time. But I 17 did just kind of want to touch on three things, one of 18 -- as your work is kind of nearing these topics as 19 well. One of course is the digital television 20 transition, and the two others are the things that this 21 committee's taking a lead on, accessibility issues and 22 truth-in-billing matters. 0028 So the recently completed digital television 1 transition, a topic near and dear to my heart 3 obviously, it=s an area where your voice was so important and really contributed to a successful and

relatively pain-free experience for consumers. The

digital television transition required all of us, the FCC, the industry, the local governments, the civic groups, the interest groups, the consumers, and of course NTIA, our partners, to work collaboratively, to streamline and to simplify what could have been just a harrowing experience for many households.

And so you should know that this work continues. Just a few weeks ago, the FCC in conjunction with CEA and NAB -- you guys -- and others, also released further aids to help the consumers understand the antenna issues that are associated with DTV transition. I know that that was one of the issues that you all flagged for us as warranting greater focus. And I just urge you to continue to highlight the additional transition-related issues that need our attention.

I also want to take this opportunity to

commend the FCC staff for its continuing work past June 12th. And of course to my colleague, Commissioner Copps, for his leadership as well.

Now looking forward, I'm also very appreciative of this committee's work on accessibility issues in the digital world. You guys have shone a great light on this problem. And digital technology provides a great promise to expand opportunities for all Americans, but it has also created some implementation challenges. And so as programmers, and broadcasters, and pay-TV providers, and consumer electronics companies work to bring advanced technologies into our homes, too many consumers have been left without the services that had -- that they need a clear path to resolve these issues. So I'm appreciative of Commissioner Copps when he was acting chairman in May for establishing a technical working group to review the digital captioning and other related issues. This is a long-standing recommendation from this committee.

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{Those}}$ of you from industry, thank you for letting us borrow your engineers. This is an important

group. And as you know, my experience really is when you get some of the lawyers out of the room, and you bring the engineers together, we really can focus and find solutions to these problems. So by bringing all the stakeholders together, I am hopeful that best-practices will evolve into a better understanding of really the technical issues that will translate to improved service for consumers. And I really do look forward to learning more about these ongoing efforts, and again appreciate your work in this arena.

Similarly, this committee is raising the profile of consumer complaints and truth-in-billing matters. And I urge the same collaborative spirit to guide these discussions as we seek to find best practices amongst those within industries. We need to know what specific billing and service issues are not

17 being resolved, and which industries are not stepping 18 up to serve their consumers effectively. In this, we 19 must be data-driven, and -- I think I'm required to say 20 that by the Chairman at every proceeding -- data-21 driven.

[Laughter.]

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

0032 1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

3

MS. BAKER: But it is truly an important concept to stress, so once we quantitatively and qualitatively identify the problem areas, I really do challenge the providers to work aggressively to address any infirmities.

It is important that we do not regulate at the first sight of a problem, rather that the industry should have the opportunity to respond to the consumers' concerns. All regulation, no matter how well intentioned, does have costs and may frustrate the efforts to -- of providers to act in a more consumerfriendly and responsive manner than the one-size-fitsall regulation that sometimes we come up with. I'm also sometimes dubious of the government's efforts to come up with something that is clear and transparent quidance to consumers. You know, look at our IRS tax forms.

So anyway, all of this is not to suggest that the Commission has abdicated its responsibility. Obviously we have a very important role to play here. And we really do -- must be prepared to act if the market fails to address this issue. So I appreciate

your raising this issue for us to look at further.

So really thank you all again for your efforts. What you do is an essential part of, you know, our work here at the Commission, and I look really forward to working together with you.

CHAIR BERLYN: Excellent. Thank you so much. [Applause.]

MS. BAKER: Did you want me to take -- does anybody have any time for questions if B-

CHAIR BERLYN: Claude, I saw you go with your card first, so Claude.

MS. STOUT: Hello there. I'm Claude Stout, and I represent Telecommunications for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, and I'm also the chair of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Consumer Advocacy Network. And I really want to commend you for mentioning accessibility issues and bringing those to light and talking about the FCC's responsibility in working with the various agencies here at the table. I look forward also to working with you on these issues in the coming future.

And I'm so excited to hear you mention that technology work group that=s working on the digital 0033

1 captioning issue. Please know that consumers are still very, very frustrated. We remain hopeful, however,

that technical working groups will reach some

conclusions and come up with some recommendations and

findings in due time, not after the passage of several years. And we want to work with those working groups to get some fixes in place within a deadline.

So I am one of the folks who likes to watch ADesperate Housewives.@ I feel like I'm a desperate consumer because we cannot -- many of us cannot follow what's happening. And so it's difficult when the captions come and go. The -- also the program Brothers and Sisters, again watching the captioning there. It just flickers and it's off and on, and it does put us in a desperate situation, not to play on that too much, but, you know, we're trying to be patient. And we're hopeful, and we're looking forward to the FCC and the consumer work groups and the television industry groups working on resolving this issue. We can't wait too long for it because again that puts us without access. So thank you again for your comments. I do appreciate it, and we look forward to working with you.

MS. BAKER: Thank you, and I appreciate your raising that issue, and I will continue to follow it, and thank you for your participation.

CHAIR BERLYN: Karen?

MS. STRAUSS: Hi. I also want to thank you so much for mentioning people with disabilities. We're always excited when we hear a new commissioner recognize our issues. And I'm just thinking that maybe we can set up a meeting with you to talk to you about some of the closed captioning issues that are going on. There's been a petition that's been pending at the FCC since 2004 to correct some of the quality problems that Claude is talking about, and we would like to get it moving again. So maybe we can set up a meeting with you and we can explore these issues further.

MS. BAKER: Absolutely. I'd love to do that. And I've been remiss in not introducing someone you already know. But Brad Gillen is sitting behind me, and I'm lucky enough to have Brad join me as my media advisor. So we=ll look forward to seeing you in the office.

CHAIR BERLYN: Excellent. Well, thank you

again, Commissioner Baker. It's great to have you with us again, and we look forward to talking with you at our future meetings, so thank you very much.

MS. BAKER: Terrific. Thank you. [Applause.]

CHAIR BERLYN: Okay, we're on schedule. This is wonderful. Next up is Thomas Wyatt. Again a regular at our CAC meetings. Deputy Chief of the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau to provide us with an update about the Bureau activities. So thank you, Thomas.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ WYATT: Good morning. I'll do my best to keep us on schedule as well.

As usual you have a pretty busy schedule so I'll just take a few minutes to talk about CGB's recent

and upcoming activities. Some of you may have heard that there have been a few front-office changes in CGB since you last met. Mark Stone, formerly of the Office of Managing Directors, is now Acting Chief of the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau. Mark wanted to be here today but could not due to some scheduling conflicts, but he sends his regards and best wishes for 0036

a productive meeting.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

0037 1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

0038

2

You also may have heard that we have a new Deputy Bureau Chief. I believe Brandon mentioned him earlier. He met him earlier. But Yul Kwon is the Deputy Bureau Chief at CGB. Yul has a very diverse career background spanning across law, technology, business and media. He joined us in late October and has fully immersed himself -- it doesn't really seem like he's new to me, he's been so fully immersed in our activities, and we're excited to have him. He's brought some really fresh insights and energy, and we=ve already -- already have had a pretty significant impact on the Bureau.

Mentioning Yul is probably a good segway into the first Bureau priority I wanted to briefly mention. That is the work we are doing with respect to distracted driving. As you may know, Chairman Genachowski testified before the Senate in October and the House in November about the dangers of distracted driving. Since then the Commission has been working with numerous parties to address the issue, including the Department of Transportation, National Safety

Council, CTIA, and the Consumer Electronics Association. We held a workshop on distracted driving here on November 20. The workshop included two panels on technology and a panel on outreach. We were pleased to host I believe 75 participants at that workshop.

We've also created a web site on distracted driving. And we're really encouraging anyone with suggestions for other educational opportunities to email us or contact us via that web site. And Rachel Kazan or Dan Rumelt are our key contacts. And that web site is distracteddriving@.gov.

And speaking of workshops, we were pleased to announce yesterday that the Commission will soon host a workshop on VRS, video relay service. And I think that is scheduled for December the 17th. The -- and the workshop is part of the comprehensive review of the VRS to assure that the program's underlying structure fosters efficient, effective, and lawful provision of VRS.

The workshop will be open to the public, and it's intended to gather data and information in several key areas. One, the most efficient way to deliver VRS,

particularly whether the service should remain a competitive service or be provided via competitive bidding. Two, a fair, efficient, and transparent

compensation methodology. And three, mechanisms for combating waste, fraud, and abuse. I will provide additional details about the workshop as it approaches.

Next I wanted to briefly mention the impending Notice of Inquiry -- I'm looking around to see if Julie Saulnier is here -- and just wanted to mention that -- and you all are aware of this -- the record closed in late October, and the staff is analyzing the record and formulating recommendations. And I don't see Julie, but I wanted -- oh, there she is. Hi, Julie. And Julie's here to answer any questions you might have about the Consumer Information and Disclosure proceeding.

I guess it was the Information Disclosure — and Disclosure proceeding that really started me to thinking about the issues I believe you will be covering at this afternoon's round table discussion on consumer complaint resolution best practices. Having worked in that area for many, many years at the

Commission, I am especially pleased that the CAC's going to take that issue up. I think we all have a sense of what a massive, nationwide rollout of new broadband services will mean in terms of consumer inquiries and complaints. I suppose I should publicly apologize to Scott and Debbie for pestering them about this issue, but I'm really excited that you all are having that discussion.

I didn't want to take too much time, and I guess we're a little bit ahead of schedule now, Debbie, but --

CHAIR BERLYN: That's fine. Yeah. Because we may indeed have questions for Thomas. Does anyone have a question you'd like to ask?

MR. WYATT: Well, thank you.

CHAIR BERLYN: Okay. It's okay that we're ahead of schedule. There are a couple of issues that I would like to tee up, and this is as good a time as any to do that.

One B- couple things that I'd like the CAC to think about this morning, and we can talk about it this afternoon. You can also e-mail me suggestions in the $\,$

coming months.

One thing I'd like to think about is how getting to action process is going and ways in which the CAC can be -- is, and going forward can be more productive. We have had a rich history in the years past, in CAC's past, of producing recommendations. And over the years, one of our major complaints has been that we have not been listened to by the Commission. And we now have, I think, the ears and eyes of the Commission, and I think it's a wonderful opportunity that we have to provide recommendations to this Commission that I think will be listened to.

So with that opportunity, I would love to see a CAC that is providing a lot of recommendations to

this Commission. And so I think we have a tremendous opportunity, and I want to figure out a way to fill that opportunity. And so I've looked at our working group structure, and I wonder if this is -- if we -this is the right way to proceed. We have a year left in this CAC, and so let's think about how we are structured, and whether or not this is the way we want to continue to work, whether it's working for all of 0041

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

0042 1

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

0043 1

us, and if there are suggestions that you might have of how we can work better.

You know, having three meetings a year, and when we do meet, we spend a good part of our time doing -- getting reports, and we all know that that's how we have to function. So the work really needs to be done between our regular meetings. And I know that is incredibly difficult for everybody because we're all volunteers, and we all have other jobs to do. So how is the best way for us to function within the structure that we have is the question.

One thing I've thought about is would it make sense to have some sort of working group or task force of some sort that is responsible for taking concepts and ideas and putting those into recommendations? Sort of a -- you know, like a ledge council of sorts, for this committee. So you know, thinking about how we get to action is what I'd like to propose.

And we have -- if you would like to, we can spend a few minutes discussing that now, or we can -and I see a card go up. So I will entertain a short discussion about that now. Yes, Brandon? And if you

could raise your hand so they recognize you, okay? MR. STEPHENS: Okay. No, it=s still B- okay, now I'm on the air.

Well, I believe that we were very well focused, and we had a goal and some objectives during the digital transition. And now I kind of get the feeling after the digital transition phase left us, now we're sort of wondering, well, what do we do? We come here and we meet -- and I don't have to say that -- and please, I'm not casting any aspersion or any -- back to the committee. I think that we do some wonderful work here, and we can continue to listen to reports. But I believe that we also have the potential to be very effective, and we were -- I believe we did some -- we had some effective comments and recommendations back to the Federal Communications Commission for digital transition.

But I believe now, very much so, in feeding things like digital TV, the broadband is going to be very important. And I look at Commissioner Copps' comments about really moving America. And if there is to be true recovery, if there is to be true

reinvestment in America, whether it's with the blind, or with the physically challenged, or with some of our utilities, or in Indian Country, or in rural America where also I represent a good -- I see the Appalachian Regional Commission here -- real true recovery, whether that affects education, housing, it affects economic developments, all of these infrastructures. And also, if you read what's now going through with the President's initiatives, those types of issues are coming to the forefront. So I believe that we need to set some sort of strategic plan, some sort of set of goals and objectives here with that. And then I believe then we can go back to where we can really reorganize into different subcommittees and task force to do that. But I believe that we're going to miss the boat if we don't do that.

But I think that we did a great job with what we needed to do, and some of the areas we needed to address in the digital transition, and we did that quite well, and maybe so. There was a different -- and also there is a different area, and there is a different group of commissioners. And I think also

there's a different feeling at the Commission now with a little more transparency and also openness. I get a different feeling when I walked through Consumer and Governmental Affairs the other day. I really had a good feeling in your area up there, Mr. Wyatt. That was wonderful. But with that, we need to seize that. We need to develop a strategic plan of action here to do that.

Now what that is, I can sit here and preach all day long about how we go about doing that. But I think we need to address some things with broadband if that's one thing. If there are other things, and some minutiae there that we need to work upon, but I think we were really effective. So I think it's just a simple task of what it is we want to address, and what the -- it's sort of the John Cubby approach. See the end in minds and start taking those steps to getting there.

So what is it that we want to accomplish? And what are the recommendations we want to make? And I think that's where we begin.

CHAIR BERLYN: Charles?

MR. BENTON: I'm delighted that you're raising the issue of our productivity. I -- which is one of my favorite issues for the Commission. And just to focus, Thomas, on your report, the Consumer Information and Disclosure proceeding, we have just in terms of the current structure of the CAC, which can be improved, I am sure, I volunteered to chair the Consumer Information and Participation Subcommittee of the CAC, and I have been struggling to figure out -- try to figure out -- how this subgroup might help -- be helpful.

Now I don't know anything about the Consumer Information and Disclosure proceeding that you're

doing, and I -- not knowing about this, know even less about how we might be helpful. So one of the things that it seems to me if we're going to be more productive is that we need to have more of a real discussion and dialogue with key people at the FCC who might be able to use our help. And so since we are lodged I believe in the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, I think that's our structure here. We need your leadership I think in helping to define areas

or point to areas where a group like this could really contribute to your work so that we, you know, so that we can have a dialogue about this. And the Consumer Information and Disclosure issue, for example, would be it seems to me a very good case in point. But I haven't a clue what this is about. And maybe you could help us with that. Just as a hard specific. It's just -- I mean, we could go off in many directions, but you're here. You've put us at the table. Here's a hard specific. How can we help on this?

MR. WYATT: Charles, we certainly share your vision, and I think that's a very worthy goal, and I will say this. I mean your timing=s a little off because I believe -- Julie just left me, and she's probably more of an expert, although I do see Michael Jacobs here. I would maybe ask him to -- Michael, can you talk a little bit about the Consumer Information and Disclosure proceeding?

CHAIR BERLYN: Well, could we -- could we just hold off on getting to -- let's have a discussion about the process first before we get to particulars about the issues? And I think we -- do we have someone

coming this afternoon to do that or no?

MR. MARSHALL: We have a progress report -CHAIR BERLYN: Oh, wait. I=m sorry, Scott.
MR. MARSHALL: Okay. Where=s my -- okay. We
have a progress report from our consumer participation
working group this afternoon chaired by Brenda
Pennington on the drafting that they've been trying to
do on the Consumer Information and Disclosure NOI.
Also we did have a presentation about that at the
September meeting from Erica McMahon, who could not be
with us today, and she regrets that. But -- so we do
have some things in the works on this particular topic,
is I guess the point.

CHAIR BERLYN: We do.

MR. WYATT: Debra, if I could just make one more comment? Charles, I appreciate your comments. And CGB is certainly interested and willing to work with you to figure out how we can maybe work together better, and we'd appreciate any suggestions and ideas. And I think our goal is to support you as best we can and there are some clear things that we can do. We=re more than happy to talk about those and try to

implement them pretty quickly.

 $$\operatorname{CHAIR}$$ BERLYN: Brenda? And then we'll come around to Lise.

MS. PENNINGTON: Good morning. I'm very happy that you're taking up this issue, and very pleased that the Commission is open to -- open in -- where we believe, open and much more receptive to incorporating our concerns.

As we talked earlier, I am the chair of the Consumer Protection Subcommittee, and Charles has been — as well as other members of the CAC who are on the subcommittee — have ben helpful in putting together some principles that we will — I've sent around a memo. We'll talk about this in much more detail later, but I sent around a memo. I've revised that memo slightly, and we are going to cull down the principles so that when we do present them to the FCC, they're sharp and focused.

But we really do appreciate the Commission looking at this issue because it's a very important issue regarding truth-in-billing principles. Thank you.

CHAIR BERLYN: Lise? Lise Hamlin?

MS. HAMLIN: Do you have me? Yes, okay. I
wanted to say that I have found the disability work
group has been very productive and has been able to put
forth recommendations. And we still have a lot of
work. I see that there=s some things that have held up
in the past that we'd like to move forward. So I have
no problem coming up with new things for our Commission
-- our committee to recommend.

I do have a little concern -- maybe a lot of concern -- about the new technical working group. And there may be some way that -- there may be times with a new group, or even with some of the older groups, depending on which one it is -- where we need more input from the Commission itself to help move things when they're stuck. And that to me is a process question. At what point does the Commission get, you know, two feet into a group? And when we're feeling like we're frustrated, as Claude was saying earlier, with the -- you know, as consumers we're frustrated -- how do we move things when they're stuck? And that kind of process, I think we do need to try to figure

out.

MR. WYATT: As I was saying earlier, I think you'll find us ready and willing to work with you to figure that out because I think it is a very worthy goal. And we want to be helpful, and I think staff is ready and willing to -- we'll work something out. Let's keep talking.

CHAIR BERLYN: Karen?

MS. STRAUSS: I agree with what Lise said, and I just want to add that -- I mean obviously this committee has kind of evolved over time, but I would prefer to go back a little bit. I think there was a

time that we spent more time at the committee itself dialoguing with each other, both as a group and as subgroups. And that's kind of gone away. It went away with DTV, when the focus was only DTV.

I guess I'd rather work together to try to develop policy rather than receive a lot of presentations. I think that brief presentations are okay, like the one that you just gave. You know, 15 minutes at a time. I -- there's a lot of access to information that you can get at the FCC. I think that

sometimes presentations are helpful, but I'm finding that they're dominating. I'm concerned that they're dominating the amount of time that we have together. People fly in. Once they're here, let's use the time that we have together.

There's -- you know, it used to be that there was always time on the agenda for subgroups to meet. And granted, we have to still do a lot of work between the meetings. But while people are here it helps so much to have face-to-face meetings.

So, and I'm, you know, like I=m even concerned today that the three recommendations and progress reports are getting an hour and a half of a whole day. That's not nearly enough for this kind of stuff. And we have major -- I can't even here for the last one, unfortunately, but we have major concerns with what's going on on the DTV working group and its lack of progress. It just needs -- we just need more time at the meetings. If we're going to be developing resolutions, we need time to talk about them.

CHAIR BERLYN: I think that's very important feedback, Karen, and I think we'll take that seriously

because we do need more dialogue time. I will agree with you completely on that.

While I agree with that -- you know, I've been on this for a long time, working on this as well. It has been my experience that while we always had that -- well, we have that, and while that can be very productive, it has always been my experience that a lot of time was spent in between meetings as well. So we - that works. It works if you have -- also have a lot of time spent in between meetings. So I think both are needed. And so I think that's a very good point.

Let's see. Cards are going up. I'm not sure where and when, but we'll -- Mark, I'll just go to you, and then we'll go back around.

MR. DeFALCO: Hi, Mark DeFalco with the Appalachian Regional Commission. I'm probably the newest member of the group, so I think -- I came here after DTV was over, and it seems to me like maybe from a -- one perspective, you lost your big mission in terms of you got DTV done, and you did great work trying to get that in place. And you still have a lot of other issues that you started working on -- sounds

like some of them for years -- that are going.

But my focus is broadband, and in particular rural broadband. And I see it as a money issue. I see it as a deployment issue where, you know, the providers are going to go where the money is. And it becomes a question of how do you support deployment in rural areas.

But there's a big need on the demand side. And maybe this committee as a consumer advisory group should be looking at things we could do to work the demand side of the equation, trying to get people to understand how they can use broadband, what it could be used for, rural applications, education, healthcare, whatever. But maybe there's something we could do with our outreach efforts to try to get people to understand it better, so that quite frankly when it becomes available, they take it because right now we have a big gap in where it is available, where broadband is available, the -- you know, the acceptance rate or the take rate, whatever you want to call it, the penetration rate. They're still pretty low. So maybe that's a big focus area that we could put some serious

attention to. Just a thought.

CHAIR BERLYN: Great. Good. Okay, I think Irene was next, Gloria, and then Brandon -- Claude -- Brandon, we're going to have to wind up at that point. Irene?

MS. LEECH: Yes. I'm new to this process, been here less than a year, so I'm still trying to figure out kind of how it operates, and could operate, and that kind of thing. But I think one thing we could do is possibly, you know, send people information and expect that we're going to read it and so forth in between. That might help with the presentations. But — and I think we do need time for the subgroups to meet when we're together, and that we need to set some schedules while we're together.

And I was confused about -- I thought maybe we were meeting yesterday instead of today, and whatever -- I -- you know, I guess it's just that I got confused about the logistics of all of this, but it -- I think there's some ways that we can communicate a little better and maybe make things a little smoother.

CHAIR BERLYN: Okay, thanks. Gloria?

MS. TRISTANI: I just briefly wanted to concur -- well, let me step back. I've missed the last couple of meetings, so I'm in a vacuum as to what happened in the last couple of meetings. But I would point out that I think one of the things that had an impact on how we worked and necessarily slowed us down a little bit was not only the digital transition, but it was the new commission.

We had a meeting scheduled, and then it was cancelled because we wanted to make sure that the chairman would address it, and that necessarily kind of

ruffled our process. So I think we're being a little hard on ourselves. But now's the time to seize. You know, we've got a year left. We gotta work.

But I have to concur with Karen because when I looked at the agenda -- it's very good agenda, by the way. I don't know if I'd take anything out -- but I saw there were no subgroups. And the broadband subgroup -- and maybe they were going to meet earlier -- but is not meeting. So I absolutely agree that that has to be the main -- a main focus of future meetings, and of course it has to happen before the meetings as

well. So that's all I wanted to say.

1.3

CHAIR BERLYN: Oh, I love this idea. Scott just came up, whispered in my ear here, and I love this idea. Aha, we've got Thomas here. He'll -- he may blanche, but -- I mean, but the possibility of extending our meeting to a two-day meeting, which would be a great idea. So that we would have more time to do that if folks would be willing to do that. Or even a day and a half. Exactly. So that we could extend our time to have -- or even a full day?

MS. STRAUSS: Or a full day. Because it's not even really a full day.

CHAIR BERLYN: Well, it's close to a full day. I mean, you know, the idea to have an opportunity for our groups to meet in advance of the meeting, and have time for reports, and then have time for -- you know, an adequate amount of time. I really like that idea. For out-of-towners you have to really almost come in advance anyway.

You know, any initial reaction to that. We could try and see if the budget could handle it for out-of-towners. I don't know if it adds too much more

expense for B- there might be a couple of people that would need a room.

MR. WYATT: I think it's certainly something that we could explore, and, you know, I think Scott's always coming up with really, really great ideas.

MR. MARSHALL: Just put you on the spot with B we can put you on the spot, right?

MR. WYATT: But usually they make me look good, so -- but we can certainly explore it here and provide some feedback.

CHAIR BERLYN: Yeah. No, I think this is one of the few times we don't have our working groups meeting. And just to say I agree, there's no question there. We do need to have our working groups meet. There is no question, so I heard you. Hold on. Irene, did you want to react to the two-day meeting?

MS. LEECH: Well, I think that may be a really good idea. And also did we ever do anything like schedule for a whole year's worth of meetings so we get them on our calendars and are prepared instead of meeting to meeting?

CHAIR BERLYN: That's another great idea, and

Scott and I are working on our calendar. And in fact Scott just yesterday went through the calendar for next year, did holidays and big conferences, and so we are trying to do that. It is, you know -- because we are subject to availability of space here, and we want to make sure that we can meet here, there are some complications there, but we would like to try and do that as much as we can.

And we do apologize for various changes we've had to make over the course of this past year. But we will try and do that as much as we can. And I do want to propose our next meeting date before we leave, and I don't see -- is Erik in the room? Eric? Ah, he just walked in. So we do want to stay on schedule. He just walked in. Erik Garr.

Brandon? Oh, Claude -- Brandon and Claude, if we could do that in the next two minutes because we need to wind up. Claude?

MS. STOUT: I've heard the suggestion about extending the meeting to two days, or a day and a half, and I think that's a good idea. That would be fine.

