CONSUMER ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Federal Communications Commission

Commission Meeting Room TW-C305, 445 12th Street, Southwest, Washington, DC

Friday, May 19, 2017

Welcome and Call to Order
Eduard Bartholme, CAC Chairperson

Chair Bartholme called the meeting of the Federal Communications Commission's (FCC) Consumer Advisory Council (CAC) to order at 11:00 am. He welcomed members and thanked the Competitive Carriers Association (CCA) for providing lunch.

Introductions and Meeting Logistics
Scott Marshall, CAC DFO

CAC members introduced themselves. Scott Marshall, the CAC Designated Federal Official (DFO), thanked members for their attendance.

Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau (CGB) Update
Patrick Webre, Acting Bureau Chief
Mark Stone, Deputy Bureau Chief
Karen Peltz Strauss, Deputy Bureau Chief

Patrick Webre, Acting Bureau Chief of the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau (CGB), spoke first. Mr. Webre thanked Chair Bartholme, Mr. Marshall, and CAC members for their work and dedication to consumer education and protection. Mr. Webre was named as the new Acting Bureau Chief of the CGB about a month ago. Mr. Webre has had experience working in the CGB and is excited to serve in his new capacity. Consumer issues are very important to the FCC, and Chairman Pai has listed them among his highest priorities. In March, the FCC adopted a notice for proposed rulemaking (NPRM) that allows for carriers to stop illegal robocalls before they reach consumers. The FCC has also promoted broadband deployment in rural and underserved areas and taken steps towards greater disability access. The FCC needs the CAC's help and expertise to meet goals in improving consumer experience.

Mark Stone, Deputy Bureau Chief of the CGB, spoke next. Mr. Stone further discussed the FCC's March NPRM on illegal robocalls. This NPRM was partially a response to the efforts of the industry-led Robocall Strike Force. The Strike Force asked the FCC to help clear regulatory uncertainty so that industry can better stop illegal robocalls before they reach consumers. The FCC is excited about the Strike Force's work and what it means for consumers. The FCC continues to receive requests for clarification from parties seeking regulatory certainty. For example, petitioners have asked the FCC to clarify that ringless

voicemail technology is not subject to the Telephone Consumer Protection Act's (TCPA) consent requirements. As with all requests, the FCC has sought comments from the industry and public. In March, the CGB granted an emergency temporary waiver to Jewish Community Centers (JCCs) to help them and law enforcement better respond to threatening phone calls by allowing them to access the caller ID information of these calls. The CGB has sought comment on whether to make this waiver permanent. Mr. Stone thanked CAC members for all of their work.

Karen Peltz Strauss, Deputy Bureau Chief of the CGB, spoke last. In March, the FCC released a report and order on video relay services (VRS). The order contains proposed improvements, trials, and pilots. For example, the FCC has authorized a trial of skills-based routing, which would allow calls to be specifically routed to interpreters with specialized knowledge of medical, legal, and computer support terminology when needed. The FCC has also authorized a trial of deaf interpreters who would work with hearing interpreters to improve communication. The FCC approved a one-year pilot of at-home VRS call handling, which would allow VRS interpreters to use private and secure at-home work stations. Call quality and confidentiality would be emphasized. The FCC will decide whether or not to continue these programs based on provider feedback. The FCC will begin publishing summaries of how fast each VRS provider answers calls. The FCC has amended its rules to provide hearing individuals with VRS phone numbers, allowing for more direct communication between hearing and deaf individuals. The VRS order adopted a notice of inquiry on performance goals and service quality metrics in order to determine metrics that will achieve congressional goals. It also adopted a further notice on the compensation methodology and rates for VRS.

The CGB is making final decisions on the National Deaf-Blind Equipment Distribution Program (NDBEDP). The Telecommunications Relay Services Fund provides up to $10 million annually through the NDBEDP to support local programs that distribute communications equipment to low-income people who are deaf and blind. Since its start in 2012, the NDBEDP has helped roughly 4,000 deaf-blind people. The program's transition from a pilot to a permanent program will end July 1st. Each U.S. state and territory has to have a certified entity to operate the NDBEDP. The CGB has been reviewing applications from entities and entities will be certified on a rolling basis. The FCC's Disability Advisory Committee (DAC) has been renewed for a second term, and CAC members are invited to its second meeting on June 16th. The CGB is continuing efforts to promote direct video calling.

On May 22, the FCC will be hosting a free webinar on telecommunication and video programming issues related to older Americans. In June, the FCC will be recognizing outstanding private and public sector ventures that advance accessibility for people with disabilities through the Chairman's Awards for Advancement in Accessibility. As of July 10, multichannel video programming distributors (MVPDs) will have to pass through audio information about emergencies on linear programming accessed on second screen devices though an MVPD's network. This is an expansion of a previous requirement to make emergency programming more accessible on televisions. As of July 1, clips of live or near-live video programming shown on internet protocol (IP) will have to have captions.

Questions from the CAC

Member Richert commended the FCC for scheduling the May 22nd