The working groups -- the groups, like Karen

1 2

and Gloria were speaking of, those folks can meet. I=ve been with the CAC for quite a long time, and I think it's very important for those groups to meet, as well as the full CAC.

But just one word of caution. The working groups would work well if there were resource folks or key people from different FCC branches who could be involved at the same time. So the disability access working group, if they could have the, you know, chair of the Disability Rights office, or the chief of the Media Bureau, or someone who can really address the captioning issues, or the wireline versus wireless access issues. Sometimes we have, you know, equipment compatibility issues.

So I think it's really critical to have those resources and people within the FCC who can effect change and who can participate in that conversation. I think while we're here and while we're setting aside time to work, that it's really critical to have those key folks at the table.

And when we make our recommendations like we've made in the past, I think we can, you know, check

off what we've already addressed internally, and the folks who are working, you know, on stuff with the FCC can let us know what's in the works, what's already past a certain stage, that we don't need to continue to give feedback on. And then that way we can focus our energies on what's remaining. So it's important to have those notes and to know what's happening internally at the FCC rather than, you know, having us as the Consumer Advisory Committee chasing after old items is basically the point. Thank you.

CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you. And I think, Claude -- I think we definitely have a commission that supports that. So, you know, we can certainly -- if there's a working group request -- I'm speaking -- I shouldn't be speaking for you, but -- you know, I think there's more openness to that. Is that correct, Thomas?

MR. WYATT: Absolutely, Debbie. As I said earlier, we're interested in identifying ways to facilitate your ability to do what we've asked you to do, and so let's keep talking. And if we can come up with some ideas, we'll try to implement them right

away.

 $$\operatorname{CHAIR}$$ BERLYN: Do you want to be recognized for a very quick comment?

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah, I do. I just had -first of all, I wanted to say that I supported the
thoughts and the comments from Karen and Mark and also
the two-day meeting. I think that probably in those
two days, we could probably have one day to sit down
and have subcommittee group meetings and to discuss
some issues and come back, and then into a larger group
and say here's our resolve, here's what comes back.
And everyone can agree and vote and be a little more
kinetic.

But the other thing too is I think somewhere today that we need to probably have some discussions as to what some of the issues are that we need to address and to begin to address those, whether it's broadband, or issues for captioning, or other issues that have fallen through the cracks of this digital transition, and on, and on, and on, so many other things that we may want to address.

But I think somewhere today, I would like to

have some discussions as to what we would like to do to once again build a set of objectives and goals and where we need to go with that so we can -- so it can move an agenda forward and be a little more proactive and productive.

CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you. And thank you all for -- I'm so glad we found the time to do that while we had critical mass in the room. What often happens is it's the end of the day and everybody is walking out the room, so we don't have a chance to do that.

Two quick items because we want to stay on schedule today, my goal. A proposal for our next meeting date, I'd like to throw out. We don't want to wait too long before our next meeting date. So Scott has checked on holidays and major conferences and the availability of this room, and I'd like to propose the date of Friday, March 19th for our next CAC meeting date. So if you could look at that and give me reactions later. That's item number one.

Item number two, I'd like to propose, and --we'll do a wind-up of this discussion later -- I'd like

22 to propose -- and I know that folks like to have some 0063 1 break time during lunch. Scott, is it possible that we could have a discussion though during part of our lunch time? Is that a possibility? Or do we need to give 3 our folks in the back room a break? MR. MARSHALL: Well, that B-I think that 6 might be problematic to some extent. 7 CHAIR BERLYN: It's Brandon suggestion that 8 we discuss issues? Can we do it during lunch? 9 MR. MARSHALL: We might have some time in the 10 afternoon possibly, or at the end -- well -- the issue 11 is giving people enough time to eat and not have to 12 work that lunch. I'm not sure what our interpreter's 13 situation would be over lunch. I don't know. Do we have -- is Helen here? 14 15 I think that might be problematic. I mean we 16 could have planned for that, but I'm a little bit 17 afraid that logistically that will prove difficult. 18 CHAIR BERLYN: All right. We'll hold on that 19 decision, and we=ll figure it out later. Okay, but thank you all for the discussion. We'll continue this 20 21 later. Thank you all. Let's move on. 22 I'm so pleased to introduce Erik Garr, 0064 1 General Manager of the Broadband Omnibus Initiative. 2 We've been talking a little bit with the Commissioners 3 Baker and Copps about the national broadband plan. And Erik is going to provide us with an update on what=s 5 going on with the efforts here at the Commission to 6 produce that plan. So thank you very much, Erik. 7 MR. GARR: Yeah, thank you very much for 8 having me, Debra. First off, it's nice to see some 9 familiar faces. Happy to be down here and spend some 10 time with you. 11 I actually don't want to talk for very long. 12 I'd much rather hear from you all. Most of what, you 13 know B- just looking around the room, these are folks who are pretty engaged already. So, you know, I'm sure 14 15 you've been to the public meetings and you've heard the things that we've been saying, et cetera, et cetera. 16 17 So I'll spend a couple of minutes on kind of where we 18 are, and then I'd more like to take questions and just 19 be available. I'd love to hear any thoughts anybody 20 has on issues that are important to you, et cetera, et 21 cetera. Does that seem fair? Is that a good use of 22 time? You don't need me droning on for 30 minutes. 0065 1 That=s no fun. 2 I do want to say a couple of things briefly, 3 which is, you know, we're -- where are we? We're in 4 the 70s, low 70s -- 71 days I think until it's due, 5 something like that. There's a sign outside of my 6 office that I used to walk by and now I take a 7 different route --8 [Laughter.] 9

MR. GARR: -- because it's, you know -- to

me, I'm behaving as if it were due tomorrow, which I think is the way I need to behave over the next 70 days or so.

You know, overall we feel pretty good. The amount of public dialogue has been outstanding, which I think is priceless, and, you know, we still have time for more of that. So, you know, any discussions we want to have here or further, we should do. We've been joking that we should, you know, we should -- there is a point where we need to not put out public notices. We're probably getting close to that. So you all hopefully will get a holiday break. We will not, but hopefully you all will.

You know, and I know there's been -- those have been hard, particularly, you know, if you're a large corporation, that's one thing. If you're a community group, that's a different all thing -- all together different thing to respond to. We're sorry for that, but there's not a lot, you know, we can do. We need your input, and unfortunately we were given a set of ridiculous deadlines, which translates to sets of ridiculous deadlines all over the place.

You know, and -- in a week and a half or so, we'll be talking publicly about the policy framework, and that's where we'll really be zeroing in on, you know, what are the elements of this thing. What are the issues that the Commissioners are going to need to make decisions on. And how are we going to move forward with the plan. I think that will be an important public meeting. I'd encourage everybody to attend.

In terms of where we are as a team and as a Commission, the amount of activity is high. We've been here nights, weekends, everything, kind of working on the range of issues that we have with all kind of

pushing towards this December 16th meeting, which I think will be important and useful in the sense that we should give more clear direction at that point. Everything we've said up until now has been going through an analytic process, which I'm pleased that everyone in the broadband community has been patient with because I think it's important to treat this issue in the way that we've treated it, which is starting with the facts and moving to what we think the gaps are, and then to the policy recommendations. But I also recognize that there's a point where that runs out. And December's really the beginning of the discussion about, you know, what are the answers. What are the things that the country really needs to do. And we look forward to engaging with all of you on that.

That said, that's all I really want to say. You know, we're hard at work. But more than anything I'd love to take your questions and engage in any dialogue of any topics you want. I hate to lose

opportunities when people are here in the Commission to learn. So I'd love to learn a thing or two from all of 0068

you, and I'll just kind of open it up $\operatorname{\mathsf{--}}$ open it up there.

CHAIR BERLYN: I got my card up first.

[Laughter.]

CHAIR BERLYN: I know that John Horrigan is

busy at work on a B

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ GARR: Yes. We have the data in the building now.

CHAIR BERLYN: Oh, really. Okay, he's been working -- for those of you who haven't heard, John Horrigan, who was with Pew Internet in American Life project and is now at the FCC, has been busy at work trying to assess -- get a real assessment of where broadband is and isn't. And so this is now -- this data is now -- in the building?

MR. GARR: Yeah. It's not analyzed yet. It's on John's computer, which is great. That's where it needs to be. And he is hard at work. He's actually at home -- working from home today because he wanted to be alone with his numbers, which is a good thing for him to be.

You know, just to remind everyone. We

basically took, you know, the great work that John and others at Pew have done over the years and tried to point that work more towards non-adopters, non-adopters or underserved folks rather than worry about kind of everyone that already has broadband, not that those aren't -- those folks don't have needs, but we wanted to really zero in the research. And we did several things to really focus on populations that probably haven't been focused on in research of this type in the past.

We had a Spanish language version of the survey, which is useful, because if English is not your first language, it's really useful to be able to speak in Spanish. We also have done focus groups in different communities where maybe we, you know, wanted to make -- maybe we -- different communities where we would have trouble doing phone surveys and things like that. So John has made a good faith effort as a, you know, kind of world class survey researcher to do the -- use the types of techniques required to get at this problem.

We have the data. To be honest, John and I

have had a couple conversations about it, but I don't have any details on it at this point. Other than he was pleased with what came back. Feels like it gives him the raw materials to push his knowledge further, and you can be sure that all of that will be totally published and transparent and available with the plan.

CHAIR BERLYN: Do you -- I guess what I'm wondering is will there -- the information that he has

gathered will then be used to inform the plan at this 10 point? 11 MR. GARR: Oh, yeah. 12 CHAIR BERLYN: Make adjustments and that sort 13 of thing? 14 MR. GARR: Absolutely. So there's two things we're doing. First is he needs to finish up, and he's 15 16 probably a week or two away from being able to say what 17 he thinks the data says. He needs to do the work that 18 he does. That -- you know, we've already had some 19 initial conversations on that, but when you think about 20 how we're doing the adoption section, it relates very 21 much to John's work. So rather than just kind of guess 22 at adoption, we thought let's push the research bar a 0071 1 little further down the field. And then based on what we learn, let's think about the programs that we need 3 to put in place, based on the best information that we 4 have. So those two things are definitely related. 5 And then second of all, John will also -- you 6 know, you should expect a publishable thing, like John 7 typically does, that goes through all the 8 methodological details and all the things that he 9 usually does. So there's really two outputs from his 10 work. One is the kind of thing that we're all used to 11 from John, and the other is using that work to inform 12 other parts of the plan. 13 CHAIR BERLYN: Great. 14 MR. GARR: And that was kind of the idea to 15 begin with. Yeah. MS. TRISTANI: I have some comments, but I 16 17 was confused because we didn't hear exactly what John 18 was -- is this adoption data? Is this a survey on use? 19 I mean I B-20 MR. GARR: Sure, no, that=s fine. So --21 MS. TRISTANI: Could you clarify that? And 22 then I do have some --0072 1 MR. GARR: Yeah. If you've seen any of the 2 Pew American Life Studies --3 MS. TRISTANI: I have. I have. 4 MR. GARR: -- where they ask questions about 5 adoption and usage, it's a very similar piece of work, 6 but it's just targeted a little differently. So we 7 tried to take that work and point it towards the parts 8 of the broadband ecosystem that we think needed more 9 study. 10 MS. TRISTANI: Okay. And I appreciate that. 11 I appreciate hearing that there was finally a survey 12 in Spanish because Pew, with all its wonderful surveys, 13 had neglected to do surveys in Spanish, and it would 14 usually be in a little footnote, so that skewed some of 15 the numbers. 16 Is this going to be available before the plan 17 is adopted on February 17th? Is this going to be

18

19

available for public scrutiny?

MR. GARR: All I can tell you is it will

20 definitely be available with the plan. It will be a 21 part of the plan. You know, I would love to make it 22 available sooner, and if I can we will. But I can't

promise that. As you can appreciate, there's a lot of complexities around releasing things when you're in a government seat that are frankly new to me, but I know are important.

MS. TRISTANI: And I appreciate that, but so many of the other studies have been made available for comment, and this is obviously critical and critical to many communities. Thank you.

MR. GARR: Totally agree. You know, it makes sense to me. Do my red letter best, but sometimes things just, you know -- have to go in a certain way.

CHAIR BERLYN: Mark?

MR. GARR: Hey, Mark.

1 2

MR. DeFALCO: Erik, how are you? Probably more of a comment. It seems like there are so many intertwining things that all come together, and I know the -- as an example, I just jotted down a couple as I was thinking of what I was going to say here. But phantom traffic from Voice-Over-Internet has been going on now for a couple years. It keeps on growing. Intercarrier compensation, which the commission has been aware of and dealing with but not issued a

concrete order on what they're going to do. USF reform, which I know right now they're starting to look at that, and you in particular looking at trying to focus, taking some of those dollars and putting them toward broadband deployment. And even write down like frozen separation factors, which has been probably three, four years, and they're still frozen. And the Commission seems to keep on -- I don't want to say postponing decisions, but they don't make decisions on a lot of these things, and it seems like they've all now culminated into an obstacle maybe to the National broadband plan because without resolving these issues, it seems like it's harder then to develop a plan to make it work. So we could talk about -- and I know you have a ton of people working on the broadband plan. What about these other issues that affect that plan?

MR. GARR: Yeah. I mean I think we're considering most of those. The one that is news to me -- that doesn't mean it's news to the team, since I would be foolish to think I can have in my head all the different issues -- is the frozen separation factor. But I will write that down and make sure that, you

know, we're paying attention to that, too.

You know, this becomes a little bit of a philosophical question about, you know, what are we actually trying to do here. To me, the plan is a unique moment in time when as a community, we can work together and lay out a path for things that a lot of which are things that the Commission is going to do.

And my view is the plan is a way to help, kind of let a lot of these things move forward. And things that maybe have been languishing for some time, you know, we move more towards action.

My impression as the new guy is that that's the intent. That's what I certainly get from the chairman and the other commissioners that this -- you know, this group wants to take on some of these issues. But I think there's -- my own view is they were wise to use the plan as a chance to think through these problems, rather than, you know, kind of charge ahead because they are so interrelated.

Which is — brings me to the final point that I'll make. You know, most countries that have done this, if you look around the world, they got started a $\,$

long time ago. So broadband planning has been a phenomenon in most of the world for many years. Not so much here, but -- and it's a many year process. And one of the biggest things we need to recognize when we do this plan is, you know, we don't have the magic broadband wand. There's no -- you know, I'm not going to -- we're not going to wake up on February 18th and all this great stuff will happen. But what it should lay out is a -- a way to move forward on many of the issues that you've raised in a meaningful way based on what we think the needs are today. And over time, you know, we need to push those things forward. And then we need to adjust as well. I think another important part of the plan is going to be about measurement and adjustment, and that's -- when you look at the countries that have done well, you know, pick your favorite. Korea's the one that always, you know -- I always love the Korean example. Because that's like, you know, Northern Illinois. I mean, it's -- lovely place, but just not as big and complex as our country. But it's -- but I think they've done -- you know, to their credit, they have done an outstanding

job. But if you look at it, they've done plans for different parts of their ecosystem, and then they've worked on them for a while, and then they've reviewed them. And that's the habit that we need to get into. My sense as the new guy is I said -- I feel that commitment amongst my teammates and the colleagues that I'm working with, and that's -- that's our job past February 17th for sure. So I think your points are right on. And you're right. We've got to figure these things out. We can't, you know, we can't just keep pushing things around. We've got to do these things.

CHAIR BERLYN: Erik, that was actually -that's a good segway to my question, but you've
probably answered half of that, which is sort of what
happens after the 17th? And that's probably the
critical point. I don't know -- you've got the
countdown clock. And so once you've reached zero and
the plan is out there, what's sort of next? And that's

in a way much more critical for consumers is --MR. GARR: It is way more important. CHAIR BERLYN: B- what happens after the plan?

22 0078 1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

19

20

21

MR. GARR: Yeah.

CHAIR BERLYN: And for us, as we think ahead because our next meeting is going to be after that plan is out, we need to start thinking about, you know, how we can help implement, and what we can offer in terms of help in that regard.

MR. GARR: Yeah, that's for sure. You know, it's funny. I've actually been spending more of my time recently about what happens after the plan. So, you know, we've been being pretty deliberate about, okay, we've gotten -- we've kind of done all this analytical work, and there's no way to do that easily. It's hard. You just have to roll up your sleeves and do it.

But even as, you know, really over the last few weeks, myself, several other bureau chiefs, sort of the other -- kind of some of the other folks who are longer term FCC folks -- have been spending time on not just the plan, but what cascades from it, and what are the actions and activities that need to go on. very much interested in -- not this plan, but interested in looking at where we are a year from now,

22 0079 1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

and two years from now, and five years from now. And we're starting that process.

So the thing we said from the beginning is that if all the plan is is a nifty document that, you know, we pass out and we read and think, you know, hey, this is big fun, if that's all it is we haven't -- you know, we've actually not succeeded. That's -- I would view that as a failure, and I would feel disappointed about the time that I've spent trying to do it, and I know that most of the people in this building would feel that way too.

So, you know, judge us on the plan, for sure, but we should really be judging ourselves on what do we do after the plan. And, you know, all I can say is that that's been a big topic of discussion. And I think that's very healthy and required, for sure. And, you know, we're going to -- in the plan we're going to say we need to do these things, and we need to have some timeframes for those things, and that's what the Commission needs to do. And what -- you know, there's other -- you know, there's a few other parties involved in this too. There's a few things that industry needs

0800 1

2

3

5

to do, there are things that community groups need to do, et cetera, et cetera.

CHAIR BERLYN: Charles?

MR. GARR: Thank you for having coffee at this event. This is a great way to attract a tired civil servant.

MR. BENTON: Erik, wonderful that you're here, and thank you for your comments. I think the notion of -- our next meeting is on -- the tentative date for it is March 19, so it's about a month after the plan will be delivered. We tried to rally around the digital transition as the previous major event and spent a lot of time on that. Our chairman, Debra, has raised the issue of structure, and how we can be most productive in the remaining year that we have in this two-year term. And maybe the thinking about the next steps following the plan might provide a real event around which we can organize an ad hoc group of the committee here that would be interested in focusing on the next steps post-plan.

 $\begin{tabular}{lll} If we were to do that, how should we come about -- what would be your suggestions as to how we \\ \end{tabular}$

could best address that, and interact with staff between now and March 19, which is our next meeting? In other words, how -- just put yourself in our place for a moment and give us some advice as to how we might organize ourselves to address that emerging need.

MR. GARR: Sure. You know B- so a couple thoughts. It's a good question, and I think, you know, there's two ways to think about it. The first way is we should just commit to working together on that event. And if we can use that as a way to talk about particular parts of the plan and get feedback on what that means to the different groups that you all are a part of, that to me seems wise. I can't imagine why we wouldn't want to do that. And view that as the first discussion with this group after the plan where we dig in and say, all right, you know, what things are in here that require us to do some things, what things are missing.

I'm sure -- you know, one thing I can tell you is it will not be perfect. That I know it will be the best we can -- the best it can be, but there will certainly be gaps, so if there's something we missed

that's a good time. Let's talk about it. Doesn't mean it should never happen. It just means it wasn't in this document that we wrote.

From a practical standpoint, which is kind of the second way to look at the question, I think the -- you know, the thing that is tricky is we have a -- just a tough resource problem in that there's literally -- there's a few hundred people right now working on this from a staff standpoint, and they're working really hard, and they're doing a great job. It's going to be kind of mid-January before the intensity ratchets back.

You know, any project you do like this -- I describe planning projects like this as a little bit like surgery. You know, you -- there's a certain point where you -- there's only a couple doctors who are on the patient. And you can't have every surgeon, you know, working on the patient at once, or, you know, bad

things happen. You need lots of consulting surgeons in the room with you, and then a bunch in the gallery kind of looking in to make sure you don't make mistakes. But as it gets to fewer and fewer doctors working on the patient, that does allow us to start doing other things and start thinking about how we interact with you all. So I would suggest that's kind of a mid-January type of thing. By that time, we're doing the final, you know, final -- I'm not a doctor, so I don't know what they do at the end, but -- yeah, they=re sewing it up. We're sort of -- you know, we're doing kind of the last steps of the thing. And that's a couple of surgeons, but many of the doctors are, you know, they feel like the work is done, and they can be,

Does that answer your question, Charles?

MR. BENTON: Given the holidays and then we've got a couple of weeks into January, and that's no problem. So, Debra, maybe you have some thoughts reacting to this.

you know, put onto some other things. But until that

time it's just going to be hard. That's the reality.

CHAIR BERLYN: Yeah, but we can talk about this later, Charles, but I think it -- I think we -- I think based on our discussion this morning, we can talk this afternoon about how we proceed in our goals for this next year. I think we have some good charges

there.

Erik, thank you very much. And we're looking forward to having you join us for our panel that we're starting at 11:00 on dispute resolution. Are you going to B- not -- just to listen if you=d like.

MR. GARR: Oh, okay. Okay. CHAIR BERLYN: If you=d like.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ GARR: You know, I would love to. I'm going to have to go back upstairs. I'm sorry about that.

CHAIR BERLYN: Okay. That=s okay.

MR. GARR: I'm really glad to be here. It is a pleasure to see you all. I say this at the end of every speech. If you have questions, E-R-I-K-dot-G-A-R-R-at-F-C-C-dot-gov. You can all reach out. And I try to answer every e-mail. I don't get to all of them as fast as I want, but, you know, I think it=s important that this is an open process, and we've made a good faith effort to do it, and we can't stop now. You know, we're almost there. So we still need to stay open. So thanks very much. And I will -- I'm sure I'll see you all again soon.

1 CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you very much. 2 [Applause.] 3 CHAIR BERLYN: We have -- Thank you

CHAIR BERLYN: We have -- Thank you, Erik. Thank you very much.

MR. GARR: Yeah, you bet. Thanks for having

6 me.

CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you. Thanks. Gloria?

MS. TRISTANI: Just quickly. Listening to all of this and thinking about all the things that are happening at the FCC that are not -- well, they may be related to broadband, but all -- there's a lot of activity going on. I think it's really imperative that we find a time to talk about issues, which you were trying to find for the noontime, because --

CHAIR BERLYN: Yes. We can chat right now during our break, and come back to everybody with that.

MS. TRISTANI: Thank you.

CHAIR BERLYN: Okay, we have a break, but we will start promptly at 11:00 for our panel on consumer dispute resolution on broadband issues, which should be fantastic. So everybody please be back promptly at 11:00. Thanks.

(Luncheon recess.)
(On the record.)

CHAIR BERLYN: There we go. Ah, now we=re B we have to B I know I need a gavel.

There we go. If everyone could be seated back at the table, unless you're on the panel. Okay, very good. Thank you all for coming back promptly. Before I introduce the panel, I'm going to reintroduce myself. I realize I didn't have my coffee this morning, so I want to reintroduce myself with my proper affiliation. Debra Berlyn, CAC Chairperson, representing the National Consumers League very proudly, I must say.

And as such, I have asked to moderate this next panel one of my colleagues, John Breyault, who is with the National Consumers League, and this is a great panel. I'm very excited about this. John is vice president of Public Policy, Telecommunications, and Fraud for the National Consumers League. And I thought this would be a great panel for him to moderate because the -- and a former CAC member - thank you, Scott, for reminding me of that several years ago you were on the

CAC. That's right. So he has experience with being with this organization as well.

But John has done for many years previously to NCL but also with NCL quite a bit of work on the issue of consumer complaints about their telecommunications services, and helping consumers resolve issues that they have with their services. So I thought this would be an excellent opportunity for John to address this issue for us.

And we have an excellent panel. John is going to introduce for us, so I'm going to turn this over to you, John. Thank you so much for doing this this morning.

MR. BREYAULT: Thank you so much, Debbie.

And thank you to CAC for inviting me to moderate what I think is going to be a great panel. We've got a great

panel of experts here.

Few changes from the agenda. Eric Friedman from Montgomery County Office of Consumer Protection and Mitsuko Herrera haven't been able to make it today. But Keith Hawkins -- Watkins, rather -- has kindly pinch hit for Mitsuko here for us.

So Debbie sort of went over a brief bio of myself. I've been working in the telecommunications arena now for almost a dozen years with Sprint, BellSouth, and then I moved on to consumer advocacy with the Telecommunications Research and Action Center. Most of you probably know it better as TRAC. And then a year ago, I moved over to the National Consumers League.

One of the things that we handle at the League is consumer complaints, which come in directly to our fraud center. Last year, we took in 22,000 complaints about fraud. Many of those dealt with broadband service. And at TRAC, before NCL, I did deal a lot with consumer complaints about broadband. We focused primarily on advocating and educating residential telecommunications consumers.

So as you can expect, as people have moved away from using traditional telephone service for local and long distance, now they're using their broadband connections more for communicating, that the number of complaints and the issue of customer service has become ever more important.

One statistic that I think was useful enough

to help kick off the panel here. According to the OECD in 2008, the average monthly subscription price for broadband is \$45.52. That works out to \$546.24 in annual cost, subscription cost, per year. And the question that arise — rose in my mind from that is what are consumers getting for that, besides just a broadband connection? Do they have expectations of certain levels of customer service? This is something that, you know, for better or for worse, phone companies and cable companies, which are your — primarily the biggest providers of residential broadband, have, unfairly or not, become characterized for customer service that, let's say, is below average sometimes.

And as consumers now use their broadband connections for many of the things that before, for example, they may have used their phone company for, they're using Vonage now, for example, instead of residential -- instead of the phone company for phone service. Who do they call when they have trouble? Do they call Vonage? Do they call their broadband provider? Do they call someone in a state or local

agency?

These are all questions that I think I'm looking forward to our panel discussing. I'm going to take a quick moment to introduce them. First off, we

have Philip Ziperman. He's the Deputy Chief of Consumer Protection Division of the Maryland Attorney General's office. As Deputy Chief, he supervises the division's litigation and enforcement of Maryland's consumer protection laws. Philip has worked for the Consumer Protection Division for 13 years where he's also served as Assistant Attorney General, and Counsel to the Attorney General's arbitration program.

Next to him we have Keith Watkins. He's the chief cable and broadband complaint investigator at the Office of Cable and Communications Services in Montgomery County, Maryland. His office administers Montgomery County's cable and telecom franchise agreements, and works with service providers to ensure that they comply with service standards and franchise requirements. Keith is primarily responsible for investigating subscriber complaints and assisting in resolving disputes between the subscriber and the cable

provider.

1 2

Next to him we have Susan Mazrui. Susan is the Director of Regulatory Affairs for AT&T Services, formerly Cingular Wireless, and is the first co-chair of NSCIA's Business Advisory Committee. Inside the company, she has been a leading champion in the development of accessible and usable telecommunication services and products, and for marketing with and employment of people with disabilities. She also serves on a variety of boards, the World's Tune Disability*, Women's Concerns Committee, the American Council for the Blind, and the Advisory Committee of the UCLA Anderson School of Management's Leadership Institute for Managers with Disabilities. Thank you for being here, Susan.

And finally, last but certainly not least, we have Brenda Pennington. She is with the District of Columbia Office of People's Counsel. As supervisor for telecommunications there, she is responsible for managing the legal group that handles all telecommunications matter before the D.C. Public Service Commission. She began her career at DCPC --

PSC in 1988. And after that she was with CTIA as regulatory and legislative counsel representing the wireless industry before State and Federal agencies.

So thank you all for being here. The format here, we're going to allow each person in turn to give a five minute remarks, followed by some questions. I'm going to take moderator's prerogative and ask then first, and then we'll open it up to questions from the floor. So without further adieu, Philip?

MR. ZIPERMAN: Good morning. Do I need to use the microphone? This is fine. Good morning. I'm not used to going first with a name like Ziperman, and so I appreciate that, thank you.

[Laughter.]

MR. ZIPERMAN: Most of my career, in fact my

entire legal career, has been as a -- working as a litigator. So most of my experience is handling consumer complaints when they weren't resolved through some form of dispute resolution. Having said that, for the last 13 years, I've worked for the Consumer Protection Division of the Attorney General's office doing enforcement work. And now as a deputy in the

Agency, I supervise most of the operations within our office, including our complaint handling unit, our mediation unit, which is quite large, probably the largest complaint handling unit for a government in the state of Maryland. And so I'm going to focus my introductory comments, explaining a little bit better what we do, how we do it, and then be happy to take any questions later.

The Consumer Protection Division is one of the larger divisions within the Attorney General's office, and we have a jurisdiction that is virtually unlimited when it comes to consumers. Our jurisdiction is over consumer goods or services, and consumer goods or services are services that are -- and goods -- that are sold to consumers for personal, family, or household uses, or agricultural uses. If a consumer is buying a good or a service for a business purpose, it wouldn't be something that we would cover.

We're statutorily charged with enforcing the Consumer Protection Act, but also a whole host of other laws in Maryland that declare violations to be unfair and deceptive trade practices. And then outside of our

statutory jurisdiction, we can enforce just about any other law if there's been a deceptive activity that's occurred in connection with that law. And I'll use the FDA Act as an example. Years ago I prosecuted a company that was selling consumers a unimproved new drug as a cure for cancer. We have no statutory authority to enforce Maryland or federal drug laws, but if a company is advertising a product in a way that's illegal, either implicitly or expressly, then we can take action.

And so when complaints come to our mediation unit, the net that's cast is very, very wide, and really we will handle just about any kind of complaint that comes to us, unless the complaint concerns a good or a service that's specifically regulated by another agency. And I tried to compile a list last night, the list of things that we really don't do, as cable, gas, electric, banking, which would include debt collection and debt management, water, local telephone, home improvement, and secondary education.

And having said that, that doesn't mean that we won't mediate those complaints either. Using

broadband Internet as an example, we'll mediate those complaints if the service is part of a bundled group of services that we do -- that does come -- excuse me,

that isn't specifically regulated by another agency. So I personally have dealt with complaints and investigations against some of the larger Internet providers, DirecTV, Verizon, and so on. If the complaints that are coming in are of a non-regulated activity in a regulated industry, we will also mediate them

The way our mediation process works is fairly simple, although the organization is fairly complex. We have somewhere in the area of 120 mediators that work within the office, largely comprised of interns, retirees, volunteers. They're supervised by a group of six supervisors, who are then supervised by an attorney, who then reports to myself and the chief of the agency. Consumers can complain via Internet, via phone, they can come in in person, they can corner us on the street. Anywhere they can find us they can complain. And they do. We get about 12,000 complaints a year. Our resolution rate last year was about 68

percent.

2.2

Keith?

You would expect the usual suspects. auto industry, auto repair, are usually the largest complaint generators. I will tell you that a significant Internet provider was the leading complaint generator over the last several years as part of their bundled service offering. And the complaints that we usually get in this area usually have to do with billing -- and they're probably the same complaints that you folks are dealing with -- but billing, advertising, particularly with respect to price, cancellation, and customer service. With respect to cancellation, I think the most common complaints are I cancelled, but yet I'm still being billed, or I'm cancelling, and why am I finding out for the first time that my account is going to be tapped for a very large termination fee.

In the area of enforcement, which is really my bailiwick, in the last several years we've announced settlements, national settlements, that dealt with all of these issues with DirecTV and with EchoStar. And that's it. Thank you.

MR. BREYAULT: Thank you very much, Phil.

MR. WATKINS: Hello, my name's Keith Watkins. I work for Montgomery County, the Office of Cable and Communications Services. And specifically I deal with all of the complaints that involve the three counties franchise cable providers, Verizon, RCN, and of course also Comcast.

Complaints range from billing to service issues, to also now with Verizon and their construction issues, we get a lot of construction complaints as well. But the primary thing when -- and course now I only talk to people who are complaining. No one ever calls me up and says, gee, I love paying \$200 for

substandard service. And I love getting double billed and then not having -- not posting my check to my account, and then I have to prove to the cable company that they actually did take my check, receive my check. I've got to show front and back of the check just to prove it. Consumers don't like to do that. They don't mind paying a fair price, and they understand that from time to time things go awry, especially with 0098

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

1

2

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

0099

1

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

0100 1

technology. But they want someone to address that problem immediately and just not give them a lot of lip service. So I don't ever hear from the customers that are happy. I only hear from customers that are unhappy.

Now fortunately, I came from a cable background. I worked in the cable industry for about 10 years, so I'm a little bit more familiar with the problems. And when the cable provider tries to say something that's not quite right, it's easy for them to catch them in something that may not be accurate. So it's fortunate for me that I've done that, but it's also -- I think it's beneficial to not only the county but to the subscribers -- to the consumers -- because they really can't pull the wool over our eyes as they maybe could for someone that didn't have that sort of background.

We actually have three people -- I'm one of three -- that came from the cable industry. So we -you know, we have an engineer from the cable industry, we also have another person in the cable industry, so it's -- it helps the consumers. But I'm the sole

person that handles all the complaints for the County. Now in addition to that, even though we don't regulate rates, they still complain about rates, and of course notification of that. So we have to explain that process as well.

We do get complaints on broadband. And of course with broadband being more -- you know, it's just -- everything is broadband now, you know, web sites, things like that. People have to be on the Internet with work, telecommuting, and things. And when the broadband is unreliable, they want it fixed, and they want it fixed right now. They either want it fixed within a day or so. But if you were to tell someone --I believe if you were to say, look it's going to take us three days to get to this issue, I think people would pretty much accept that if within that three day period, it was fixed. But many times what they do is, when they call the cable provider, they say, oh, yeah, we're aware of the problem. We'll be out there in a couple of days. And then they never hear from them. Or they'll call and say someone will call you back within 24 hours, and you'll never get that call.

So it's just -- people just kind of feel as though they're not -- they're paying good money, but

yet they're not getting the type of service -- they're getting service that may be inaccurate, as far as when they speak to them.

We also educate people on the DTV transition that just took place. We were very involved in that, gave a lot of seminars around the County. We're all set up very heavily for that when that took place back in June.

Recently the cable companies have also migrated to a digital format. That's creating some issue right now, specifically with Comcast in Montgomery County. So there's a few issues going along with that.

Verizon, with construction, many people don't understand the right-of-way and the public utilities easements. So we get a lot of calls where they say Verizon's in my yard, and they're digging two feet from my front door. Well it's really not two feet, but -- so we have inspectors that go out, would look at the construction, make sure they're within the PUE. We

also work closely with permitting inspectors to make sure they have the proper documentation, proper permits to be where they're supposed to be.

Other than that, we have a very good success rate with our complainants, and our complainants -- we send out surveys, usually once or twice a month, very positive feedback from our surveys that we send out. So look forward to any questions you folks may have. Thank you.

MR. BREYAULT: Thank you so much. Susan?
MS. MAZRUI: Well, good morning. My comments
today are actually going to be a little bit more
looking toward the future, and where I think we need to
work together, and to go.

The work that you've done on digital TV was extremely helpful. It made the transition go much better. We think that in terms of broadband, we're talking about another huge issue, and the outreach and education piece that you've worked in, and the advice that you've all given is also going to be critical. So I'm happy to be here today.

The broadband environment again is different

than what we've done traditionally. It's an ecosystem. There are a lot of different players. There are a lot of pieces that can work or not work together, and it makes it much more difficult. You're talking about the network itself. You're talking about Internet service providers. You're talking about gadgets that you use to access the Internet. You're talking about browsers. You're talking about web sites. So a range of issues and players that work together to make the Internet work. That also means it's a little more complex when there is a problem.

Service can be provided over a variety of different ways. You can get it again on your wireless

device, your home device. You can be in a public location. You can be in a private location.

So of course doing these -- this system

becomes much more challenging for consumers. Consumers often have difficulty understanding where a complaint belongs. You know, who is the Internet service provider -- you know, when I did talk to folks in complaints, they were saying one of the key questions is, you know -- they can't get complaints. It could be

for the wrong place. And so some things that seem basic to some of us who've been around in this area for a while, are really not for the general public.

You know, what is an Internet service provider? That's another thing. People aren't sure. And if there's a problem, where does the problem occur?

That makes it more critical that all of us work together, that as state and federal agencies work to protect the interests of consumers, they also work with industry to prevent and resolve issues, and we've seen that work in the past. It's in a company's best interest to be proactive on these issues, and it's extremely helpful if organizations or agencies like the FCC can work together to convene the non-traditional bodies, folks who haven't had the long history of working with the FCC, to work on these issues because it can add a level of encouragement, let's say, if a federal agency says we're working on this issue. We need you. Not just the Verizons and the ATTs and the folks who've been around for a while working with them, but all the players in the ecosystem to participate and help to resolve and prevent issues. They can work on

things like transparency and other things that can really help the consumer. So we strongly support that.

We also think that the FCC and the Consumer Advisory Committee here can provide critical, helpful -- play a critical, helpful role in helping companies understand issues, including those faced by people with disabilities. It's common that we want to say here are the broadband issues, and here are the disability issues. We think that there's both pieces, and the composition of your group where you have both consumer and disability issues is extremely helpful because, you know, people with disabilities don't only live in, you know, a separate world. You know, they're part of society as a whole. So we think that issues around disability access need to be addressed in both areas.

We made B- the outreach and education by folks in digital TV was critical. We also think that with broadband where you're talking about access to employment, of civic participation, social immigration, these are critical issues. We think that there needs to be education around these, not only for the area of how to resolve and address complaints, but also the

value of adoption, things like this. And we think that

the FCC, these other agencies, and this committee in particular can play a very helpful role in addressing that educational effort.

We also think that problems — because the environment is different, some of the problems can be avoided because of lessons learned. One example of that is work AT&T has done with the Better Business Bureau to develop an intake form that helped make referrals go more quickly. If you're getting a referral from a complaint and it's not toward your company, or you can't resolve it, that adds time before that time that the complaint gets resolved. So if we get sent a complaint for another company, or in an area — you know, maybe about a web site, or something that's really beyond our control, that doesn't help the consumer.

So we think that industry can work with agencies and organizations to help them put together their programs in terms of intake for complaints. And that can help direct the complaints in the right way, and that of course helps to quicker resolution.

We also know that people who are in customer-facing roles often need additional education, and we think in the area of broadband, it's even larger. And for agencies and organizations that are working to resolve those complaints, additional training is needed to understand and to do intakes that make sense and can drive the customer to the right location for a resolution. We also think that people with disabilities come into those forums, and that it's critical to have customer-facing personnel, and we do that at AT&T, get at least a basic understanding, disability awareness, communication skills, make sure the ways that the people with disabilities interact with the company are all accessible.

And we think that there needs to be additional expertise that can be provided around disability issues specifically. So we think that if you're customer-facing, and you're working in an agency, if you're working in a company, you should have you know, basic understanding and awareness because unfortunately in our society, we don't really have that training. A lot of people are still today,

uncomfortable with disability. And so when you're looking at these specific needs, you have to have a person comfortable and willing to ask the right questions and do the right referrals.

Then we also think there's some specific issues that are disability only, and you need some folks with additional expertise. And it varies on how it may be handled by companies. It's handled differently in different parts of our company based on the specific need and the level of technology expertise that's needed.

We also think that there's another role that

agencies can play, especially those who work on 508. We know that as part of the ecosystem for -particularly for people with disabilities, there is a realm of assistive technologies. There are people within the federal agencies who work specifically on assistive technologies. And we would hope that the expertise that's developed in places like the FCC, where you have people who know about assistive technologies, that that could be an additional resource to people who are trying to access the Internet and 0108

happen to run into an issue around assistive technologies, which really go beyond -- unless we're specifically offering an assistive technology, it generally goes beyond what you'll see in the standard service providers.

And so we hope that that additional expertise, the additional training, and the work that's being done now to get people up to speed and to understand or help prevent some of the issues will help consumers understand where to drive complaints, and we hope will bridge the gap between people without disabilities and people with disabilities, and provide additional services.

And again we just want to reiterate that companies throughout the ecosystem also need to work together, and again reiterate that the organization like the FCC could help in that process. And that way we could streamline how complaints are handled. This can also add additional transparency and other feedback that might be critical to the agencies, but we think that getting all the players from even the nontraditional service providers together can really help

serve the consumer. And again, an organization or a group like yours can really help provide the feedback both on disability, nondisability issues, trends, concerns, and provide important help to agencies and to companies as well. So I appreciate your time. Thank

MR. BREYAULT: Thank you so much, Susan. Finally last, but certainly not least, Brenda Pennington.

MS. PENNINGTON: Good morning. I'm so pleased to be here today to talk to you guys about something that is dear to me because it's something that I do every day, which is resolving consumer complaints.

You usually know me with my hat representing NASUCA on the CAC, but in my day-to-day job, I am an assistant people's counsel with the D.C. Office of the People's Counsel. And what we do in addition to -- and I'm in the Legal Services Division. We have a whole division, the Consumer Services Division that does consumer complaints.

With -- the lawyers get involved when the

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

0109 1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

consumer complaints go -- and we take these consumer complaints before the Public Service Commission dealing with local service. The lawyers get involved when the consumer complaint goes from the informal stage to the formal complaint stage.

At my office, we are averaging about 400 complaints in the broadband area since we don't regulate, or since the Public Service Commission does not regulate broadband. The OPC's jurisdiction extends as in most states only as far as the Public Service Commission's jurisdiction extends. So while the number of consumer complaints that we get for local service are triple that amount in one year, when we looked back into our database, we're only getting about 400 complaints over the past eight to nine years. However, we have had a lot of experience in trying to help consumers resolve these issues, even though it's not under our statutory mandate. And we can't go so far because certainly we're being paid by the rate payers of the District of Columbia in order to focus on issues regarding local service.

But what we do when we get a consumer

0111

3

5

6 7

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

complaint dealing with broadband, is we actually help walk the consumer through that. Now there are -- we are a member of NASUCA, and out of the 44 member offices, there are really only two member offices --California and West Virginia -- that actually have authority over cellular, mobile, or broadband applications. My office does not. So in order to help assist consumers B- because what we don't want to do is to have the consumer call up, and they have maybe already spoken to someone at the Public Service Commission. First off, they're going to have spoken to someone at the company. And they may have spoken to several someones at the company. And they may have more often than not gotten more than one suggestion as to how their complaint is to be resolved. So by the time they get to us, we try to break down the process so that they can understand it more clearly as to what we do and what we don't do. But what we don't want to do is to just hang up on them after we tell them that no, we can't help you. So we really try to walk people through the process.

A lot of times we may get complaints from $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right)$

22 0112 1

2

4 5

6

7

8

10

11

consumer -- I mean, from seniors who are not well versed with broadband technologies, so they're confused from the beginning. And as soon as there is an issue or a problem, they're even more confused after they've gotten a run-around.

What we find -- a particular dilemma is dealing with a complaint that involves a bundled service because when it's a bundled service, it is a local service that's going to be combined with one of the unregulated services, wireless or broadband. We had one particular complaint -- and I can't mention any

of the companies, you know, confidential reasons -- but they -- it was dealing with a bundled complaint and their wireless service. And under the Public Service Commission rules, your local service is not to be disconnected for non-payment of a non-regulated service. However, due to practice and the encouragement of competition in the local market, the Public Service Commission has allowed, through some other various reasons, has allowed the local phone company to disconnect for non-payment. There was a 2.2 litigated case back in 2002 that the Commission did not

come out with an order -- has not yet -- so that record is stale, and if they were to come out with an order they would really have to, you know, take more evidence.

So this particular couple had lost their local service because they were complaining about an issue with respect to their mobile service. While my office was able to walk them through the process at the FCC, in conjunction with the process at the PSC, we were not able to get them an adequate resolution. Basically they still had to pay whatever it was that the local company was demanding that they pay in order for their services to be restored.

So we took a different tactic. The local company, which is Verizon, is under a price cap plan, an alternative regulatory plan, while hopefully the local market moves into competition. And this was a litigated case before the Commission. But what the People's Counsel decided to do was, since none of the issues that we had heard from consumers were before the Commission, in point one of B- this disconnect for non-payment, we negotiated with the company. It was that

same year that the city council had held quality of service hearings over a two-day period and over 600 consumer came. While these -- all of these consumers were not just concerned about the quality of service with Verizon, there was also concern about the quality of service with Pepco and Washington Gas. But we were able to take directly from consumers their concerns, and negotiate with the company on getting a resolution. Certainly for further complainants regarding disconnect -- non-disconnection -- that their local services would not be disconnected for non-payment of mobile services. So we had to, you know, be creative in the way in which we could address consumers' concerns.

Certainly as we move into more intermodal competition, we will be seeing more of that, and I definitely think that we're going to need to work together. I think that some rules may need to be changed as the local market moves into more competition. Thank you.

MR. BREYAULT: Thank you very much. Those were wonderful remarks by all the panelists, and I

1 2

really do appreciate it.

I do have a list of questions here that I wanted to make sure were aired before we open it up to questions from the CAC as a whole.

You all mentioned the increase in complaints from consumers due to bundled service. Today -- it used to be when you had a problem with your phone service, you called the phone company. When you had a problem with TV service, you called the cable company. And with consumers increasingly using bundled services, oftentimes they don't know who to turn to.

And -- but one of the offshoots of this is that consumers who do have access to the Internet are now turning online to air their complaints. They are not always using traditional complaint avenues. Blogs, for example -- consumerist-dot-com, if you've never been on there, has a wonderful blog, but they oftentimes are a clearinghouse for complaints, complaint boards, like ripoffreports.com. People are turning to social networks like Facebook and Twitter to air their complaints. Many companies are now monitoring these sites, and Facebook and Twitter and

social networks, to protect their brands, one, and also to nip consumer complaints in the bud.

How is the -- how are these technologies and the increasing use of these technologies to air consumer complaints, affected what you are doing at your agencies, and Susan at AT&T, to address consumer complaints? Anybody?

MR. ZIPERMAN: From a law enforcement perspective, we use those sites all the time. One of the issues that we need to face is if a business is generating complaints, does it — is there a basic misunderstanding between the business or the consumer, or is the business actually doing something, from an enforcement perspective, that's deceptive? And so we'll look to the Internet and some of these sites to see at least what sort of information is being shared among consumers with the understanding that the accuracy of what's being said on these sites can only go so far.

On the other hand from a mediation perspective, we don't go looking for complaints on the Internet. We like the complaints to come to us. And

the only other thing I can say in a recent experience that I had, or that my office had, we were -- it wasn't broadband. We were investigating a lawyer in Frederick, Maryland that was taking people's money, promising to settle their debts, and then stealing it. When the word got out on some of these social networking sites that my office was investigating, we got inundated with complaints.

MR. WATKINS: Well, I would have to agree with Philip. We really don't go looking for

complaints. We have enough that come to us. If you go on DSL Reports, under one of the cable company's headings on DSL Reports, it has horror stories, and it's kind of funny. I've read through those before, and the stories that you read in other parts of the country are identical to what we're seeing. It's like Dragnet, you know, everything's the same except the names have been changed.

[Laughter.]

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

0119 1

2

3

4

5 6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

MR. WATKINS: So that's about it.

MS. MAZRUI: On the other hand, at AT&T we actually do look -- go looking for complaints. We do 0118

have a new social media team that looks at sites like Twitter and Facebook, and try to use that as a feedback tool. Because, you know, basically complaints are a form of feedback, and you can use that to improve what you're doing. You can also use that to address specific complaints.

We do, however, have to be incredibly cautious. And when you get to sites I think like Consumernista where you can't respond back privately, we can't respond back because privacy is such a paramount concern within AT&T. So we do look at new sites. We can't always work with them as transparently as some folks would like just because of our policies where privacy and, you know, our work is a regulated entity. But it is a great feedback tool, and it's certainly something we're looking at.

MS. PENNINGTON: My office -- while many of our complaints, most of our complaints, come by telephone, we certainly do have an active e-mail address specifically for consumer complaints. We also send out e-mail blasts to community organizations when the Public Service Commission is considering taking

action on issues so that we could maximize the amount of involvement that we get from other community organizations.

And with the increase in social networking, my office has taken an active role in the SmartMeter program regarding Pepco and these SmartMeters. And we actually created a blog where we encouraged people who were participants in the SmartMeter pilot program to email and to keep in contact with the other participants, you know, as well as anyone who'd be interested in learning about it -- about their daily activities with regard to the SmartMeter program participation. So we are increasing our technological reach.

We certainly -- the People's Counsel is certainly very committed to doing a lot with technology because that is the way that we would be able to maximize our participation out in the community.

MR. ZIPERMAN: I think the use of these sites from either the businesses' perspective or from a

22 regulator's perspective, is -- one of the questions 0120

that we always have to ask ourselves is a complaint being generated from an isolated incident, or is it a pattern or practice that's occurring within the industry. And so where we use these sites, whether it's a ripoffreport.com, or whether or not we're going to the Federal Trade Commission's site for gathering complaint data, or sharing data among our various state AGs, and we gather data. It's useful in determining whether there's a pattern, and if the pattern's repeating itself in multiple geographic regions or from multiple sources, then it becomes more of a concern and less of an individual complaint-based issue.

MR. BREYAULT: Thanks. You know, one of the issues that the League where I work that is dealing with complaints and from -- we hear directly from consumers is they feel often that their complaints go into a black hole. That they go in, and they never hear back.

One thing that we would -- are interested in hearing about is efforts to track these complaints that the consumers themselves can access. For example, when I mail a package through FedEx, I can track that

package at every stage of the process. Have your agencies considered some sort of complaint tracking system that a consumer could access to address this worry that they make the complaint and then they never hear anything back?

MR. ZIPERMAN: We do have a complaint tracking system, and it's in Atlanta. That's what it's called. It's our complaint tracking system. Consumers can access data from our -- we call it CTS -- from our CTS system not so much for the purpose of tracking their own complaints, but for the purposes of seeing where complaints are being lodged and against whom. What we do in our office is we assign a specific mediator to each complaint that comes in so that the consumer is provided with a name and a phone number. Through that Complaint Tracking System we, track the progress of the complaint, and we keep the data that's being provided in support of the complaint from either the business or the consumer.

If a consumer wants to track the progress of his or her complaint, they need to call. We don't yet have remote access to specific complaint data. And

quite honestly, not because of any technological reason, but because we don't want to provide them with that data. We don't want to provide business with that data because for law enforcement purposes, we consider it privileged, or the Attorney General's office. And so everything we do to investigate a complaint, we consider it attorney work product. Everything's being done under the supervision of an attorney, and we don't want to create data that could be used, should the

matter turn into a law enforcement action, that could be used in the litigation. And so there's a legal reason for it, not a technological one.

MR. WATKINS: Well, we have a database that tracks all the complaints, but that's not available to the complainant.

With every complaint that we receive, we certainly inform the complainant that they -- if they don't hear from the cable provider within a day or so, to call, you know, to call me back. I give them my direct number, give them my e-mail address, so they have all of my contact information.

Many times we won't hear back with a

resolution until it's actually been resolved by the cable provider. But we certainly coach the complainant that if they haven't heard from the provider to contact us back. Each provider has a group of individuals that's designed specifically to handle county complaints, so that's a very good benefit. And usually the provider calls that person back, depending on when the complaint comes in, usually we get the complaints in immediately. And if it's early in the day, they'll call them back the same day. If not, they'll call them back the next business day. But we certainly coach them to notify us if they're not contacted quickly.

MS. MAZRUI: And I'm not going to answer that question. I'm going to actually take it to another point, which is to reaffirm what you said.

One of the pieces was you have -- people have a way of contacting you. I think one of the critical pieces in this new ecosystem is that the companies, the agencies, all need to work together to have good contacts. We have, for example, 800 numbers or numbers that we have directly with agencies that help us resolve something more quickly. That helps.

But you also need to have it on your web sites in multiple ways, including ways that are accessible for people with disabilities, available. And that regardless of whether you're an Internet service provider, or whether you're a manufacturer, there needs to be that ability to contact companies, agencies, organizations.

MS. PENNINGTON: Yeah. My organization as well keeps a data base, but that is not available to consumers. When consumers call in they are assigned a consumer complaint resolution specialist that is in our Consumer Services Division. They open a matter. They contact the utility, and they wait to get resolution from the utility. And we usually are negotiating at some point, you know, once we get the full story of what happened, what's the complaint, what does the consumer want for a resolution, we try to negotiate within that.

Also with respect to utility contacts and being able to negotiate, that negotiated agreement that

21 I was telling you about earlier with the price cap 22 plan, we were coming into an issue of consumers getting

their complaints resolved in an expeditious manner with one of the utility companies. So we were able to put into that negotiated agreement that there would be two dedicated people from the utility company which -- who would resolve the complaints. Now we don't give those names out to the consumers, of course, but two dedicated people that would address the complaints when the Office of the People's Counsel calls. Thank you.

MR. BREYAULT: Great. One quick question for Susan. You know, an idea that I've seen floated around from time to time in -- for banks, an example of a bank, I have a bank account where I -- if I go in to see a teller, I have to pay a fee, for example. And I use -- but I -- and I'm encouraged to do all my banking through the ATM or online, and that's fine with me. I don't need to go in to talk to somebody all the time, but there are certainly people who do. Similarly in broadband service, some people need more customer service, let's say hand-holding, than others. Would AT&T consider moving to a per-call fee in exchange for lower monthly subscription fees if the customer wanted that?

 $\,$ MS. MAZRUI: I have no idea. I can bring that question back, but I -- any answer I gave would be wholly uninformed, so I don't think it would be a good use of the time.

MR. BREYAULT: That's okay. Just a -putting it out there as a question that I've seen -it=s certainly people who are a little more consumer
savvy and know how to reset their modem, for example.

For Brenda. You mentioned in your remarks that the settlement that OPC reached with Verizon in March of '08 addressing consumer complaints related to telephone service, and one of the agreements in that settlement was that Verizon would increase how fast they were deploying FiOS within the District. Now a little -- we're going on two years since that agreement was reached. Can you give us an update on whether that agreement has resulted in better consumer -- customer service for D.C. consumers now than when that settlement was reached?

 $\,$ MS. PENNINGTON: Right. Well, let me give you a little background on what happened with that negotiated point.

The Office of the People's Counsel is not involved in any way in the negotiations with Verizon bringing FiOS to the District of Columbia. The reason that we put that into the -- and that jurisdiction is solely under the auspices of the Office of Cable Television. But the reason that we put that in there is because we received so many consumer complaints concerns frustrations regarding the deployment of FiOS

in neighboring suburban jurisdictions in Maryland and Virginia. We wanted to show our concern, our support, and our desire for an expeditious rollout of FiOS. So my office is only privy to information that, you know, Verizon has released to the public.

This is a question that is very important to D.C. residents. They want to know when is FiOS coming to their neighborhood. And so we've only been able to respond with the information that Verizon, you know, has given publicly. But we certainly do encourage and look forward to a full deployment of FiOS throughout D.C.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ BREYAULT: Well, I'd like to open it up for Q&A while we have some time left. Yes, Mark?

CHAIR BERLYN: And John, just to tell you that we have a format here, a process of asking all our participants around the table to put their cards up as an easy way to recognize, and then do the order. So you'll look around the room and recognize those who have their cards up as an easy way to keep track.

MR. BREYAULT: Thank you.

MR. DeFALCO: I think as we start going to things like metered broadband and things like that that, the propensity for complaints could go up very high. But I'm interested in knowing from the panel -- I think I know what Susan would say to this -- but from the rest of the panel -- and Susan you could weigh in too -- do you think -- especially when you start talking about like Voice-Over-Internet and things, do you think the Internet should be regulated from your perspective? Because I think you're going to get a lot of questions coming, and a lot of complaints coming in from people about my charges for my broadband, and did I go over the cap that I=m supposed to have? And what about poor voice quality in my -- with my Skype, or with my MagicJack? Do you think the Internet should be

regulated to some degree?

MR. WATKINS: Well, I think that it's not so much maybe that the Internet should be regulated, but yet the delivery of Internet is what I think should be regulated. Not so much as, you know, you can have it, you can't have it, but if it goes down, I think there should be some sort of service level that would require the provider to get you up and running in a reasonable amount of time. And if they don't, then there should be some penalty that is imposed on the provider. That's where I think B-

Now, you know, I know that Internet providers can throttle back and forth download speeds, and they have caps. But yet you don't really know what the cap is because they don't want the heavy users of Internet to go up to the cap and then stop. So they just say yeah, we have a cap. If you go over it, we'll let you know. Well, I think in the Count, Montgomery County, we've only had I think either two or three cases where

the people have actually gone over the cap. So -- and then they shut them off. They just completely shut them off. them off.

1 2 enfc 3 all 4 mgs 5 it' 6 del 7 that

1 2

But I just think there should be some enforcement on the delivery of Internet. And of course all the companies say oh, we're going to give you 50 mgs. But yet, in the fine print, it's "up to." So it's the speed that they say that they're going to deliver, but in actuality it's not really that. And that's what seems to be the most frustrating for people. They think they're going to get this great -- you know, this -- oh, I'm super fast. It's the best you've ever seen. And then when they get it, it's really not. So it's a little misleading, but of course they always have that little disclaimer, "up to" the certain speed. So that's what I think.

MR. ZIPERMAN: Why don=t I jump in for a minute? In the absence of such a regulation, if an Internet -- excuse me, if a broadband provider is promising something that it's not delivering, then in the absence of regulation, that would still be an unfair and deceptive trade practice. Conversely, if -- or on a related note, if -- so taking Kate's example, there are laws in place with respect to fine print. You can't promise one thing and then disclaim it away

on the back or in smaller print. You can't sell a service and not inform the consumer of material facts. In the absence of a misrepresentation or material omission in advertising, then without a regulatory scheme, I think it leaves the law enforcement community with little to do.

MS. MAZRUI: I think you probably know I would say we want a level playing field. That's all. [Laughter.]

MS. PENNINGTON: My agency has not come out with a policy position on that. However, we certainly would want consumer protections across the board so that consumers, you know, there's a direct way in which their complaints can be resolved expeditiously, and it's, you know, in a B- it's in clear print. We just want to make sure that consumers are protected with whatever technological service that they choose to use.

MR. BREYAULT: Let me go to Gloria, and then

Chuck -- Claude, sorry.

 $\,$ MS. TRISTANI: Thank you. I=d like to step back and ask the Maryland AG and Montgomery Cable and People's Counsel. And by the way disclaimer. I live

in Montgomery County, and I know if I have a cable or a FiOS complaint, because I now have FiOS -- where to go.

MR. WATKINS: I'll give you my card.
MS. TRISTANI: Yeah, yeah, I know. Trust me,

6 I know.

But I think one of the initial problems --

and I=m going to say the average consumer, many consumers have, is that they have no idea where to go.

And nothing against companies, but oftentimes if you call a company and ask them where to go, the front line is very reluctant to tell them. I had that actually personally happen to me twice, three times with three different companies on other issues.

So what -- how -- I heard you do blasts of e-mails to agencies to let consumers know, but what do your agencies do to let consumers know, particularly those consumers that are not savvy, that may not be able to get on the Internet, and immediately find out where to go to get their complaints resolved?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ WATKINS: Well, we have a Cable and Communication Advisory Committee in the County. In

fact, Claude sat on that for a number of years. And they put together a cable rights brochure that's available on our web site, and also that is in paper as well that we hand out. But our information is on everyone's bill, but there's one provider that placed it on the bill such that when you tore off your remittance, the information went with your remittance, so you never kept it. So that was very strategically placed.

But, you know, I always tell folks to -- I always try to give them my direct number, if they have any neighbors. You know, word of mouth is kind of the only way, because -- I don't know, that's the issue, how do you get that out? I mean I don't think we can do PSAs on the channel because that would seem to be creating more of an issue, and that's -- you know, the providers certainly don't want that. And then they'll -- their lobbyists would call, so, you know, that creates an issue, yeah.

MR. ZIPERMAN: With my agency we have the advantage of publicity from our law enforcement efforts. And so, to a large degree, when we take

enforcement actions in any regulated area, it'll publicize that we're here, that you can complain to us.

We do regular public outreach. We have a consumer publication that we call Consumer's Edge that we e-mail to all -- and fax to relevant industry, all media outlets. We go and try to be in the public's eye.

With respect to some industries, and I don't know that I can use Verizon as an example, although I will say this, people seem to be finding their way to us to complain about Verizon because they are our number one complaint generator as far as a business. But we've required in settlements that businesses notify consumers of our existence and not on the back of a return bill. We require a bold face, 12 point prominent disclosure above the signature. And generally speaking that would be the smaller industries. If we=ve got a homebuilder, for example,

19 that wants to keep its license and it=s causing a 20 problem, then we'll require in its building contracts 21 to tell folks that if you have a problem call the 22 Attorney General's office. And we've done it with --0135

done that repeatedly with a variety of different industries.

The largest industry -- business I can think of is a Internet-based business that was selling subscriptions, had a customer base of close to 100,000, and we required it as part of its business practices to tell folks of our existence.

MS. PENNINGTON: We have a tremendous consumer education and outreach program. We are out in the community at least three times a week during the day, evening meetings. We go to the ANC meetings. We go to community meetings, particularly if the company is going to be there. We always go if we have taken a position on the issue. We also have brochures and other leaflets that we continually distribute.

But you are right. It's a very important issue because even though we are on the back of the bill, we do get a lot of calls confusing us with the company, not knowing really what we do. So we still do have a very big job in order to not only let folks know that we're here, but what we do and how we can help. So it is -- that was a good question because it's a

really big issue.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

0136 1

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

5

MR. BREYAULT: Claude. Then Debbie.

MS. STOUT: I'm Claude. I think this may be a question for both Keith in Montgomery County and also Brenda in D.C., in D.C.'s office, excuse me. So I basically have two questions.

The first being have you seen a continual rise of consumer complaints in regard to television captioning? So that's the first question. And also, I know in Montgomery County you do have franchise agreements like you referred to with RCN, with Verizon, and with Comcast. Do you do the best within your area of authority to ensure that providers are captioning television programs and voluntarily providing caption streaming when they provide these broadcasts through -cable broadcasts through Internet means?

MR. WATKINS: Well, I'm not familiar with captioning through Internet means as much as I am with the cable television portion. The only part that -we've only received very few complaints on captioning -- is the ease in which you can either engage or disengage the captioning feature for a cable box or for

0137 a television. Other than that, that's pretty much it. MS. PENNINGTON: Because my office deals strictly with the public utilities that operate in D.C., we have never -- or at least to the best of my knowledge -- we have not ever gotten any complaints regarding TV captioning. I'm sure that if a complaint of that sort came into the office, that the person would be redirected to the appropriate agency by our receptionist, and those calls would not get back to the staff because we really, you know, have no jurisdiction over that area at all. Not even remotely. Because if we did, we certainly tried to help the consumer, give them as much information as they would need.

MR. BREYAULT: Debbie?

CHAIR BERLYN: I just wanted to get back to Gloria's good point. And what we are as a consumer advisory committee to the FCC charged with looking at is ways in which we can advise the FCC on this matter. I=m just thinking about consumer education and outreach on this issue. The most basic of basic confusions here consumers are confused, it seems to me, and may not even really understand who their Internet

service provider is in many cases. So just something for us to think about is what part we could play in helping with that process to help consumers understand some of these basic issues and confusions and perhaps work with the FCC to help with that process.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ BREYAULT: Any comments from the panel? No? Charles.

MR. BENTON: As I remember, Gloria, it was you who suggested originally that there be a consumer protection — you were the one that raised the issue of consumer protection with respect to the CAC. And I'm just wondering from today's panel, since in line with your experience being a commissioner at the FCC, what is it that the CAC could or should do with respect to consumer protection in line with what we've heard today? What are your suggestions about what we do?

MS. TRISTANI: You left me speechless, Charles, because, you know, I'm not ready to give the one answer to that, but I think -- I think there -- we do need to focus on how do we aid the consumer initially. You know, if I were to -- if my mother had a problem with her cable service - she's 84 -- she

would not have a clue where to go, and she lives in a condominium, which has a different type of provider. I don't even know who her provider is. And so, you know, I get concerned about how do you aid people.

And it was interesting to me to hear about the closed captioning question that Claude had because I know many complaints come to the FCC because they really -- they are the agency that has jurisdiction. But it's very hard for people in new Mexico to think of that's where I have to go, so a whole host of issues. And I guess it's something we need to address.

But I think with all things at the FCC, we need to get the attention of not just the Bureau, but of the 8th floor. I assume this is important, critical issue. And I think this is going to become worse before it becomes any better because you have so many different jurisdictions. You have ongoing legal

fights. We=re not going to get into that about jurisdiction, and it's a very difficult world for the consumer to maneuver.

And one last point which brings us back to broadband is that you know, everybody says we put it on 0140

the web page. We put it, you know -- you can easily find it there, and what do you do with all the people who don't have the web pages? Or let's -- it'll cost you more if you call. That's a real problem.

CHAIR BERLYN: That's a real problem, considering the numbers, which we will hopefully find out soon of how many are not online. But we know it's an extraordinary number of individuals, and particularly those who can least afford to not have that sort of access and information. So we have to make sure while we have the eyes and ears of the Commission to make sure that we don't only rely on that information being online.

MS. TRISTANI: And I guess one last point is I do want to commend what all the local and state government agencies do to do this. And I know you know this better than I that the better you can work together and work with the FCC and everybody work together, it's better for the consumer.

MR. BREYAULT: Well, I've gotten the wrap-up B- oh, sorry. One B

CHAIR BERLYN: Marti has a point, and then

22 0141 1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

Karen, and then wrap up.

MS. DONEGHY: Good morning, and thank you very much for this panel. As always, very relevant and critical.

I just wanted to throw out not so much a question, I guess comment/question for all of us to think about as a consumer advisory panel to this Commission. And it's my understanding that there is some legislation, federal legislation out there that could possibly move, or has the potential to move even $% \left(1,...,n\right) =\left(1,...,n\right)$ telephone service into IP, as an IP level, that the industry may want.

And I guess what I'm saying a lot of telephone service is now moving to IP, which would remove state consumer protections. So thank you because sometimes my vocabulary gets -- thank you, Gloria.

So anyway, I just throw out for a comment. This would eliminate a lot of state consumer protections if it were to go through, if it were to happen. I know I read that Mitsuko's very concerned. And then, Gloria, you just mentioned the point about

0142 1 what if it's not on the web. So I just think that this panel is more critical than ever because consumers -you mentioned confusion -- but if state regulators are preempted, then there's an even bigger job ahead. So I hope that we can look at that at some point in the

future. And we have no way of knowing how fast it may move through Congress, or if it will be successful, but we need to be think about that I think.

MR. BREYAULT: Brenda?

MS. PENNINGTON: I just wanted to say support both of the issues that Gloria as well as Marti have addressed to the committee today. Being a member of the CAC, I would definitely like us to look at and undertake the issue of how to help consumers navigate where they go, but also to make certain that there are still state consumer protections that flow to consumers. My office's policy is that if it's a local service, we're getting involved. Thanks.

MR. BREYAULT: Karen?

MS. STRAUSS: This is just a quick comment just to reiterate something that somebody said in the context of disability access.

You talked about how fragmented the various services are. We are now working on legislation, as everybody knows, HR-3101, to try to make sure that broadband services and equipment are accessible to people with disabilities. And from the time that we started working on the bill, which was about two years ago to now, we have already seen such an enormous shift in the way that these services are provided in terms of applications. And we're now having to confront the issue of exempting, for example, service providers from liability where they are not responsible for the application.

And this is not uncommon. There are other similar provisions in other laws where they=re passed through B- the entity just passing through the application B- is not held liable, except that it's becoming so incredibly complicated, as well as for general consumers, for people with disabilities because when a product doesn't work, or a service doesn't work, trying to figure out who in that chain was responsible for the lack of access is going to become -- I mean almost impossible at some point.

And just -- I'm just raising the issue. There=s no resolution now, but it's something that we're having to grapple with in terms of this legislation, and it's going to become only worse. So as you take on complaints from people with disabilities, be aware that this is even going to become more confusing for this population.

MR. WATKINS: I always advise people -- just one last -- briefly. Because all the cable companies require equipment now to view enhanced products and even basic products, any time that there's a change of equipment, just make sure -- I always tell the consumer just make sure you get a receipt for any equipment that you've returned, or that's been picked up, or that's been swapped out because many times that equipment will not be removed off of your account. And the cable

company will then look to you for payment, reimbursement of that equipment. And sometimes that can equal 5- or \$600 if it was an HD/DVR box or something like that. And the only thing they'll accept to remove that off is a copy of their own receipt. So you have to really make sure you protect yourself that 0145

way.

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

And particularly when you have billing that's an automatic debit or automatically -- auto pay through your credit card, make sure you monitor that very closely because if there's a mistake, you want to catch it right away. So many times I get complaints from a consumer that says I've been paying for three boxes when I only have one box, and I've been paying that fee, that extra fee, for five years. And now all of a sudden I've caught it, and I want the cable company to reimburse me for those five years of overpayment. Well, the cable company doesn't want to do that. They're in the money receiving business, not the money giving business. So that=s it. Thank you.

MR. BREYAULT: So I will leave the panel -and all of the questions and feedback we've gotten here has been great. I'm glad to see this dialogue.

I want to end with one question to the panel. Phil mentioned at the beginning that there was a -his office had a 68 percent resolution rate on complaints. As -- would it be useful for you as state and local agencies and to the service provider

0146 1 2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

community at AT&T to get guidance from the FCC potentially as part of the national broadband plan on a goal for complaint resolution rates? Do -- for example, would you, if you moved to -- if the goal was to move to 75 percent, or 80 percent resolution within five years, is that something that would be useful to your company and your agencies?

MR. ZIPERMAN: I don't know that setting a goal would necessarily be useful to my agency. I will say this. Before I came today, I looked at the complaint forms that the FCC has in place, and I was actually very impressed. I mean I think that the fact that the FCC is taking complaints based on practices and trying to categorize its complaints is a very useful thing.

I think if I had to -- and first of all, up front I should thank you all for inviting me here today. Thank you very much. I think what's been crucial to the success of my agency -- and we have the advantage of size, and so to a certain degree, it's unique to our size, but we have a lot of people working on resolving complaints, and they're heavily trained,

22 0147 1

2

3

heavily supervised, and heavily re-educated on a consistent basis.

And so going back to Debbie's issue before with respect to getting people to the right place, we

have an institutional experience where one of the things that we're focusing on when consumers call us is just that. I mean we're not simply a conduit through which information passes from the consumer to the business and the business back to the consumer. We're a law enforcement agency, but we have a lot of experience mitigating complaints. We have a lot of experience about the way the laws work, and we try to rely on that institutional experience so that when a consumer comes to the agency, we can not just pass on his or her complaint, but we can actually actively get involved in resolving it. We can give them meaningful advice with respect to who they need to complain to if it is not us. The last thing you want is some consumer that is going to be passed to the wrong place because then they're only going to be angry with the agency that's now receiving them, but they're going to be angry at us, and they're probably going to call us 0148

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

0149 1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

And so ultimately, you know, we are the Consumer Protection Division. It's our goal and our job to protect people and to make them happy. And so do the best you can to train and retrain, and then retrain the folks that are dealing with consumers so that they can provide them with meaningful advice. Get actively involved in resolving the complaint, and not simply act as a conduit, but get involved in actually mediating complaints. I think you'll have a successful program.

MR. WATKINS: I don't really think a threshold would be that beneficial because many times the cable provider will say, well, we resolved this complaint, but the consumer will say, well, they didn't resolve it to my satisfaction. So you have two issues there. You have, you know, a resolution, but then is the complainant satisfied with the resolution. that's --

MS. MAZRUI: And I would add that I think there definitely is a role that the FCC can play and agencies in terms of bringing the right players

together so that complaints go in the right directions, are resolved more quickly. I think there's also a role within this organization in terms of outreach for preventing complaints, and for ensuring that consumers are educated and know what their rights are, and know how to resolve complaints or how to avoid them.

I think that there's educational opportunities within the community, which you all have tremendous outreach for, but I think you also have the opportunity to educate the industry and the agency as well because you have more experience and background than most of us do. So I think that that to me is a huge role and a big need that you guys could fulfill.

MS. PENNINGTON: Having a specific goal would not necessarily help my agency, which was one of the

questions. However, I do think that it would help in the resolution of complaints, setting a goal for consumers. I think that it would help with the issue of consumers believing that sometimes their complaints may fall into a black hole because it gives you a goal and an objective from which to work from.

MR. BREYAULT: Well, thank you. And seeing

1 2

no other questions, thank you, Debbie, and the CAC for hosting this panel, and I'd ask you to join me in thanking our panelists today.

[Applause.]

CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you, John. I really appreciate. You did a fantastic job, and thank you all -- panelists -- for coming today from as far as Baltimore and Montgomery County. Great Montgomery County.

We are just putting lunch out, so it looks like our timing is perfect here. We have an actual break until 1 o'clock, and please take a little break, then get your lunch.

This is a good time for informal discussions. Use your time well. I think we can use this time, although we don't -- we won't have any discussions as a whole, but this is a time if you would like to have some discussions in a couple of your -- with colleagues about some issues just together, if you have some thoughts. We are going to try and find some time this afternoon to continue our discussion about our planning going forward. So thank you all, and we will reconvene

at 1 o=clock.

(Off the record.)

[Beginning of Track 2 at 1:05 p.m.]

CHAIR BERLYN: In the interest of keeping on schedule, we're going to get started. I think there are a couple of people out in the hallway, but they will come if they hear we have started.

I know a number of you are interested in hearing about -- an update about what's happening with the Web site redesign. We've heard that the FCC is working on that, and that's very -- of great interest to all of us. We know that this is an important first step in terms of communicating with consumers.

And so today we have Gray Brooks and Haley van Dyck, who are with FCC's new media effort, and they're going to fill us in on the status of the Web site redesign. So welcome to you both. Thank you very much.

MS. VAN DYCK: It's great to come back and speak with you again. So yes, thank you again for the opportunity to come back and speak with you guys. I wanted to introduce you to my colleague Gray, who will

be joining us this time around, which we're very pleased about. I wanted to give you a quick couple of updates on some of the things -- projects and

initiatives we've been working on since I spoke to you last, a few months ago.

Broadband.gov, which we touched base on a few months ago, has been functioning fantastically well. We've gotten a ton of support from -- and participation online. We've now done over 30 workshops helping engage the community and the discussion on the National Broadband Plan, which have all been streamed online with the ability to participate through Twitter or Facebook, or other online mechanisms in the workshops. Those have been, actually, so successful that we're planning on doing similar implementations of those for some other initiatives we're working on at the FCC, which we will talk about coming up.

Actually, Gray, do you want to continue with broadband? Sorry about that.

MR. BROOKS: Sure. First of all, it's a pleasure to be here as well. Thank you for regularly meeting with us and -- or allowing us to meet with you,

I should say -- and there's a number of things that we're going to be touching on. We have, you know, brief glimpses as well of our Web pages. I'm not sure, with this room, what the best way will be, but perhaps if everyone's all able to, say, you know, reference the Web site, the gentleman in the back can pull up -- I mean all of you are familiar with FCC.gov. You know, it is our old friend. It's been with us for quite a while. And we're going to be touching on mainly projects that are related but separate. But the overarching part of this conversation will get back to not just how -- not just other projects that the FCC is doing online, but where FCC.gov, as a Web site itself, is moving to as well. Bear with us.

But to go ahead and start moving into it, we'll address some of the topics that we've been working on, and then of course, you know, look forward to questions in a short period of time.

Many of you are familiar with broadband.gov as a Web site that launched earlier this year. It's gone through a number of updates and has been, you know, an important basis for innovation that we've

started to experiment with, and then once it's been proven, adopting other platforms, and start adopting for the agency-wide. You'll note up here there is a link to "en español," for the Spanish version of the Web site. That is -- you know, it is a project that is -- become more standard by now but has a lot of room for innovation. Something we'll touch on a bit more. We've had over 30 workshops that have been hosted online. They've been live stream. They've taken questions from the Internet, live. It's been a very active source of blogging. The National Broadband Task Force have been fantastic about, not just going through the paces as a government entity, but also talking about what they're doing and why they're doing it.

The comments -- we've had over 500 comments on the blog itself. Through the crowd-sourcing Ideascale platform, there've been a little over 5,000 votes, 500 ideas, several hundred comments. But moving forward, one of the questions is also how we can not just have this be a traditional, you know, new media engine, but at what point we can also start involving even further collaboration with the public. And with

that I'll, kind of, hint with a, you know, to be continued. But I think even though there are other projects that have launched since then, in between now and February you're going to see quite a good bit more innovation with broadband.gov.

One of the things that I wanted to just touch on as, you know, we lead into the social networks is, you know, there are many things which I think everyone has in mind when people hear "new media" and new media with the government, and we'll touch on, you know, the Web sites that we've launched, and are going to be launching, the platforms that we're going upon. But it's -- you know, when we talk about where we're at with Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, the important thing is to not just see the numbers growing but to also start seeing them implemented in our day-to-day activities at the agency. And the point isn't just to have a presence on these sites, but to start integrating them into what we're doing across the board. Transitioning a little bit there.

 $\,$ MS. VAN DYCK: One example of integrating the social networks into the daily functions of our

operations here is Facebook -- FCC live, where we were actually live streaming everything that's on FCC.gov, including this event -- on Facebook, which is pulled up on the screen over here as well, to help increase FCC's visibility to these different audiences. Doing everything we can to lower the barrier to participation and getting the content and things coming out of the FCC easy to access and available for audiences that may not have been as able to engage with the FCC before. This is one example of how we're dong it.

Twitter, also a fun update. We passed 200,000 followers on Twitter this morning, actually. So a very, very significant base that we are reaching out to on a daily basis. That also puts us at the third-largest Twitter account in the Federal government. We're behind White House, who gets to tweet about Barack Obama; CDC, who, you know, gets to tweet about H1-N1 and updates; and we recently just passed NASA, who's been tweeting from space, so we're kind of proud to join the ranks of the top of the list there.

To touch on quickly another project that

we've been working on since we spoke last is "give" -FCC.gov/give -- a site that we put up to help employees

donate to the Combined Federal Campaign. Started using some more new media tools to help get this message across. That's another little project to cite for you guys that we've been working on.

The largest initiative that we've been -we've been trying to harness public participation on
since our last meeting has been OpenInternet.gov. We
launched this Web site following the beginning of the
Open Internet NPRM proceeding. Since it has launched,
we've received a ton of participation online. We've
received over 30,000 opinions and ideas shared from the
public about the FCC's actions regarding the Open
Internet NPRM, as well as over 15,000 comments via the
blog engine and Ideascale crowd-sourcing platform. So
we're very pleased at how this has been going, again,
using this as a model, learning from our experiences
here as to how we can best engage the public going
forward in FCC proceedings.

We will be setting up similar workshops which are starting on Tuesday, around the Open Internet NPRM, $\,$

similar to how we did broadband, with some improvements. Our goal is to make them more accessible. We'll also be launching them on Accessibility Event, which is a, you know, platform that I'm sure many people in this room are familiar with. But it's easier for screen readers to help with participatory elements and joining the workshop online. We'll also be live streaming this on OpenInternet.gov, and Facebook, with no registration technically required, so hopefully it will be much easier for people to get involved.

There will be conversations that will be happening online around these workshops -- around the content of these workshops -- both before and after, to give it a much longer breadth of discussion. We will be using the Ideascale platform for that as well, and soon launching mobile elements of this site too, so you will be able to access it through your cell phones, through mobile access pages, WAP pages, to help again increase the audience and the reach that we have to involve people with this NPRM.

At which point we've been working on some

other accessibility issues, which Gray is going to talk about a little bit further right now, as well.

MR. BROOKS: There's several dynamics here that I think are overarching, and what we've found, very quickly, is not only that accessibility issues are common across the government, but also there's even a slightly wider question as far as, What are fundamental aspects of a new media presence that the government should have that they are -- could do better with? And this again gets to something where it's not just an FCC issue; it's an EPA issue, it's a FEC issue, et cetera, et cetera. And having friends in these other agencies, we've been communicating, collaborating, more.

A very exciting incident happened a couple of weeks ago that some of you may be familiar with, and we were able to be invited for the unveiling of this, where Google announced, two weeks ago a project whereby -- first of all, everyone on every YouTube account right now is able to create captioning much more readily. Up till now, we have been creating subtitling files through a tool that -- you know, you have to go through and parse out the text based on the

1.5

timing. They now have the ability to just take a raw transcript and create the captioning based on that. That dramatically lowers the investment of time, and getting good closed captioning up for our video presence on YouTube.

A very interesting parallel announcement was only relevant to about a dozen education institutes that are partnering with YouTube, but what it involves is the ability to have machine closed captioning that is as good as, or better than, broadcast quality, without any human involvement whatsoever. It's also tied with their translation engine, so that you're having alternative language subtitling on these videos in 50 languages -- again, automatically, with every video being launched in these channels. We reached out to them at that event and followed up with the people who coordinate YouTube across the board and also with the government to say that we understand them starting with a partnership of a dozen education institutes and looking to scale up from there, but that Federal YouTube accounts are a prime candidate to be followed up on that. They were very receptive, and there's --

there will always be more work we can be doing along these lines to make it better, but the idea of not just having very smooth captioning available for all of our videos in YouTube, but to actually have it available and also Spanish, also French, German, you know, on down through to, you know, Finnish, Mandarin, Swahili - is just -- it's interesting because it's something that is -- that we can build upon. It's not just another tool, but we can take that and build it in and then go farther.

You know, similarly, we -- as we roll out more new media tools we're dealing with greater and greater volume of material. You know, there have been docketed items in the past that have had lots of comments on them, in the realm of hundreds of thousands, and so the tools that we're bringing to the table are not inventing a new problem. The problem -- the question has always been, How do we best deal with getting a large amount of citizen involvement? And, again, this is something which is not specific to the Federal Communications Commission.

Along those lines, we are working in parallel

on two projects that are very important and have rich

dividends down the road. They include an internal dashboard where we're able to start viewing not just numbers of comments at certain times and across certain platforms, but also starting to work on how we can, you know, learn more from these comments other than, you know, the traditional means of printing them out and looking at them and putting them in folders.

We're working with some partners to experiment with some other comment handling. We -- you know, when we receive x number of thousands of comments for an issue, how can we start tagging them and sorting them in ways that are much more advanced and allow multiple people to be interacting with this data in a much more efficient way? And that is us working with the other offices and bureaus to try to give back, if you will, and not just be, you know, creating platforms that result in more comments being on their plate, but actually give them tools by which they can much more efficiently interact with those comments.

Another project, which Haley's going to talk more about, I think has been familiar with you in some

ways, even before, you know, this term came up earlier in the year. But that is the question of reboot.FCC.gov.

MS. VAN DYCK: And as we continue to work out the internal processes of how to best handle comments, and field input from the public, we're afforded other opportunities to keep asking for input online. Reboot.FCC.gov is going to be one of the large forums that we will be doing that through and be launching very soon. The purpose of reboot is to serve as a platform for public engagement on how to best create changes at the FCC and to FCC.gov. It is going to be a platform to outline our reform agenda to have input from the public to help us shape our goals and objectives for what we can be doing going forward at the FCC.

The way that we will be outlining this will be following the process of systems, rules and processes, data store, engagement, and the site redesign. When reboot launches, there will be forums on each of these subjects, broken down into further defined subjects such as, you know, under systems, ECFS

and CLS and these different, you know, large systems that consumers interact with very frequently through our online operations. And we will be asking the public and the heavy users of our online operations how we can best improve these services for consumers, for heavy users. And we really want to hear from the public on what we can be doing best, which is partially where we would love to ask you guys for your help and support in these efforts, in taking reboot and this site to your members of your various organizations and really drive participation on the site as everybody in this room and many of your member organizations know

ways that the FCC can be improving its ability to access -- or to help consumers online -- that it's not doing now. And we want to hear from you guys on the best ways to create these changes, and would love for -- when reboot goes public -- to be able to turn this around to you guys and ask for your participation and support as well.

We look very forward -- we're looking forward very much to the launch of that in the near future and will, you know, alert you guys to when that's coming

out and give you a warning on that as well.

MR. BROOKS: It's always a good reminder whenever we think to ourselves, you know, that we've been talking a good while. So I guess I would put it out, and I don't know what amount of time you want to budget, but, I mean, we would like to answer any of you questions.

CHAIR BERLYN: Let's do cards, and that's our technique here is to put up cards, and then we go around the room and -- so, Karen and then Lisa?

MS. STRAUSS: Thank you. I'm Karen Strauss, I'm with Communication Service for the Deaf, and I was also at the -- I don't know if we were at the same event, but we were at the Google -- several of us here were at the Google event. And one of the concerns that we had -- we're ecstatic -- let me just say that we're ecstatic with the ability to create an easy mechanism for people to time-stamp captions. That is an extraordinary breakthrough because that is probably, you know, at least 75 percent of the hassle, if not almost 100 percent of the hassle, of adding captions. But we are aware that the accuracy is not nearly as

good as a human being, and the knowledge that it was 80 percent with broadcaster speech, which is very clear, distinguished speech. So we're just a little concerned when we hear an agency say that this is as good as regular captioning, so we want to make sure that you know that you have to go back over the captions once they're -- the automatic portion is great, but then you have to go back over and fix them. And it can't be relied on for real-time captioning.

MR. BROOKS: I mean -- I completely understand that, and, yes, you're absolutely right. Everything that we talk about up here I believe we take very seriously to heart is not the end and is merely a question of whether it's moving the ball forward.

Specific to that point, one of the important aspects that they discussed on the launch was that you can use the machine translation or the autocaptioning from uploading the transcript, and then download the SRT file, or the other subcaptioning file back for further editing. I mean it's very much in the engine's interest as well, because we are providing a human corrective element to it. But no, you're absolutely

right, and this is only a matter of where it can be further with of help than we currently have

CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you. Lisa Hamlin?

MS. HAMLIN: I'm from Hearing Loss

Association of America, and I was there too, and yeah, in broadcast -- captioning --

MR. BROOKS: Sorry you didn't meet us.

MS. HAMLIN: Yeah -- broadcast captioning is 2 percent error rate, so we're looking at a huge difference between 20 percent and 2 percent. You need to -- when you get the word out to the other agencies, you need to really make clear that they must go back and make those corrections.

But I had another question. You -- I think -- I have been looking at the workshops on broadband when I can see it streamed, and I love that, and it's wonderful. But I'm thinking about a day like today, where usually what happens is on the screen there's something -- there's captioning under -- it's captioning. Today we have CART. What do you do when you're streaming -- I'm thinking people are home looking at our meeting, and -- or in their office or

wherever -- and are they getting a separate window that has the captions?

MR. BROOKS: So, to answer your question, there is a mélange of current answers to that right now. And it depends on which -- we're trying to standardize across the board, but right now for instance the field events are done slightly differently than the workshops, which are done in here with broadband.

The answer is that everyone is having access to captions. Depending on the event, sometimes it is what is the standard for the open commission meetings, where there is, you know, the black captioning along the bottom of the video. Other times it's a matter of an engine called Accessibility -- I'm sorry, Accessible Events, actually -- which involves, I believe, opening up a second window that provides streaming captioning.

At the end of the day. we know exactly where we should be getting to, and that is to have a seamlessly integrated, turn-on, turn-off, you know, choose your settings, captioning functionality, both for archived video and live video. We're not resting

until we get to that point, and it's smooth and seamless across all events, but the answer is that we are captioning -- we are captioning all live events that are being broadcast, and the mechanisms range as far as which one's being done in what way, but it's happening.

MS. HAMLIN: Okay. That's -- just to be clear, it is happening right now, as we speak, that somebody can open up a second window and see the CART?

CHAIR BERLYN: Here, Scott, sorry.

MR. MARSHALL: We have had technological

problems today, and I don't think we're real-time on the stream at the moment, because of equipment problems here in the room. I'm sorry you didn't get the message I sent out about that.

But I believe what we're going to do is caption after the fact, you know, as a sort of a stopgap measure, because of the problems today. But the equipment is here, and it just needs to be installed, and hopefully that will occur quickly so this will not be a recurring problem.

MR. BROOKS: And I apologize. I mean, for --

0170 1 2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

1

2

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

that's -- I apologize for my incorrectness on that. My understanding is also, then, that, I mean, it is not a matter that this has been lacking up through now, that today is an exception.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

MR. BROOKS: And we'll work on that.

MS. HAMLIN: And I totally understand, and I think the FCC does a fabulous job of getting the access. I love coming to this room, because I know I can get what I need, both -- in terms of that.

Bu I -- what -- I didn't bring it up as point of saying, you know, terrible things are happening today. I just wanted to know, in terms of backup, what do you have if things -- we know with technology things don't always go the way they're supposed to. All I'm asking is, Are there plans for backup? Not just here, but when you advise other agencies, you're saying, Look, we're a model, but this is what we do when things don't go right. That's really my point, not that today

MR. BROOKS: You're absolutely right. mean, the question of what makes sense and what should 0171

be is what is driving this whole process. Both with accessibilities and across the board. And you're absolutely right in that, you know, what we currently have can be better. And the good news is that under the current Chairman's leadership, you know, there are not barriers to moving forward on this. You know, whatever should be is in the process of becoming.

CHAIR BERLYN: I have Irene and Charles. And Irene, I was wondering if I could just ask a quick question that is sort of a follow up to Lisa's question, and that's -- as Scott knows, I've tried to, from home, go on and listen in to various proceedings, and sometimes things just don't work right. And so, on behalf of consumers who are trying to take advantage of all the great opportunities that you have -- and you're there, and you're home, and you want to watch a proceeding, but things aren't working well. There's nothing much -- there's nothing you can really do. There's no one to talk to, real-time. And so you miss

And I, fortunately, live a half-hour away, so I jump in my car and I come down and I sit in, and I

1 2

come here to listen. But one suggestion might be that there should be someone on hand during all these proceedings to help consumers work through problems when things don't go well, to help. To say, you know, I clicked and nothing happened, so what am I doing wrong, or do I not have the right software, or, you know, what's going on?

MR. BROOKS: And there are several follow-ups to that. One is, we've been dong several fundamental back-end changes. It's hard to tell if -- actually you can switch back to the computer screen here and see, you know, what we currently have -- you don't notice a difference, but this is based on Flash streaming video, as opposed to RealAudio. We -- which is simply because, you know, one is much more modern and much more ubiquitous.

We're trying to implement standards that just work better. But also in what you're seeing there is a commenting functionality, so that the people who are viewing this from Facebook, for instance, have the ability to, right next to the video, say, Hey, this is not working. And that's happened before. We are doing

more and more live coverage, where we're doing live Tweeting, live blogging. And both of those have mechanisms where, while we're doing that, we're able to see the comments coming in below the blog post or back to us on Twitter.

At the end of the day, you know, I feel bad with the repetition of this answer; you're absolutely right, and we're angling strongly in the direction of progress.

CHAIR BERLYN: It may not be your fault. And with more and more consumers who will be getting — being new users of the Internet, it may not be a problem on your end. That's not refined. It may just be that the consumer, who is maybe a relative neophyte to using the Internet, has not downloaded the right software, or —

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ BROOKS: Then we need to take that into account.

CHAIR BERLYN: Yeah.

 $\,$ MS. VAN DYCK: And one of the things that we noticed during the broadband workshops is that a lot of consumers were having difficulty downloading the WebX

software, and getting the ability to watch those workshops online. So we're making a change for open Internet to help address that issue. That's why we got rid of -- we're not using the WebX platform anymore. So there's no registration required, you can go straight to the URL, and it'll be streaming live right there on the site without downloading anything or signing up for anything. So you are completely right, and that's one of the small things we're doing to help make that more accessible.

MR. BROOKS: And, again, one of the, you know, non-romantic, you know, small but substantive changes going on in the background is us moving forward, having the ability to host all of this video in several file formats to enable it so that anyone doesn't have to go digging for it but can readily, you know, find -- say, Where can I find the video of last year's open commission meeting? Where can I find the video of the last four CAC meetings complete with transcripts, audio, et cetera.? That's a work in progress, but it's happening, and it's happening retroactively as well.

CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you.

Irene?

MS. LEECH: This is really exciting to hear about, but just bringing up the point that, at my house I can't get this. I've got to be at my office in order to do that. And so, you know, for all my interest in broadband and so forth, I don't have a very good way to participate in your blog and your whatever, because at my home that's something I can't get. And there are a lot of other consumers in that situation. So as you analyze your data and so forth, please remember those of us who have real concerns -- and I desperately want that capability -- but what the folks in my state keep telling me is that I need to move if that's what I want, and that's not the answer.

MS. VAN DYCK: One of the motivating, or driving, purposes behind our interest in launching on mobile platforms is that we can start to engage people through their cellular devices and help increase access to those who don't have Internet connection. You know, we also have the National Broadband Plan. He's working on the larger issues behind that. But from our

perspective, that's one of the motivating reasons for our wireless.

MS. LEECH: Granted, but even the wireless is slow and -- in the areas where people are having trouble getting that, I mean wireless is the best that I've got right now, but it's still hard and some things just don't work very well when that's all you've got. So just -- I just wanted you to be aware that there are some locations where it's a real problem.

MR. BROOKS: And an example that we're experimenting with, to roll out in the not-distant future, would be to not only just have -- for instance of this event -- live streaming video, but an option at the bottom to click and choose a lower resolution version of the same that's much more accessible for lower speeds.

This gets back to the same issue that, you know, we're the Federal Communications Commission, and we should not be resting at any point, as far as making this more open and accessible.

CHAIR BERLYN: Charles?

22 MR. BENTON: Your job is daunting, to put it 0177

mildly. Haley, I wonder -- I think it would be useful -- you ran through the reboot.FCC.gov really quickly, and I think it would be really useful to slow down a little and give us a little more of the structure of that

My understanding is that reboot.FCC.gov — and please correct me if I'm wrong — is the effort to get systematic about the restructuring of the FCC Web site, which as I understand it from the Sunlight Foundation original analysis, when they came — when they started this last year, you had — FCC had 14 different — or something like that — different Web sites, all driven by different bureaus, so that there was — I mean you're going from a, sort of, bureaucentric multiple Web site to trying to get an overall FCC Web site, where you can trace rulings, where you can focus in on specific ideas or concepts, let alone people. It is just a radical transformation.

And so, if you could talk a little more about the history and what reboot.FCC.gov represents in terms of this structural reform that it seems to me you're leading the charge on, and in the five points on the

reboot, go a little more slowly. Give us these five points so that we really can understand what it is you're talking about, and as we understand it maybe there will be -- we'll be able to figure out in a more concrete way how, collectively or individually, we can be helpful.

MS. VAN DYCK: Sure. And thank you for bringing up Sunlight too. We are very grateful to the Sunlight Foundation and the work they did for the redesign. As some of you may or may not know, they have launched a project that's gone through and, fairly systematically, picked different government and Federal Web sites that can be redesigned to have better access for consumers and usability in general. And FCC.gov was one that they chose to do a redesign for.

They did a great job with it. They actually came to the FCC and met with us the day after they launched it publicly. We had a very productive meeting with them. And we're very receptive and glad to hear their ideas, all fabulous ideas, and definitely all part of the things that we're incorporating into our redesign thoughts. We appreciate everything they

offered and have a lot more expectations as well, above and beyond some of the things that were part of their design.

But one of the big things you'll notice, and what Sunlight presented, is a shift, like you were saying, Charles, in how the information is presented. Right now there is so much information and content on FCC.gov, and it is incredibly difficult to navigate, particularly because you don't necessarily -- unless

you're very familiar with the way that it is laid out for, you know, usually a professional purpose -- it's hard to figure out where the information that you're wanting to access lives, just sort of by the inherent structure of it right now. And so one of the purposes of reboot is going to, you know, highlight how we can best work through these systems that we offer and make the systems themselves much more usable.

To go walk through reboot a little bit more slowly -- and sorry for going through that so fast -- one of the big -- of the five cones -- we'll start with systems. Each of -- the goal is to break out the conversation into smaller pieces, so that if you have,

you know, a lot of experience with ECFS and have a lot of ideas and input on how we can change and, you know, start the dialogue on ECFS 3.0 -- you know, 2.0, I think -- I believe -- came out since we were last speaking, which was, you know, a wonderful effort by Bill Cline, who did a fabulous job and a lot of work on 2.0, and as Gray has mentioned earlier, you know, we would always like to keep conversation moving, and while we did just launch that, we were already looking and thinking about 3.0 and would like to start fomenting conversation on what is most needed for the next iteration of ECFS.

So, systems. ECFS is one of the largest ones we'd like to focus on. CLS is another. Consumer complaints; fee filing; and we'll have a larger section for "other," too, where if there's systems that we're missing, parsing out specific conversations for, users can flag and say, We would like to have more conversation on fee filing processes and what not.

Rules and Processes. In that section, a lot of the attention -- we're going to want to focus on exparte reform and how we can incorporate online tools to

make this form -- or this process easier to understand, easier to file, and sunshine act reform, and other necessary rule changes are going to be the three breakouts of what we're going to be talking about under Rules and Processes.

Datastore is another cone, and it's going to be a long, long process to how we start really reforming how the FCC presents its bulk data to consumers. We hope to come out with an initial attempt at just a clearinghouse for what is currently available online as we start moving towards reworking how we can actually present every — immense amount of data that's stored within the FCC in a much more — an easier way to access. One of the initial low-hanging fruit that we tackled was incorporating RSS stream, or feeds, into a lot of the data coming out of the building. A simple easy thing that actually, I believe, the Consumer Advisory Committee suggested we do, I think it was 3 or 4 years ago, and one of the first things we've implemented to start making data

21 coming outside this building easier to process. 22 As I said, a lot more work will be done on 0182 1 that. Initially, though, we would like to start just 2 putting everything in one space so you can find 3 everything that's coming out of this building in bulk downloads. 5 Actually, do you have anything more to add on 6 data? 7 MR. BROOKS: No. 8 MS. VAN DYCK: And engagement is another 9 The e-rulemaking process -- the FCC again is not 10 unique in engaging the public in its rulemaking 11 processes, but we would really like to develop more 12 mechanisms to allow consumers industry and other 13 constituents to learn in real-time about the FCC 14 process, the e-rulemaking that's going on inside this 15 building, and foster new and deep levels of citizen 16 engagement and participation in these rulemakings. 17 Workshops is a small way that we've been doing that. 18 We want to be working -- the commenting process, this internal dashboard that Gray mentioned earlier are all 19 20 parts of this process. 21 And then lastly the redesign, which we will 22 also be opening up to discussion on how best to lay out 0183 1 the information, what's the easiest way for people to access the information that they're looking for, 2 3 audience segmentation and what the structures for that 4 are going to be. 5 If there's any further questions on that, I 6 would be happy to talk in depth about any of those 7 subjects. Thank you for raising that, Charles. 9 appreciate it --10 CHAIR BERLYN: Brandon, and then I think 11 we're going to try and wrap this up because we're close 12 to the end of this session. Thanks. 13 MR. STEPHENS: I wanted to ask a question 14 about that, because all throughout Indian Country we 15 have various tribes that want to make comments about their particular areas. And talking with Shana 16 17 Bearhand, one of our tribal -- or, our tribal liaison 18 and senior attorney, who works for the FCC in the 19 consumer and governmental affairs area. We wanted to 20 be able to, potentially, make comments on rulemaking, 21 and she showed me an area in your Web site where we can 22 -- sort of like a blog that was set up. Can you talk a 0184 1 little bit about that? And whenever we place comments 2 into that area, does that automatically go into some of 3 the -- I guess, the archives or the record making or 4 some of the comments are read by the FCC on some of the 5 items that they are going to start making for rulemaking? 7 MS. VAN DYCK: We -- I'm sorry, I didn't mean

to interrupt you. Were you --

MR. STEPHENS: Go ahead.

MS. VAN DYCK: We are very grateful, I think on a daily basis, Gray and I, get to say that we love the general counsel of the FCC. We've been working very closely with them to reevaluate how we define comments on the public record.

And one of the wonderful things that we've been able to do in the last few months is take discussion and conversation that we're having online, on these Web sites, and actually include them as part of the public record for these different docketed proceedings. And the main purpose of that is to be able to engage, you know, people like your communities, who may not be as familiar with how to engage in the

commenting-filing process, which is a very, you know, legal process that can sometimes turn off people who are not as used to participating in these systems on a regular basis. It's much easier to comment on a blog, or through a crowd-sourcing platform or other ways that may be more intuitive for online consumers than going through the legal processes of filing paper comments or through ECFS or things like that. So those are absolutely some of the goals and motives of what we're doing with these sites.

CHAIR BERLYN: Could I just ask a quick clarification on the last point on the reboot, is — the redesign of the Web site? Is that a — going to be an ongoing process? You said you're going to launch reboot in the near future, and then will you continue to work on the design of the Web site at that point — MS. VAN DYCK: Absolutely.

CHAIR BERLYN: -- after you launch reboot?

MR. BROOKS: One of the fundamental overtones of this launch will be beginning a conversation on how we can be doing things differently, on a large scale as well as a very specific scale. We are interested in

looking at the different parts that make up the current FCC.gov Web site and saying, both on a very drilled-down level, and then in other conversations more broadly, you know, how can this be done differently? How can it be done better? What are we doing right? What are we doing wrong?

One of the things we're experimenting with for the reboot site will be a page-specific, you know, link at the bottom that people can use to get feedback for that specific page, to say what's right on this page, what's wrong on this page, et cetera. And these are all tools that we're bringing into the -- to our toolbox but it's -- you know -- the idea is not for any of these to be one-time usage. I mean the idea is to start implementing an iterative process that should not -- I mean, you know, we're moving forward from a period where FCC.gov has maintained a fairly static appearance for a number of years, but going forward it should be constantly asking itself how it could be better.

MS. VAN DYCK: Part of why we're packaging this with reboot is because it's also about addressing a lot of the systems that are in place behind it, not just the

simple Web interface. So while it's definitely a huge part of it, it's not the only part, which makes this FCC redesign in many terms much more complex than other Federal sites redesigns, and why we're so interested in doing this process of reboot together, and put in feedback from people who do use the systems behind our Web site.

CHAIR BERLYN: And then a final -- just a final question is, with that continuous effort, would you be willing to work with a small number of CAC members on a regular basis to work on that give-and-take feedback process as you are looking at redesign of the Web site? Just -- it's sort of hard to do this on a -- you know, every few months to talk about it, but maybe on a regular basis to work together on that?

MS. VAN DYCK: Absolutely.

MR. BROOKS: And I think -- I mean, I think an important aspect, you know, will be that -- I mean, there will be functionality for any person in this room, or any person watching this live stream, or any person new to the FCC in the future, to become part of that conversation, both in directing feedback to us and

then also discussing it with each other. You know, how we will go about that is going to be a very complicated and never-ending process, but it's -- yes, it's going to happen, and we always want good ideas and further conversation.

CHAIR BERLYN: Okay. Great. Thank you very much. Really appreciate it. Thank you.

Okay. Very quickly, now. Let's see, we are at 1:45 -- a few minutes post, but we want to move quickly to our recommendations and progress reports, and we're gong to start with Karen and Lisa on -- we're starting with the disability working group, correct?

MALE SPEAKER: Right.

RECOMMENDATIONS SESSION

CHAIR BERLYN: This should be information in our packet, right?

Lisa Hamlin?

MS. HAMLIN: Are we on? I'm on. Okay.
Yes, the proposal, the recommendation that
we're making from the disability working group is in
your packet on the right-hand side. I had looked
through this, this morning. I had hoped I could just

go through highlights, but, frankly, everything that we want here is important to your understanding of the recommendations, and I'm going to go through it. If at some point you feel that you -- feel free to interrupt me at any point. Also if you feel like I'm -- it's too much detail, you can stop me at any point. Debra, okay?

CHAIR BERLYN: Okay. Before you start, Lisa, let me just mention that we have -- for those of you who are cold in this room -- of which I am one -- we have mentioned several times about the temperature in here, and we're waiting -- we're waiting -- but, anyway, my apologies. We hope to warm it up shortly. Hopefully before 4:00.

All right, thank you. Lisa?

 MS. HAMLIN: I think it'll be warm right as we're leaving, is what's going to happen. And I was just -- I've just gotten a note here that I cannot go through the whole thing, so I'm really going to try to hit the highlights. Everything's here that you would need to know about it. But let me just go through a few of the important points here, so that you can have

some understanding, because we would like to take a vote today, if we can do that.

Let me start with the introduction. This proposal, the FCC's — in this proposal, the FCC's Consumer Advisory Committee Disability Working Group requests the full Consumer Advisory Committee to approve a resolution requesting the FCC to mandate nationwide caption telephone relay service, to the extent the service is provided over the publicly switched telephone network. At present, the provision of caption telephone relay service varies widely from State to State and is the only PSTN-based relay service proven to be functionally equivalent that is not uniformly and consistently available to anyone who needs it throughout the United States and its territories.

That's the basis of why we come here. This is a caption service -- caption telephone service is not provided universally at all. Each State has different rules and regulations. We would like to see this mandated across the board.

A little bit of history. I'm going to go

through each paragraph but just a little bit, cover the highlights.

Title 4 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 requires the provision of telecommunications relay services to people who are deaf, hard of hearing, or speech disabled, that is functionally equivalent. Caption telephone service is one type of relay service that achieves this goal by enabling a person to use his or her own voice to speak directly to another party while reading responses from the other party in captions, and if he or she has residual hearing, hearing the responses voiced back by that individual.

So what it is, is it's phone that looks like and is used like a typical phone. Like somebody who is hearing -- for hearing -- picks up the phone, dials out, makes a connection. What happens with a caption phone is I pick up my phone; I can dial out to the

party I'm calling, but it leads directly to a relay operator, who then revoices, using speech recognition technology, and what I see is the text of what the other person is saying. So now I can use my own voice, 0192

I can hear what -- hear the other person talking, and I can get text to catch -- just like the text that's coming up with CART -- I can get text to get everything I'm missing. This is hugely important to people who are older, who age into hearing loss, who have no idea what a TTY is, and of course now the TTYs are being -falling by the wayside. It's also been used -- I've had experience not with my own -- it's just -- it's so smooth. You use a TTY, you have to wait. One person speaks, then the other person speaks. Even IP relay, with an operator, you get -- the operator will call you -- will be repeating back, if you're on the listening end, but you have to wait. You have to take turns. Here, I can talk to somebody. I can interrupt them. They can interrupt me. There's a smooth, functionally -- it's equivalent to the way a hearing person would use a telephone.

And, again, that's important, not just in, you know, me talking to my two children on the phone, but it's important at work. Somebody has to be able to function at work on telephones. They need a functionally equivalent phone.

22 0193 1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

0194 1

2

3

5

19

20

21

22

1

3

4 5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

The problem is -- I can give you a little bit more background. The procedure has been -- on July 25th, 2003, the FCC approved single-line caption telephone. That would be a form of advanced voice carry over relay service. Then in 2005 they authorized a two-line version. A two-line version is not only that I can call out, but I can get the relay service coming in as well. And then in 2007 the FCC released a ruling approving Internet protocol version of this service so I can use my computer to get the same kind of service.

But during none of these procedures did the FCC ever mandate any form of caption telephone relay service. The service is totally voluntary, which means each State has picked it up one at a time, and we still have three States that don't -- it's two States now, it's Massachusetts and Delaware -- or Louisiana? I can't remember which ones picked it up. But one of the two did pick it up. But now this is seriously, after -- since 2003 it's been available, and some States still don't have it. And in fact we're D.C. -- D.C. was covered by Federal relay, and then I heard from people

when D.C. had no relay -- had no caption services. was hearing from consumers who were panicked they would lose the service that they had gotten used to.

Because caption telephone relay service is authorized but not mandated by the FCC, States are free to decide whether or not to offer the service to all of

their residents, and -- well, okay, we have the two States.

1 2

But not only that, they're -- each one has a whole -- each State can put whatever regulations in place they see fit. So, for example, on a monthly basis, Michigan only allows 25 additional program participants. Tennessee allows 16. Connecticut allows 15. And so forth. At least 36 States have limitations. Some also limit through the back door by placing restrictions on the number of caption telephone devices that can be sold or acquired or used in their jurisdiction. For example, an individual may get a device in one State, but not be permitted to use it in another State. So when I was working in NVRC, I'm living in Maryland; I go to Virginia. Well, what happens if the Virginia phone -- she's wonderful, she

already provided me a CapTel, and I had one at home, but what if one of mine broke? I could not necessarily take my one that I was using at home to work, because it wouldn't be allowed to work in that State. Now, I don't know what Maryland -- I don't know what the rules are, but that's an example of some ways it could be -- not be usable.

Did you want to add something here?

MS. STRAUSS: I just want to comment on the absurdity of this. I don't know whether you're getting this. Can you imagine not being able -- buying a phone in a store and wanting to take it to work, and imagine that you're not allowed to use it there? Or moving, or going on vacation, and you cannot -- you absolutely are barred from being able to make telephone calls.

And just to enhance a little bit of what Lisa said, this is -- and I guess she'll get into this also, but this is the only form of relay service that has been proven to be functionally equivalent, that's not ubiquitously available to anybody who needs it. There are lots of different kinds. One of the things that this memo doesn't describe is that there's a lot of

different kinds of relay services now. The original one was text-to-speech, where you typed on a TTY and a relay operator read everything that you said and then typed back. That's pretty much antiquated. I mean, there's still a very small portion of the population that uses it. It's very burdensome. It takes a lot of time. There's caption telephone. There's video relay service, which uses interpreters. But that's provided -- video relay and IP text relay are provided on an interstate basis and reimbursed through the -- through a Federal fund, basically, and are available to anybody through that means. There's also speech-to-speech, which is used for speech-disabled people.

All these other kinds of relay services are available to anybody who needs them, anywhere. This one is not, because this one is a PSTN-based version. It's a public switch -- we're not talking about the

18 Internet -- we're not talking about mandating the
19 Internet version. We're talking about mandating the
20 State-versus-Federal version, and it's -- basically
21 it's a PSTN version, and the reimbursement is divided
22 up into State and Federal jurisdictions.

2.2

Because it is divided up -- the payment -- the States have been reluctant to adopt this on their own, because they -- well, you know, they have limitations; they don't want to pay for it. But in fact the consequences are that consumers are losing out everywhere.

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{Did}}$ you have a question that we can answer $$\operatorname{\textsc{now}}^2$$

 $$\operatorname{CHAIR}$$ BERLYN: Do you want to wait until we have our discussion?

MR. STEPHENS: I'll defer it till you finish your statements, but I do have a question that is dovetailing off what you're talking about with the cost. But go ahead.

MS. HAMLIN: So let me continue through, and we will try to answer all questions that we can here.

So, the consequence of this is that -- okay, she was saying, I have to catch up to where she was. I don't want to leave anything out because I really want you to have an understanding of where we are with this.

In order to remedy the situation, 30 organizations -- do you want me to -- did you want to -

- you can stop me at any time, if I'm missing something. Okay.

In order to remedy this, October 31st 2005 more than 30 organizations representing people with hearing loss filed a petition requesting a mandate. And that was back in 2005. The lack of response from the Commission prompted a second FCC petition, which was filed this year, June 10th, and which various consumers — a number of the same organizations— some new ones and some that didn't sign on that I couldn't find — since 2005 — they renewed it. They renewed and supplemented their petition — our petition — to the FCC, initiating — to initiate a rulemaking for the purpose of mandating caption telephone relay services.

Both the 2005 and the 2009 petitions described at length the significant ways in which caption telephone relay services enhance the ability of people with hearing loss to communicate by phone. And in fact there were a number of stories in that petition — we can make that available if you want it — where real people were really being affected, people who hadn't been able to communicate by phone. Once they

got it, they found that it was the only way they could communicate. It was their way to -- then it opened up whole new areas, both for older people and for people -- working people as well. Real stories all over.

Though the caption -- although the caption

telephone relay service provides a phone experience that closely approximates the experience of conventional phone users when making phone calls, without a mandate the provision of in-State caption telephone services have been subject to the vagaries and internal State political and budgetary processes. And I can tell you myself it got frozen in Maryland, so people in my office could not get a hold of a caption phone when they needed it.

And this is just here, and I don't know what's going on in the rest of the States, but I know, again, these limitations have been severely impacting people.

A service that has been, over the past 7 years, including a trial period, proven itself to be technologically feasible, cost-efficient, and most importantly, the most appropriate and functionally

equivalent form of communications access for this population.

And let me emphasize that. There is new --with video relay services, people who are deaf, who use sign language, have a really fluent way, a smooth way to communicate. But I can't use that. Because I don't understand enough sign language to use it. And a lot of the people that I know -- again, senior citizens won't tend to have video in their homes or think to get video.

And the other issue for me is that, as long as it's not mandated, because there are restrictions there isn't a lot of outreach to the community. The community doesn't even know it's out there, and these are people who could really benefit by having access to telephone service that they don't now have access to. And just yesterday I got an email from somebody who was trying to get a hold of legal services, but didn't have the process — they knew about, actually, caption phone, but the process of getting a caption phone made it impossible for them to get it in time to talk to legal services. So it has a real impact on real

people.

Do you want to add to that?

MS. STRAUSS: The only thing I want to add is a little bit more background in terms of the ADA. The ADA, as you know, was enacted in 1990, and that contains a very, very clear directive to the FCC to create nationwide relay services. So this is really just fulfillment of nationwide relay services, as Lisa said, that's functionally equivalent to voice telephone services.

One of the reasons -- the main reason that that section was enacted is because, before the ADA, there were these relay services across the States that were very inconsistent and not uniform with each other, and imposed all kinds of restrictions on their users. Like they limited the number of calls you could make a

17 day; they limited the number of hours that you could --18 or the amount of time you could stay on a call. And 19 they had very similar jurisdictional restrictions. 20 So, we've already been there. We've already 21 gotten Congress's stamp of approval on eliminating 22 those restrictions, but the FCC has been slow to adopt 0202 1 this particular form of relay service, even though 2 they've approved it. They've allowed this -- these 3 State inconsistencies to go on. 4 So, I guess we can open it up to questions 5 MR. STEPHENS: Am I the first? Well, this --7 are you guys going to introduce the resolution into 8 this? I was just asking --9 MS. STRAUSS: I guess we should go ahead and 10 11 CHAIR BERLYN: Yeah, I think you should move 12 the resolution, and then we --13 MS. STRAUSS: Okay, and then have questions. CHAIR BERLYN: We're following our Roberts 14 15 Rules here. 16 MR. STEPHENS: I was going to say, if there was a point of order here to -- I would make a move to 17 accept the resolution, you know, to get that on the 18 19 floor, to get a second, and then have the discussion. 20 So if that's a point of order, so -- I'll make a move 21 to accept the resolution as presented. 22 CHAIR BERLYN: Do I hear a second? 0203 1 MS. STRAUSS: Second. 2 Okay, well, why don't you let Irene do it? 3 MS. LEECH: I will second. CHAIR BERLYN: Okay. Discussion? 5 MR. STEPHENS: Now the discussion. 6 The -- the first question I just have is, 7 since you talk about State limitations inside of the 8 resolution, is this going to be incumbent on the State, 9 Federal government, or the users to make the cost of 10 this? And what are the costs to making the 11 improvements to these systems? 12 And -- this doesn't -- and I want to just 13 make this -- when I ask these questions, that doesn't 14 reflect my opinion of the resolution. I find it very 15 necessary to put in these different devices so that 16 everyone has open access to communications. But I just 17 have those questions, just where -- what are the costs? 18 Or what do you think the costs may be? And who foots 19 the bill? 20 MS. STRAUSS: First of all, we're not talking 21 about devices; we're talking about services. 22 MR. STEPHENS: I understand. 0204 1 MS. STRAUSS: Okay. I just want to be very clear that that's --3 MR. STEPHENS: And I'm sorry that that's just my --

MS. STRAUSS: No, no. That's okay. And what 6 we're really talking about is just making sure that all 7 of the States provide uniformly these services to 8 people. The cost per minute is how relay costs are 9 evaluated, and I don't have it with me, the exact cost. 10 It's about \$1.60 a minute, I think, right? 11 FEMALE SPEAKER: More or less. 12 MS. STRAUSS: Around that area. 13 actually now the cheapest, right -- it's the cheapest 14 form of relay service that there is. It's actually, 15 now, even cheaper than TTY-to-voice, because hardly 16 anybody's using TTY-to-voice, so there's no economies 17 of scale. 18 So, just by way of comparison, video relay 19 service is over \$6 a minute. And other relay services 20 -- speech-to-speech -- is also in the \$1-plus range. 21 But it's around \$1.50, \$1.60, something like that. 22 It's paid for through -- each State can decide itself 0205 1 how it wants to pay for it, but generally it's a 2 surcharge on bills. That's the way it's been since 1990. Some States incorporate it into their rate base, 3 4 so the consumers don't see a surcharge at all. So it's 5 perceived as a universal service function. That's the 6 way it was originally created. Just the way rural 7 customers that -- it might cost more to provide service 8 to a rural customer because they're further out from 9 the network facilities, but those customers don't pay any more. It's the same kind of reasoning. It costs a 10 11 little more to provide the service for people with 12 disabilities, but everybody shares in the cost. 13 MR. STEPHENS: Okay, so, it's not necessarily 14 just me, who's making a phone call over to Karen, and 15 I'm the person who's -- has the hearing impairment, am 16 I going to pay that --17 MS. STRAUSS: No, no individual pays for each 18 individual call. The calls are -- it's basically a 19 monthly, either surcharge, or just incorporated in the 20 month. 21 MR. STEPHENS: Same as 9-1-1 charge, or --MS. STRAUSS: Exactly. 22 0206 1 MR. STEPHENS: -- something like that. So it's just spread around to everyone. 3 MS. STRAUSS: Right. 4 MR. STEPHENS: Okay. 5 MS. HAMLIN: Let me just add to that to make it clear. You're not -- the surcharge pays for the 7 relay services. But when I call Karen, I'm billed for calling Karen. I just am not billed for the relay piece of it. Everybody picks up that piece. But I 10 still have to pay my phone bill. Yeah, I do. 11 MS. STRAUSS: From the point of origination 12 to the point of destination. That's the functionally

MR. STEPHENS: And the reluctance here on the

States' part to do this, I'm curious as to why. Maybe

2

6

8 9

13

14

15

equivalent part.

calling from North Carolina to South Carolina, maybe there's a difference. Let's say North Carolina has that service and say South Carolina doesn't, or I can call Tennessee, but then Virginia -- you know, you get the picture.

MS. STRAUSS: Yeah, that's it exactly. MR. STEPHENS: So what's the problem there?

1 Or, what are you guys perceiving as the problem? 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22 0208 1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

0209 1

2

0207

MS. STRAUSS: Well, this is the only relay service where States have been allowed to limit the number of users that can use a relay service. That's what is so bizarre. I mean, in that situation, if North Carolina says that only 25 people in the State can come on a particular month, and there's a 26th person that wants to join the service, and they're not on board, if they try -- if somebody else tries to call them or if they try to call somebody else, that call is going to be blocked. That's the ramifications, and that's the problem.

MR. STEPHENS: And I'm just wondering, you mention universal service funds, and I know several of the activities that USF will try to pay, I know that with Lifeline and Linkup and some of those things, I'm curious as to -- you know, this couldn't go to --

MS. STRAUSS: This is separate.

MR. STEPHENS: Even to -- even in here to help foot that cost.

MS. STRAUSS: No, it's separate. USF actually copied TRS -- Telecommunication Relay Services

came first and created a USF-type mechanism, but it's a separate fund. So --

MR. STEPHENS: If costs were going to be an issue, if that is something we need to tackle --

MS. STRAUSS: Costs will not be an issue once the FCC mandates this. It's the same thing as what occurred before 1990, where the States were a little -some of the States were hesitant; the FCC mandated it, and it became a routine cost. It is not a lot of money per person. It's literally pennies. Usually the surcharge is way under a dollar. It's usually maybe 50 cents or so.

MS. HAMLIN: I think what the problem is, is that what happens is the States go to their legislatures and say, "This is voluntary," and the States say, "Ah, well, then I don't want to spend my budget on this service," and not understanding the ramifications of what they're saying, or they want to limit it -- that kind of thing. That's what the problem is. If we mandate it in every State, they must say to every State that you must have this, and we create guidelines that are universal, not one State

doing different things than the other.

MR. STEPHENS: Madam Chair, I have no problem supporting this resolution.

CHAIR BERLYN: Let's continue the discussion. 5 Gloria? 6 MS. TRISTANI: I have a series of questions, 7 and I think that some of them follow up on your very 8 good questions and very good answers. 9 But one thing I want to understand before the 10 questions, or an initial question, is the FCC has not 11 even initiated a rulemaking here, right? Or, are you 12 asking for a ruling? I want to make clear what the 13 petition -- are you asking for the FCC to issue a 14 declaratory ruling that it should be mandated, or are 15 you asking for a rulemaking? Because they're two very 16 different things. 17 MS. STRAUSS: We would love it if they just 18 declared it, but there have been some concerns raised, 19 I think by -- no, you're Verizon -- by AT&T, who 20 actually, interestingly enough, the first time the 21 petition was filed opposed it and now supports it, but 22 they've asked for a rulemaking. So if you look at the 0210 1 resolution, it is for the CAC to urge the FCC to grant 2 the petitions by initiating --3 MS. TRISTANI: By they're asking for --4 MS. STRAUSS: -- initiating and completing a 5 rulemaking. 6 MS. TRISTANI: Okay. But I think that should 7 be clarified, because I think it would be easier to 8 support initiating a rulemaking than an outlay. 9 MS. STRAUSS: The petitions ask for a 10 rulemaking. 11 MS. TRISTANI: The first one as well? 12 MS. STRAUSS: I believe so. 13 MS. HAMLIN: I'll have to look. 14 MS. STRAUSS: Do you have the petition with 15 you? MS. HAMLIN: I'm just trying to --16 MS. STRAUSS: In any case, the resolution 17 18 asks for -- and we can always take out the phrase, if it doesn't, but I thought it did. We're asking for a 19 20 21 MS. TRISTANI: Because I think one of the --2.2 I don't know who's been opposing this. Someone 0211 1 obviously has been opposing this. 2 MS. STRAUSS: No, no one has been opposing 3 We had 8 years of inaction in this agency. 4 MS. TRISTANI: Well -- but I suspect there 5 may be some States -- I'm not speaking for States --6 but there may be some States that will say, at the end 7 of the day it's going to cost us more money to -- you 8 know, and I think it's for the public good. I support 9 the principle and all, but I think if that's the case, 10 then that needs to be explored in a rulemaking to give 11 everybody an opportunity. 12 MS. STRAUSS: Actually, let me clarify one 13 thing. There has been one State that came out in 14 opposition just recently, and that was the State of

California. There's other issues with California that are not worth going into, and you're right, they would 16 17 come out during a rulemaking. They want to actually 18 alter the way the service is provided. They're the 19 only State that has requested doing so, but Lisa just 20 confirmed that the petitions asked for a rulemaking. 21 MS. TRISTANI: That was actually my principal 22 concern, because I guess a follow-up question is, you 0212 1 say no one else has opposed this? 2 MS. STRAUSS: No one else has opposed it on 3 the record. 4 MS. TRISTANI: On the record? 5 MS. STRAUSS: No. Overwhelmingly, literally 6 hundreds if not thousands of consumers have come 7 forward to support it. MS. TRISTANI: Okay. Okay. And you have a -9 - this was filed in -- the second petition was filed in 10 June, and no one has opposed it? 11 MS. STRAUSS: Only California. MS. TRISTANI: Only California? No carrier 12 13 has opposed this either? 14 MS. STRAUSS: No carrier has opposed it; in 15 fact, it has been supported by Sprint, AT&T. I don't 16 think any other carrier has commented. Yeah. 17 MS. TRISTANI: So, one party opposing it? 18 MS. STRAUSS: One party opposing it. MS. TRISTANI: Okay. Well, that's -- I don't 19 20 need to ask anything further. 21 CHAIR BERLYN: Cheryl? 22 MS. HEPPNER: I just want to add a little 0213 detail, maybe a bit of a human face. But I use the 1 CapTel phone, and I was actually involved in the early 3 pilot testing, and let me point out a couple of things 4 that I think would be interesting for you to know. 5 In fact, pretty much any one of you who 6 doesn't have a hearing loss could walk into, say, a 7 Costco or a Walmart, and you could get a Vonage, say, 8 brand name, phone for their home. And it would cost 9 you maybe \$39 to have three or even four of them, and 10 that would be cheaper than one caption telephone. The consumers have to pay some other -- some times there 11 12 are special offers. And also Lisa mentioned that we're 13 still paying for the phone service, but when you do 14 things by telephone -- not the Internet version of it, 15 but that particular telephone -- you can only make 16 outgoing calls easily. If you want to have incoming 17 calls routed to your phone, you need to pay for a 18 second phone line. 19 And I also want to tell you that at my 20 center, we place a lot of these phones with people. 21 They are specially desirable for people who are 22 starting to lose their hearing, because they want a 0214 1 phone that looks just like the phone they're used to.

You don't have to do anything special. You don't have

15

to dial a special number and wait for somebody to get on the line. You pick the phone up, you just dial the number of the person you want to call, and this service takes care of everything and puts you through to it.

Especially for those who are having memory problems and are just overwhelmed by a lot of modern technology, this has been literally a lifesaver. It's a very, very important service. It needs to be widely available. And I cannot believe the FCC has not taken action on this. A whole huge group of people are disenfranchised from communicating with their friends, their loved ones, emergency services, you name it.

CHAIR BERLYN: Claude?

MS. STOUT: I strongly encourage all of you to support this resolution. Without video relay service, many of us, you know, would have these limitations. There's no limit on that kind of service for those of us who use sign language as our primary form of communication. There's no limitation on Internet-based relay services or speech-to-speech. And

I can't tell you how much this upsets me, how disheartening it is. We really need to send a clear message to the folks upstairs that we can no longer deal with the limitation, that, you know, there are people among us who do not have basic access to phone service

I use a CapTel phone on occasion when I talk with my children, and they are delighted to be able to hear my voice while I'm using that. The relay service does not just benefit people who've lost their hearing later in life, people who've grown up using speech, or are accustomed to using their voice; but the person on the other end of the call sometimes is the beneficiary of this kind of service as well. So, you know, being able to build and continue personal relationships, to contact my family -- people who are senior citizens, who often are living away from their family, who often don't have a lot of social contacts, for children to be able to hear their parents voices. There are so many situations where people get this feedback, this direct line of communications with their loved ones. So, again, I urge you to support the resolution.

CHAIR BERLYN: We'll have one more comment. Mark -- and then we'll move to -- oh, I'm sorry. I didn't see you.

MR. DeFALCO: Can we get Mary after I speak, or do you want me to give her my time?

CHAIR BERLYN: Do you have a brief -MR. DeFALCO: I'll be very brief. I don't
know much about this at all, so I think my whole
knowledge level of this is the presentation you just
gave, because I've not been exposed to it before.

I would just raise one point. Gloria is right. There are some parties out there -- I don't know who they are -- who, for whatever reason, are

against this, because -- I guess it's money. And the States are going to incur some kind of a cost involved here. So, my only -- I will support it. I have no problem supporting it whatsoever, the limited knowledge of it that I have.

But the only point I would make is, the FCC has just opened a proceeding to start looking at IP networks for the future. And it's really a transition from the public-switch telephone network to the IP

network. And this is -- kind of strikes me as, you're asking for a rulemaking, which is going to take a long period of time to occur. And then when the ruling is made, then the States have to come up with a way of getting together the money that they individually need, so you're going to have a bunch of proceedings in different States to come up with the funding, and that's going to take a lot of time too. And are you going to put a lot of effort into something that is going to be obsolete by the time you get it accomplished? Because you're going to be starting to migrate to the new network. So I'll support it, I have no problem with that, but at the same time you should be working at trying to get your comments on this issue teed up with the IP rulemaking as well.

MS. STRAUSS: The real short answer to that is that there is an IP version of this available, but that this is specifically for all of those people that we talked about this morning who don't have access to broadband. And that's going to be a huge number of senior citizens.

I'm almost -- I'm really sorry that we didn't

bring some sample comments, because you can't believe it. I mean, people pouring their heart out about how this, as Cheryl said, is a lifesaver, a godsend, it's the best thing since sliced bread, since the invention of the airplane, since the invention of the sandwich. I mean, there's all these analogies, because what it did for senior citizens is it gave them the opportunity to use the phones that they're used to using their whole live, and enabled them to keep using them. They don't want to go to IP. They want to stay with their regular conventional telephones.

CHAIR BERLYN: That's a good point. Mary?

MS. CRESPY: Hi. This is Mary Crespy with Verizon. Just a really quick point of clarification. Four years ago when the petition was filed, our predecessor company, MCI, had filed an opposition, and then during comments and reply comments, Verizon purchased MCI's TRS business, and we went on record opposing it as well. And at that point, there was just one vendor that provided the underlying technology, and our TRS business was unable -- this is what I

understand -- unable to get access to that technology.

```
And that's why we went on record in opposition.
3
    Verizon is no longer a TRS provider, and we did not
     file in the proceeding this past summer, so we don't
5
     really have a position, at this point, that would
     oppose it. But I just wanted to make that
6
7
     clarification, and I don't know if the industry has
8
    changed in the past 4 years, with regards to that
9
     technology.
10
               And very briefly, on a personal note, I
11
    bought a IP CapTel for my mom 2 years ago when she lost
12
    her hearing, and it's been amazing, because we were
13
    going through the Dad relay --
14
               [Laughter.]
15
               MS. CRESPY: And it was wonderful to hear my
16
    mom's voice again and talk with her on the phone.
               CHAIR BERLYN: Excellent.
17
18
               So, are we ready to call the question?
19
              MS. STRAUSS: Can we move to adopt the
20
    resolution as proposed?
21
               CHAIR BERLYN: All those in favor?
22
               [A chorus of ayes.]
0220
1
               CHAIR BERLYN: Any opposed?
2
               [No response.]
               CHAIR BERLYN: Any abstentions?
3
4
                [A show of two hands.]
5
               CHAIR BERLYN: Two? Two abstentions. Two
6
    abstentions: Ann Bobeck, NAB; and CEA. And all else
7
    were ayes.
8
               MS. STRAUSS: Thank you very, very much.
9
               CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you all. Okay.
10
               How many people here have BlackBerrys or
11
     iPhones or some sort of device where you can look at
12
    your email, or something in front of you? Could I ask
13
    everyone to stay in your seat and look at your email.
    We have a mandatory break for our CART facilitator
14
15
    here, but I don't want to make this a break, kind of --
16
    or -- okay, you can go to the ladies' room or men's
17
    room. But please come back within 5 minutes, because
18
    otherwise we're not going to have an opportunity to
19
    complete our schedule on time. So 5 minutes maximum.
20
               Yes, Gloria?
21
               MS. TRISTANI: We are going to have a chance
22
     to discuss future issues?
0221
1
               CHAIR BERLYN: That's exactly why I don't
2
     want to lose our scheduled time here. So, yes, we
3
    will. Yes, we can.
4
               [Laughter.]
5
               [Recess.]
 6
               CHAIR BERLYN: We're trying to get started.
7
     If anyone's in the room who needs to be in their chair
8
     -- I knew this would happen. See what happens? I
9
    knew it.
               Brenda, do you mind starting with your
10
11
    working group report?
12
              MS. PENNINGTON: Sure.
```

13 CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you. 14 MS. PENNINGTON: Do you want me to start now? 15 CHAIR BERLYN: Yes, if you could. Thank you. 16 MS. PENNINGTON: Oh, no problem at all. 17 What I've passed out while we were on break 18 is a memo that's dated December 4th, and it's -- I'll 19 go through the memo. 20 It deals with truth-in-billing principles, 21 which is an issue that the Consumer Protection 22 Subcommittee has undertaken --0222 1 CHAIR BERLYN: I'm sorry. Could you just 2 hold up the -- what you distributed and make sure 3 everybody has it, because I don't think -- I don't know 4 if I have a copy. 5 MS. PENNINGTON: Oh, okay. 6 MALE SPEKER: It wasn't in the packet. 7 MS. PENNINGTON: No, it wasn't in the packet, 8 but I sent it around while we were on break. 9 CHAIR BERLYN: All right. Thank you, Brenda. 10 11 MS. PENNINGTON: Sure. 12 CHAIR BERLYN: Now you can go again. MS. PENNINGTON: And, basically, this issue 13 14 we decided to undertake as it's a very important issue. 15 It -- we've seen other issues that are tangentially 16 related to that, during our discussion of the consumer 17 complaints. We had -- which I thought were two very good issues that were brought up by Gloria and Marti. 18 19 Consumers are still confused about their 20 telephone bill. What it says, what the taxes and 21 surcharges are. My office in particular gets an 22 abundance of consumer complaints still asking about, 0223 1 What is this TRS? You know, that we just discussed. What is the universal service fund? Do I have to pay 2 3 these taxes and surcharges? Who mandated them? And 4 5 But it's not just taxes and surcharges that 6 we're looking at. So, the FCC issued an NOI in late 7 August, and I'm very excited about the work that we can do at the CAC in order to give the Commission some 9 guidance. The Commission had already come up with 10 principles and rules that they put into place with 11 truth in billing on the wireline side. And they've 12 also done some on the wireless. What they really are 13 looking for is an indication from industry and from 14 consumers as to whether or not there needs to be rules 15 that are put in place for broadband as well as the 16 strengthening of the rules that they currently have. 17 Of course, being a consumer advocate, I say 18 "yes." But it also addresses a consumer concern. So it's not just "yes," we want tougher, stronger rules; 19 20 but it actually will help reduce consumer confusion. A large portion of the telephone bill now 22 really does revolve around taxes and surcharges. So 0224

the subcommittee has come up with about 20 principles. And while we're not going to take a vote today, because even though we've had a couple of -- we convened a couple of teleconferences, it wasn't convenient for the subcommittee to meet so that we could get a guorum.

1 2

What I'd like to do -- my goal is to have you all read this memo. Even though there are 20 principles on here, what has come out in some of the conference calls is that I'd like to cull down and make the principles sharper. What I'm thinking about doing is to come up with four categories, and those categories would be something like consumer protections; enforcement; consumer -- point-of-sale requirements, that at the point of sale these are things that need to be addressed with the consumer; and information that should be clearly and concisely written.

Some of these principles, like 3 and 16, are duplicative of one another, but I think that if, you know, we put them together, we'll still get -- we'll make a stronger impact. So, I'm asking that the

committee get back to me by January 8th -- and I'm certainly going to send out an email -- and I'd like everyone to get back by January 8th with respect to their comments, so then we could put this document in a form that could be voted on by the full CAC.

CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you, Brenda. So, procedurally, what we're going to do, then, Brenda, is you're going to be working with your working group over the next month --

MS. PENNINGTON: Yes.

CHAIR BERLYN: -- and then what we will need to do is have a teleconference to approve these principles, so that they can then be forwarded to the full -- we'll have a teleconference of the full CAC to approve these principles so that they can be given to the FCC before our March meeting.

MS. PENNINGTON: Yes. And Scott has already taken the initiative and talked with Erica McMahon, and they're looking forward to our comments. And we're thinking about having a teleconference with the FCC before our March meeting, so that -- is that the correct understanding, Scott?

CHAIR BERLYN: No.

MR. MARSHALL: The teleconference would be of the full CAC to act upon the document as it has evolved. The -- Erica had indicated that it would be useful to have this information to her by January or early February.

MS. PENNINGTON: Right.

MR. MARSHALL: And that's why it's -- it will be necessary for us to have a special teleconference meeting. We've done this in the past, when something was time of the essence.

12 MS. PENNINGTON: Okay. Well, with that 13 clarification, it's still is in keeping with the 14 schedule that we had discussed. 15 MR. MARSHALL: Right. Correct. CHAIR BERLYN: The staff person from the FCC 16 17 is on your left here, who will give us some -- I'm 18 sorry. On your right. I'm sorry. 19 MR. MARSHALL: Sure. This is Julie Saulnier, 20 from Erica's group, who knows infinitely more about 21 this topic than I do. Did you want to make a comment? 22 MS. SAULNIER: I'll try to be very brief, 0227 1 just because I know you have a full schedule. 2 My name is Julie Saulnier. I'm Erica 3 McMahon's deputy in the Consumer Policy division. I 4 just want to repeat the information that we are very 5 much looking forward to any input that you might have. 6 At this point the Notice of Inquiry was 7 issued in August. The official comment period has closed. And we're -- what we're dong now is considering the comments. So it is very timely. We don't have -- we don't really know right 10 11 now when this notice is going to move again. The Commission, as you probably know, is sort of focused, 12 13 and will be focused for a while, on getting out the 14 broadband plan in February. But it is a good time for 15 -- and we would look forward to your input. 16 And just one additional note about the Notice 17 of Inquiry. It's very much -- we used -- the vehicle 18 we used for putting it out was our existing truth-in-19 billing proceeding, but as Brenda appropriately pointed 20 out, it extends beyond wireline and wireless telephone 21 service to broadband services. It also extends to all 22 -- the full range of communication services, even 0228 including cable and VoIP. And basically we put 1 everything on the table, just because we asked, very 2 broadly, what additional information consumers may need 3 4 when they're making their purchasing decisions. 5 So, it does -- it covers not only billing, point-of-sale disclosures, but anything else that we --7 that might come up -- to your attention. And just to be sure you have all the 9 information in your hands, I wanted to mention two 10 other proceedings which involve consumer issues. I 11 think the broadband proceeding has already come up 12 There is currently -- it was very recently 13 issued -- a public notice, in our general broadband -open broadband initiative, seeking comment on what 14 additional transparency, is the word used in that 15 16 proceeding. That -- we mean by that the full range of 17 consumer disclosures, what additional transparency and consumer information might be appropriate in the 18 19 broadband context. And I'm flagging that for you 20 because the broadband plan timeline is -- we're bumping 21 up against the deadline of February 17th. It's a very

short comment framework, and the comments on that

22

0229 1 public notice are due December 14th. And I also wanted to let you know in the much 3 more recent open Internet, sometimes called "net 4 neutrality" proceeding, the 6th principle that we --5 the Commission is proposing to codify is a principle on 6 transparency. So, again, consumer information and 7 disclosure issues are posed in that proceeding. And 8 that's much newer. The comment deadline is still open, 9 so there's -- that -- we're also -- any input you might 10 have in either of those proceedings would be helpful. 11 All of the information that I'm giving you is 12 available on our Web site. I can get you copies of 13 these things if you don't have them right now, but it's 14 all up on the Web site, so please help yourself. 15 Thank you. 16 CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you very much. 17 Appreciate it. 18 Well, that helps a great deal to reinforce 19 the timeliness of this. So, I guess that means, working group, look for information from Brenda and be 20 21 prepared for feedback and discussion. And then, CAC, 22 look for notice for a teleconference sometime. We 0230 1 anticipate around the end of January. 2 So, very good. Thank you very much, Brenda. 3 MS. PENNINGTON: Thank you. CHAIR BERLYN: Okay. On our agenda, next up 4 5 -- and Jamie, help me out here -- we have Brian 6 Markwalter -- is he in the room? Oh, okay. Great, would you come join us up 8 at the table? We have a report -- progress report --9 from the Digital Closed Captioning and Video 10 Description Working Group. 11 Thank you for being with us. Do you need to 12 hook up? MR. MARKWALTER: No. We talked about this. 13 14 CHAIR BERLYN: You can come right up here 15 then. 16 MR. MARKWALTER: Okay. 17 CHAIR BERLYN: Actually, I think I even might 18 have a tag for you. 19 MR. MARKWALTER: Thank you. Thank you for 20 having me. I'll try to be quick. 21 When I put together the information -- I 22 guess, first of all, I drew the short straw on 0231 1 presenting for the Closed Captioning and Video 2 Description Working Group. Karen would have gladly 3 done it actually, but she has a travel obligation. So 4 let me get through this quickly. I'm going to compress 5 19 slides I put together, and spare you from that, and 6 just do this verbally. 7 The purpose of the working group is to 8 conduct an assessment of closed captioning and video 9 description, technical issues associated with the

switch to digital television, and to recommend to the

10

CAC solutions to any technical problems arising with these services in conjunction with the DTV transition. That was from the public notice originally, when the members of the working group were announced.

The group had its first meeting on May 18th, there was a broad discussion of types of accessibility problems when we were first trying to get hands around the issues that we were facing. We did a review of the CSD captioning survey that they had conducted, which provided us good information on consumer views of captioning problems. And we partitioned our overall talk into a number of sub-tasks and created five

subgroups under the working group to attack the different areas. And I'll go to the subgroups in just a moment, try to give you a little status update on each piece, since the work is really happening in subgroups at this point.

We had a second meeting on November 9th, and the bulk of that meeting was spent in progress reports of the subgroups. I think virtually all of whom -- I believe all of them -- I'm not on everyone -- but I think all of them had met at least once. And in the case of subgroups I lead, we had met four times. So, most have met two or three or four times in between the first meeting of the working group and the second.

The majority of that meeting, besides the reports, was spent in discussing the main issues being resource constraints on the people involved -- it's just the amount of work, the complexity of the problems, and the limited people time, mostly. There are some funding issues, but mostly people resources to take apart some of these problems and understand them.

The lack of any identifiable, what I would call, low-hanging-fruit; there were no obvious stand-

out problems that we could say, Let's go deal with that first. They seemed to be scattered around and coming from many different areas.

And then the last part, there were some, kind of, process questions, since quite a few of us are not familiar -- we did not come from a CAC background, so how to make recommendations. We came in sort of going from work in subgroups to trying to put something together in time for this meeting itself. And so we struggled a little bit with how people -- how we should make proposals internally and bundle them up and reach consensus on them.

I want to briefly discuss the five subgroups, so you'll get a feeling for how we've broken out the problems. The first one is -- I'll use short names -- there are longer names associated with them -- but the first one is the -- I'll call it the Data Needs subgroup. And it's focused on figuring out what data service providers, equipment manufacturers, and the captioning service providers -- I'm sorry, the first, "service provider," by that I mean the video

programming distributors -- the manufacturers, and then 0234

the caption service providers -- the kinds of data they need to be able to track down and solve problems.

From that comes -- once you sort of get a handle on that, then the natural next step is, well, if you've tracked down a problem and solved it, then you're beginning to build a data base of problems and solutions. And so, that was sort of a natural next extension. There's an open question in that group -- besides the fact they're still working on the fundamental issue of who needs what data to solve problems? If we do move towards this data base, how would you operate it, populate it, and fund it?

And, last, I think this is true of several of the working groups, there is overlapping scope, if you will, because this data base probably feeds into the consumer information subgroup that I'll mention in a moment.

The second one, which are -- is Lessons
Learned and Unsolved Mysteries subgroup. So, these
are, sort of, our detectives right now. So, it's a
pretty large group. They focused on collecting data of
problems. And by "data" I mean not just, like an

incident report. What we figured out is that, in many cases, we actually have to capture the bitstream, the signal itself and have an expert take it apart. CEA has funded an engineering consultant to document how slightly technically savvy users have their -- in the captioning user community -- could help us capture some streams, and then this consultant would analyze them. We had a couple that the FCC already had; we had a couple of signals that EchoStar had seen that had experienced problems. So that's under way. We're identifying a couple more consumers to help us get these bitstreams, and then we will analyze them and figure out what it tells us about where the problems come from.

The goals for that group -- and this is a really critical group, because it helps us understand what these problems really are underneath, besides what the consumer sees on the screen. So, their goal is to be able to kind of have an interim report in the first quarter. I guess it could be final, but I don't think we know enough to know yet whether it'll be final. But in the first quarter -- and again, we're sort of

resource-bound. CEA, at least the funding that I had provided through my group, was for this year, so we'll have to see what happens when we cross over into January.

There's also an issue that was noted and discussed a little bit in our last meeting about confidentiality. So that -- you can imagine, when you're sitting in front of the FCC who also has an enforcement function, and you're talking about the --

you know, somebody -- some problem with captions, and there's lots of sensitivities about taking those apart. And who's willing to say openly, "Well, this happened," or how do you document this stuff without effectively saying, "This person violated some procedures, or apparently did"?

Then there's a Video Description Challenges subgroup that Larry Goldberg leads, and in this case — this is about the video description audio track that is associated with TV services. And the consensus is that although the standards document how to provide these other audio programs, which in the past would have been done as simply a secondary audio program in analog TV,

it's a little bit more complicated, because the digital television is much more robust, so it allows many different associated analog programs. The problem is how does a content producer indicate that what's called metadata — the associated data that says this particular audio stream is the video description that's meant to go with this program. So getting audio there is less of a problem than tagging the audio and getting it through the whole chain and getting the receivers and the subtitle boxes to know how to find it.

CEA -- in this case we already had a working group that was working in this area on this type of problem, of finding audio and finding the desirable audio in a digital television program. So we're working on a recommended practice in our standards venue, and essentially Larry's group is waiting for that, which we're going to provide a draft this week, and then I think through Larry's group, we'll try to get a handle on the impacts

So the recommended practice will say, Here's what we think we ought to be doing. There's a separate issue of what of the legacy equipment, what if the

equipment that's out there, simply can't do it the way we think it ought to be done. In other words, people made decisions about implementing that -- in the absence of clear enough guidance in the standards that we need to make a correction for.

The other piece of Larry's work in the video description area relates to the -- making devices themselves accessible. And by that we're talking about having audible interfaces for what are otherwise graphical interfaces on TVs and set-top boxes. So, in this case, this so visually impaired people can find and use the controls on their equipment. And actually CEA separately has engaged in dialogue with a couple of the visually impaired groups, trying to figure out how we can get started on that. But I have some things that -- that they would like to pursue in terms of design approaches, and we're trying to gather the TV manufacturers together. So, that's not under Larry's group itself, but we are trying to get that dialogue going.

21 The Consumer Information subgroup -- this is 22 Karen's -- and they had -- they reached general

agreement -- and she probably has the -- in some ways the most important piece, which is to take all this technical work that's going on and turn it into material for the outside world. They have general agreement on the need for easy-to-understand guidelines on how to set up and activate captioning and video description. That's an area that my group is also looking at, and I'll get to my group in just a second. That service provider, manufacturer, Web sites should be searchable, so that people with disabilities have a better chance of finding the specific solutions that they need. We think -- or we hope to get the information there, but then you've got to be able to find it without too much effort. And there's a recommendation that FCC should provide a single Web portal as a clearing house of information. The analogy that's consistently given is what was done with the DTV transition itself, but more focused on accessibility issues directly.

Some others suggested that FCC actions -- and I'm sure she'll drill down on these further -- public advisors on complaint processes, how video devices $\frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1$

interconnect with each other -- and that's actually a separate -- my subgroup identified that separately. And HDMI, which is one of -- is the new digital interface on TVs, and some usability problems associated with it.

There's a recommendation to conduct large-scale consumer education by mainstream media and PSAs, et cetera, and in publishing articles on consumer organization newsletters, blogs, and Web sites.

Okay, the last group is mine, HDMI and Video Sources subgroup. And this goes to the problems associated with the transition, not of digital television broadcast, but of digital interfaces on products, which do not handle captions the same way that analog interfaces do. Analog passes captions just like a broadcast signal, and that doesn't exist in the digital world anymore. So, there are some expectations and, sort of, things are just different in the way they behave, and where you need to turn on captions.

And so, our group has agreed that we need to document best practices. This is essentially the same thing that Karen's group identified, that we need to

write down in simple -- probably some combination of words and pictures -- how you connect equipment, and what you should expect, and where you turn on caption decoding, to help consumers understand what's become a fairly complex interconnection process now.

The other piece that's identified in our work is understanding HDMI, which right now is essentially just a picture-passing interface. What it does is,

instead of passing a video signal that the TV takes apart as is done with analog TV, it literally passes the pictures and just says make this picture on your screen. And it was not set up originally to do -- to pass captioning. So we need to think through, and we actually have asked the HDMI licensing organization, the owners of HDMI interface specification, to join our next call, which they've agreed to do. And talk to them about how they update their spec and what their plans are, and also express to them the needs of the -- especially the hearing-impaired community, in this case. And that's it.

CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you very much. Appreciate it. And we look forward to your continuing

-- your efforts and hearing more from you. Okay. Thanks.

We're going to take advantage of the next 20 minutes on our schedule, and maybe squeeze a few more minutes if we need to, to have our follow-up discussion from this morning. We want to talk a little bit about the issues going forward as Brandon teed up this morning, and also talk about our process going forward. And so, I would invite Brandon, if you want, to continue where you left off.

But let me just start off by saying, I think, for the most part, we have a couple things that are clear. So I'll start with that. One thing we know that's clear is that we have a National Broadband Plan, that will be coming out February 17th, that the FCC will need to implement. So, we know that will be happening. That's number one.

Number two, we have a couple of proceedings that are going on, you know, number one, the one that Brenda's working group is working on, the NOI, but then there will likely be an NPRM that will come out of that, that will be going on in the coming year.

And then we also have this reboot FCC.gov effort that is going on, that at the very least will have the redesign of the Web site, where this group could have a participatory effort. So those are just a few things to mention that we know that we can participate in, in addition to, of course, the disability issues that are always ongoing that the working group has made such a tremendous effort and a difference in over the past couple years. So, anyway.

MR. STEPHENS: If you don't mind I'll start out and go again, but I'll just make a few general comments. My interest in what I've heard in most cases from a lot of my constituency, either from my own Tribe and the State that I serve, or in the -- well, even Mark's areas of the Appalachian Regional Commission, of rural Appalachia and all across Indian country, broadband has to be one of the premier issues. And

also, just listening to some White House staffers earlier this week, we know that one of the key issues has to be infrastructure for the future. So, where

1 2

Irene?

does that leave us here, to say, What are some of the things that we needed to work on?

Now, in the last term, not this current term, you know, I was working with the broadband group, Charles and I were, and in that there were several key issues that we needed to really move forward. But now that the plan is going forward, I'm kind of wondering where we should even focus our efforts, because the broadband plan will -- once we meet once again that will already have been published. We will have just a small amount of time left in this term. And I'm wondering if there are other key issues that the FCC has to focus, or do we have any other kind of filings to make or comments to make to the FCC, or are there areas inside of our own interest groups from those that are physically challenged, or those from Indian country, or the regulatory, or wherever we happen to -our interests happen to lie?

I believe that there are certain things that we need to really key up, and I'm not at the forefront to -- I think there are some things that I could really speak on and waste a lot of time sitting here talking

about those things, but I think that we should -- I have a keen interest in wanting to propel broadband, but I'm not really sure where this group wants to take that, knowing that there are certain things, that we're kind of in the middle of a crunch of time where the broadband plan that's come out, and then we'll have a limited time inside the term that we'll serve.

So, but I think it's -- I think there are some opportunities for us to work. I'll just leave those out for discussion, or if anybody else wants to talk about that.

CHAIR BERLYN: Charles, and Gloria, and

MR. BENTON: Well, I'm delighted that we're open to new initiatives to be more effective and productive, Madam Chairman, I think this is very exciting. And I think the most exciting — the single most exciting idea I've heard today about our future possibilities is the one to focus on the National Broadband Plan implementation. We can't influence this plan now, I don't think. We don't have the time or the capacity to do that. But, as Commissioner Copps said

this morning, in his 8 and a half years at the FCC this is the single most impressive and exciting initiative in his total FCC experience. And certainly, from my involvement with the FCC over the past years, I am so impressed with the leadership of Blair Levin and Erik Garr, the whole team. I mean, it is an extraordinary exercise they're going through. And the kind outreach,

with their 26 public notices, and my God, it is just — the hearings and the midterm report to the full FCC — I mean, it really is an amazing effort.

So, I would recommend that as soon as the report is made to Congress on the 17th of February, and I believe they will stick to that timescale, that immediately one of the first actions is that, Scott, you should send a copy of that report to every member of the CAC right away so we have it in front of us. And then maybe we set up an ad hoc committee that kind of crosses all the other committees of people interested in this. We have Lou and Irene as the cochairs of the Broadband Committee, but there will be others. Maybe we can re-recruit Brandon from his former chairmanship. I certainly would be willing to

volunteer on this one, and I'm sure there are others as well. But we can have sort of an ad hoc, voluntary committee -- and you could begin to determine interested members today -- that would agree to focus in on the recommendations as they are made, then have a meeting end of February, early March, by telephone, that -- where we could begin to get a preliminary look at, and consideration of, possibilities. And then at least bring an outline of possible further involvement to the March 19th meeting, so that there would have been some forethought given to this by anyone and everyone on the CAC that's interested in volunteering for this ad hoc effort.

And then growing out of the discussion of that, those options that we would lay out on the 19th, we could then figure out new structures for further follow-up that would make sense. That would be my recommendation as to how to proceed.

CHAIR BERLYN: Okay. Thanks, Charles. I have Gloria, and then Irene and Lisa. MS. TRISTANI: Thank you, Debbie. Just two issues, or actually two proceedings,

that I wanted to highlight, or that have been — that are being teed up. And one was mentioned by Marti earlier today. And that's the — was notice number 25 of the National Broadband Plan, and it asked questions about the transition to all—IP networks. And it was in — I haven't read it thoroughly. Actually, it was kind of short, but it talked about leading to an NPRM, and among the — one of the questions it asks, for example was, Which regulatory structures will facilitate or hinder the more efficient transition to the all—IP network?

I bring that up because I think, for those of us who care about local governments being at the forefront of consumer protection, this is something that we have to watch -- actually, watch and get involved in very carefully, because I could envision a -- you know, some kind of new rules in transition that say exclusive Federal jurisdiction in this area. And I

can envision that because coincidentally this week a group of companies wrote a letter to the leadership of the Commerce Committee in the House and the Senate, and those companies included Verizon, AT&T, Microsoft, 0249

Google, T-Mobile, and so on, big groups, saying that there should be exclusive Federal jurisdiction for all services that are IP-related. So I'm just highlighting that. I think it's something Consumer Protection, and maybe your committee, Brenda, should get involved in, because this is going to move at some level. It's already moving.

The other proceeding I wanted to mention, and I don't know if Ann was going to bring this up, was -- and it's something that's being much talked about -- it's this question about, in looking for spectrum for broadband, there's vigorous talk about telling broadcasters to give back some of the digital spectrum that was supposed to be used for digital and HDTV, and there was a notice this week. I can't remember which -- maybe you can help us with that. But I think that also raises some very, very important public interest and consumer questions, and we should give very careful thought to.

And, by the way, Charles, because I know public interest is your -- and it's one of my favorite topics -- it does ask one question about public

interest. It's related to what we've been trying to do for a long time. Just one sentence, but it does raise, you know, what are the programming obligations, as far as civic programming, et cetera. So I just thought I would highlight. And we do have a resolution on that, from this committee. So, anyway, I just wanted to mention those two proceedings, and hope that you'll give it attention.

CHAIR BERLYN: Okay. Thanks.

You want to just comment on that one issue quickly?

MS. BOBECK: Just a quick follow-up -- public notice on the National Broadband Plan for those who couldn't count, we're at -- it's Public Notice number 26, and comments on that are due December 21st. I believe that's the same day that comments on Public Notice number 27 are due. So it's a busy season. I know that they're trying to get that done so that they can wrap up the information collecting and start the drafting for broadcasters. Obviously, to use the spectrum is important, not only for the promises we made to America, why it's important to invest in new

digital televisions, you know, HD sets, but also to ensure that we can multicast, that we can provide local service to our communities, and that we can start rolling out our mobile DTV service as well, so that you can watch us on multiple platforms. So, look for -- forward to our comments and discussions. And I'm sure

that my neighbor to my left here -- your right -- will have some interesting dialogue that will be going forth in the National Broadband Plan. But I think it's an important issue to raise globally, is how do you roll out spectrum and look to the future in terms of partnerships and collaboration, and we view ourselves as part of the wireless solution.

CHAIR BERLYN: Okay. Lisa?

MS. HAMLIN: I just wanted to add -- and we're looking at trying to make a plan for the future here -- is that since I've been here, and it hasn't been as long as some of the other people, it's been -- there was a huge focus on DTV, and now a huge focus on broadband. And those are appropriate, and I understand that deadlines came from elsewhere.

But I don't want it to get lost that there are other issues and especially in the disability realm. We have lots of things that we haven't been able to see move ahead. I mean, just the issue we brought together today, that started in 2005. So, I'd still want to see our disability issues, and I'd like to see that work group continue and have input on these other issues as well. Because I think you're right, these are important issues to deal with. But I just wanted to put this word in. I don't want them to get lost.

CHAIR BERLYN: And I think that's important feedback. Whereas with the previous life of the CAC, we had a very clear directive from the chairman: Work on DTV. We don't necessarily have that directive from this chairman to only, singularly, work on broadband issues. So, you know, we do need to consider where — the direction that we take, we have a charge to advise the Commission on consumer issues. But we're not in that sort of box that we were before. So, you know, that's why it is incumbent upon us to consider the full range of issues that consumers face. So, your comments are well put.

MR. BENTON: Just a tiny point. Lisa, lest you feel that broadband is not including disability issues, there is a major section in the broadband plan about disability issues under consumer adoption and use. So don't feel left out as we're focusing on broadband. It's just putting it into a larger context. And I think the more of those issues that you can get — and there's something we can talk about, of course, in March — so that, as we're talking the National Broadband Plan, where do the disability issues fit? And where are they? So this is not either/or, here, at all.

MS. HAMLIN: No, and I didn't mean to say that. I want it to be both.

CHAIR BERLYN: A couple of things I just want to mention going forward is, we are going to try and aim for that March 19th meeting, and Scott and I will

continue to advocate for the possibility of doing a two-day meeting. It might likely be more like a day and a half, where we start with an afternoon -- first day being an afternoon -- and then the second day being similar to what we have now, so that people can travel

in, in the morning the first day.

So, think about that going forward. So it might be March 18-19. And also one thing that I've picked up in our discussion that it would be very helpful to have is a flow of more information to the CAC. And so one thing I've thought about and checked out with Scott during the day today is he -- that he is willing to do -- don't need to pile on to Scott -- but that he disseminate information on a regular basis to all of us.

Now, there are several people in the room that are excellent resources for documents, and what I — but what I would like to do is to do it in an organized fashion. So, rather than have some of us distribute information from time to time to the CAC, if I could ask those of you that do get great information — documents, you know, and I know Charles is a great resource, and Gloria, you are as well — and sometimes I get — and others in the room, Karen and others — friends in the industry — if you could, when you get a document that you think would be helpful for all of us to see on the committee, if you could immediately send

it to Scott. And Scott will send it out to the CAC. So he will be our resource. And that way, he will know everything that's going out, and we will all get everything in a timely fashion, and we will all get everything at the same time. So, I think that -- let's try that.

And then we will all, also, be eyes and ears and look for information that you think might be helpful for the CAC to have on a regular basis, because I think that will be helpful, if we all can get information in between the meeting times.

I will be looking at ways to that we can perhaps re-jigger the working groups with the information that you've given me to see ways that we can for the next -- our next year -- look at the issues that we are now faced with for this next year and figure out ways that we can be productive to match the issues that the FCC is facing.

And, also, with respect to our friends with the New Media Group, I think it would really be helpful to stay with them in this process, and I would like to see if there is a small core group that would be

interested in working very closely with the New Media Group and getting them regular feedback. So, if you could, if you are interested in doing that, and that might mean more meetings here at the FCC with them on a more regular basis to look at what they're doing in

terms of the redesign of the Web site -- if you could, 7 volunteer for that process. And I'm not looking for a large group; I'm looking more for a group -- and if you 9 have connections that you can then, you know, feed back 10 to your community, I think that's what they're looking 11 for as well. But -- you know, they can do that in 12 other ways, but I think what I'm really looking for is 13 more of hands-on assistance with this new media effort. 14 So, if you could, volunteer for that effort, 15 three/four people from the CAC would be perfect. 16 can email me, you can come up to me after the meeting, 17 you can slip me a note, whatever. Whatever works best. 18 Just let me know. 19 Okay, thank you all. We're --20 MALE SPEAKER: Bill Cline is here. CHAIR BERLYN: Bill Cline is here, but -- so 21 22 -- you want to come on up here? 0257 1 Oh, did we have --2 Irene and I see Claude, I'm sorry. Claude 3 has a card up, and we have two people who still -- I'm 4 sorry. I didn't mean to cut off here. Can I get 5 comments from Claude and Irene? 6 Claude? 7 MS. STOUT: If I'm following the 8 conversations correctly, we're looking towards the 9 higher -- the bigger goals that we're working towards 10 in the next year. Now, the terms, as members, when do 11 these terms expire and when are they up? 12 MR. MARSHALL: November 17th, 2010, I 13 believe. 14 CHAIR BERLYN: November 2010, so just a 15 little less than a year. 16 MS. STOUT: Okay, thank you. The reason for 17 my question is because -- is it possible to somehow 18 bring up the issues within the term about the merger 19 that's happening? I was reading this morning about 20 NBC, Universal, and Comcast. I don't know if consumers 21 are going to actually come out on the winning end of 22 that, or what the result will be, and so our choices in 0258 1 content and programming may be reduced as a result of 2 that, or possibly not. So I think it's critical to 3 start considering -- I don't know, in light of that, 4 and coming up on, you know, a year left of our terms, 5 how that might affect us. 6 CHAIR BERLYN: Have we ever dealt with 7 mergers and --8 MR. MARSHALL: No, but that doesn't stop us 9 from doing it. 10 CHAIR BERLYN: Yeah. 11 MR. MARSHALL: I'm sure we will have a role 12 in that ultimate decision. 13 CHAIR BERLYN: I know the FCC has a role in 14 that. Good point. 15 Irene? 16 MS. LEECH: Mine has mostly been taken care

```
17
     of. When I put my card up it was to say that I think
18
     once we see the plan, that what we may need to do is to
19
     divide the broadband into some discrete areas --
20
               CHAIR BERLYN: Yeah.
21
               MS. LEECH: -- and try to really target some
22
     things that people are particularly interested in
0259
1
     working on. But at this point, I really think we need
 2
     to se that report and make some decisions after that
 3
    happens.
 4
               CHAIR BERLYN: I think that's a good point.
 5
    Yeah.
              Mark?
7
              MR. DeFALCO: Just a -- I guess this is a
8
     question. The expiration of the committee -- is that
9
    what it is in November? And how does that happen? And
10
    what is the reappointment, or --
11
               CHAIR BERLYN: Yes, our -- we are a two-year
12
    cycle, and so our two years is up in November. The
13
    chairman will then consider whether or not he wants to
14
    re- -- what do we call it? Reappoint, recharge, the
     CAC -- recharter, thank you -- recharter the Consumer
15
16
    Advisory Committee, and then he will determine how he
17
    fills the committee at that point.
18
              MS. TRISTANI: Is that November 1, or the end
19
     of November?
20
              CHAIR BERLYN: We go until November 17th.
21
    Now, when the chairman -- as you can recall from years
22
     past, there's sometimes a significant gap between the
0260
1
     time our term runs out and the time in which the next
 2
     CAC begins. So this -- you know, it's not -- the 18th
3
     is not the time in which the next CAC may necessarily
    begin. Although it could be.
 5
              MR. DeFALCO: And, Deb, if the committee is
 6
     reauthorized, or re-established --
 7
               CHAIR BERLYN: Rechartered --
8
               MR. DeFALCO: Rechartered, thank you.
9
               CHAIR BERLYN: -- is the word. Right.
10
               MR. DeFALCO: -- then do current -- how does
     the -- does the chairman then appoint the new members
11
12
     for the committee, or do you succeed just because you
13
     were on the old committee?
               CHAIR BERLYN: No, it's completely up to the
14
15
     chairman.
16
              Are there any other comments?
17
               Gloria? You're -- okay. All right. We're
18
     all set, I think, and ready to move on.
19
              Bill?
20
               MR. CLINE: Thank you.
21
               CHAIR BERLYN: Bill Cline, thank you for
22
     being with us.
0261
1
                      DEMONSTRATION SESSION
              MR. CLINE: Nice to see you, and sorry I'm
     late. I didn't get here --
               CHAIR BERLYN: We're late.
```

MR. CLINE: -- until a little while ago, so I didn't have -- what I mean is, I did have a presentation to put up here on the screen -- okay. Here we go. I have some presentations here on the side, and right there. If you'll pass those down if that will help.

I'm here to talk to you about ECFS 2.0. And I'll wait for those to get around. But I'm glad to -MALE SPEAKER: If you could send me an electronic version --

MR. CLINE: That's exactly what I'll do.

MALE SPEKAER: -- and I'll send those out.

MR. CLINE: Yeah. I had a death in the
family on Wednesday, and so I came in and didn't get it
to you.

MALE SPEAKER: That's all right.

MR. CLINE: So, what I'd like to talk to you about is -- what you have in front of you is the

presentation that went before the chairman for the approval of launching ECFS 2.0. We did a hard -- soft launch here in the Commission internally, in September, and then we did the launch externally in October on the 23rd. Hopefully, some of you have gotten to use the new system. I get some thumbs up here. That's always good.

It's -- ECFS launched 11 years ago this month, as a matter of fact. And it stayed the same for those 11 years, with some minor tweaks in the back end to make it a little bit faster in terms of indexing the database. Part of the reason was that we were poor around here. And if I'd made any changes to ECFS, quite frankly, as you know, you had to -- if you made any substantive changes, then you had to make it 508 compliant. And we did not have the resources. We did not have the technology to do that.

And so, in 2006, I had -- I got approval we finally had a suite of software that we agreed to, using Java. And that's what ECFS is built around. J2ee, as then refer to it in the tech land. And we started out with a list of things that you recommended,

from the CAC's past, and -- from the FCBA access committee, and as you know -- and you probably used ECFS help, where we ran both a phone line as well as an email account. That's ECFShelp-at-FCC.gov. And so some of the enhancements came from that.

This presentation will sort of walk you through some of that. I'm going to just hit the highlights. I don't like being read to either. It's late, and I think I'm probably your last session. So you probably want to leave as well.

There's the history that I just spoke to, on the first page. The -- some of the biggest enhancements to this is it is used -- you can use screen readers, of course. It has tags built into it to help you -- prompt you along the way. It also will

allow you, finally, to submit to multiple proceedings in a single submission. Additionally, you can submit multiple documents. Sometimes people want to do a face letter; they then want to do the actual filing itself; and then they want to do maybe an additional spreadsheet or something of that nature. And now you can actually do that, all with one submission, without 0264

having to hit the back button, fill out the information, resubmit, and go back and forth.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

0265

1 2

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

0266

2

There's a couple more features here, though. Once you get the documents ready and you press submit, now there's actually a review place -- a reviewing place. You can actually look at your documents, making sure that you did not submit the red-lined version --[Laughter.]

MR. CLINE: -- making sure that it is the accurate copy. You can also make modifications at that point. You can actually remove the -- if it's the incorrect document -- and reattach the correct document. You can change the indexing information, and then you can press submit again, or hit continue, and it'll give you back, then, a confirmation sheet that not only has the number of the proceeding but the official name of the proceeding and the documents that you attached and your indexing information, just so that you can have a sheet there of everything that was submitted before the Commission.

We've also done some things for the territories -- the American Territories. In the past,

you always put 999. If there are -- if you are a law firm and working with international firms, you'll still put in D.C. and then 9999. We didn't see a lot of that in the past, so we didn't spend a lot of time working on that portion of it.

The neat things are on the queries. There's a lot more features than you had before. All of the metadata that is in the record is available for you to do the searches on. We do put a date in there, you'll see on date received we put a date in there. You're welcome to change that. When you come on and do a query, it has a date sitting in the received field that's a year prior to the date that you're making the query. That's to try to minimize what we call indefinite searches, that you don't put a date in, and you put in comments, and it goes out and crawls over the entire database. Just to give you some statistics. There are over 50 million pages of information in Over 1.4 million filings. And so if you do an indefinite search, not only is it going to tie up your PC but it's going to tie up our server. And so we've tried to force some ways for you to minimize that.

The other nice thing is that, once you've done a search, you can export it all to an Excel spreadsheet, forward to search, and it keeps the links

inside of it. You can do an RSS feed. Once you've set your criteria and you've done a search -- whether it's a comment, maybe it's a particular proceeding, maybe it's a date range of information you're asking for -you can now do an RSS feed. And I understand that externally you actually get a little notification that you've got an RSS feed. Here in the Commission we've locked down Internet Explorer so tight that we don't get that. But it still sets a favorite in your bookmark, and you can -- we can then, here in the Commission, go out and see that new, revised RSS feed every day. And I encourage you to use it. It will minimize you having to come do the search, especially after you set it to your criteria, your search criteria, you might as well set the RSS feed and have it sent to you automatically.

We've done some changes on proceeding search, now. If you don't know the number, you can search by the bureau. You can search by the date that the

proceeding was opened. There's a number of ways, now, that you did not have available to you in the past to try to find a particular proceeding.

Oh, the other thing that you can do is, once you've done your search criteria, you can create a pdf of those search criteria. In essence, it's called a —it would take your entire search criteria, create a pdf, and then give you a listing of all the filings that are contained in that pdf. I encourage you to use it. It's a nice feature if you want to have one large pdf of everything that you've assimilated, and it helps speed up the printing and then gives you a record of the data that you searched.

Reason I'm talking about this is there's no way for me to show you all of this in a half hour on these screens, also. But this document you can take with you, and sort of walk trough -- at least that's what Karen Strauss did when I did the presentation. It went on for 80 minutes, and Karen was clicking and sending me emails asking me questions the next day. So I saw her walking away earlier, I told her thank you.

The Internet and the batch printing screen,

folks, that's really internal. If you've ever come to the Commission to the Reference Information Center, these features are available for you internally. I don't know if you're aware of it, but if you come to the Commission and you cue up an ECFS document, and let's just say -- oh, my goodness, let's just say it's 9645, universal service, with its half million comments. And you actually, for some reason, wanted to print all of that, if you come to the reference information center you can cue it up, and it will actually batch-print to the copy contractor, and you can purchase those, those filings. So, just for your information, if you have a large print job that you want to do, I highly recommend you come to the

Commission and perform that, and get it from the duplicating contractor. It will minimize your printer and save paper, because they can do it two-sided.

Oh, one other thing that -- I heard Debra speaking about DTV. Many of us were consumed with that little effort. And while I was away in Ohio and in the East Central region, we went through and converted every single document that is in ECFS to something

that's called Image Plus Text. It in essence is an OCR version of the text sitting on top of the pdf document. So that you can copy, cut, and paste every single document now, in ECFS. But it gave us one other feature. It now allows us to use Google search appliance to do keyword search. That's the other feature that you'll see on ECFS now, is keyword search. Now, I caution you not to type in "broadband."

[Laughter.]

MR. CLINE: If you type in "broadband," you're going to get a huge list. But if you type in something along the lines -- let's just -- and I recommend that you try it. I don't have all of the answers here, ladies and gentlemen, but I do know that if you put in "white space devices" -- if you put "white space devices" in quotes, it changes the search as if it was white space devices, without quotes. And so if you go to Google.com, they have a guide that helps you in using the various pluses and in quotes and so forth for using the keyword search. But that's the other benefit now that we went through and converted all these documents, is it's a great feature, people

have given us much kudos for that. It is a work in progress because we can only provide the services that Google allows us in terms of their programming tools.

The last thing, really, was all the things that we've done in terms of this is a very secure system now. We have pulled down, as of Monday, the old version of ECFS. It had, and what we didn't want to make available, we can now, is that because the code was so old it had some -- it was intruded a few times here recently. That's why we made -- you'll notice that you did some searches, and it limited how big your search was. And we did some other features that now that we've shelved it we don't have to worry about any longer.

You have my name, obviously, on your agenda. I'm easily found. It's bill.cline@fcc.gov. If you have recommendations, if you have -- especially low-hanging fruit of things that we can do to improve ECFS, we do not intend to wait 11 years before we make a 2.1. And so, we're soliciting your opinions, your ideas, your thoughts. And continue the dialogue. If you've got any questions, I'll try to answer.

1 Yes, sir?

MR. HEDLUND: Just -- first of all, this is

4 really applaud the hard work that you've done to put 5 the new thing together. 6 One thing I did like about the old one was 7 that you could -- there was a box you could check to exclude one page, or --9 MR. CLINE: Brief text comments. 10 MR. HEDLULND: Brief text comments. 11 MR. CLINE: It is still there. 12 MR. HEDLUND: It is still there? Okay. 13 MR. CLINE: Absolutely. Because I was told 14 by the FCBA, do not eliminate that check. 15 MR. HEDLUND: Okay. I didn't see it. Okay. 16 Great. 17 MR. CLINE: It is there. It's under the queries. You'll notice it's buried down under the 18 19 dates, right before the final selection of what type of 20 filing. But that box is still there. 21 MR. HEDLUND: That's terrific. Great. 22 MR. CLINE: Is that it? 0272 1 Yes, ma'am. 2 MS. BOBECK: I just again wanted -- this is 3 Ann Bobeck from NAB. I just also want to echo our thanks, not only for the great improvements online, but 4 5 also that your office is always available to us, especially people that are technology-unsavvy, like 7 myself, that occasionally do an incorrect filing. You 8 always are there as a great reference and resource, and 9 available by phone. So, just know that the FCC really 10 is user-friendly through your office, and we really 11 appreciate all the help that you extend us. 12 MR. CLINE: Thank you very much. 13 Yes, ma'am. 14 MS. HEPPNER: I first wanted to say that I 15 watched your Web cast. 16 MR. CLINE: I'm sorry? 17 MS. HEPPNER: I watched your Web cast about 18 You did a Web cast. 19 MR. CLINE: Oh, oh -- the presentation is on 20 FCC.gov. The 80-minute presentation that we did for 21 the training on ECFS. It is at -- if you go to the FCC live, on the homepage, it will give you a link to it, 22 0273 1 so that you can actually see the training presentation. 2 MS. HEPPNER: It's good to know it's in the 3 archive. I watched you. I watched you wade into the audience. And I do want to thank you, because that is 5 the first Web cast I've ever watched that was like that, with captions, that was useful to me. It was 6 7 wonderful, and it was very consumer-friendly, about as 8 much as you can make it consumer-friendly on that topic 9 particularly. 10 But there's one little thing that I would 11 recommend that you do the next time. I have the 12 captions, but it sometimes seems to me that you were 13 talking to some disembodied personality in the room,

great. It's a huge improvement to ECFS 1.0, and I

14 because you had control of the microphone, and 15 apparently other people were asking you questions, but 16 the camera didn't catch them. 17 MR. CLINE: Yeah. I felt like a mouse 18 running back and forth to people's questions. I truly 19 did. I apologize, and I've got to tell you that 20 fortunately I had done that same presentation 30 days 21 before, so it gave me a dry run. That's the only 22 reason I was able to act that way. But I tell you my 0274 1 daughter saw it on YouTube and said, "Dad, you've got 2 to have a better delivery style." 3 Is there anything else? I thank you much for 4 the kudos, and let me know -- let me hear from you. 5 CHAIR BERLYN: Thank you very much. Thanks 6 for coming. 7 [Applause.] 8 CHAIR BERLYN: Okay. Well, good work, team. 9 Once again, we are pretty close to on time here. We 10 do have a public comment period, so I will invite -- is 11 there anyone in the room who has a public comment? 12 I don't think so. I think actually we've 13 driven everyone out of the room. 14 1.5 16

Does anyone else want to make any general comment, of this group? I don't think we have any public comments. Is there anyone from the CAC that has anything else you want to comment on or any leftover issues? Old business? New business? Any business?

We will work on dates for the year, for the CAC, taking into account the fact that it is helpful to have the dates well in advance, I know, for folks. And we're going to work on the two dates, absolutely. I

know that's the proposal. There are some costs involved, so we do have to get the FCC to approve that. There are some additional costs.

Well, thank you --

MR. MARSHALL: I don't want it to come out of my salary, you understand.

[Laughter.]

17

18 19

20

21

22

0275 1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

CHAIR BERLYN: We definitely don't want that to happen.

Well, thank you all for being here today. Appreciate it. And we'll see you in March, and talk to you before then, and most certainly in January and hopefully on various phone calls. So, thank you all.

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Thank you.

[Whereupon, the meeting concluded.]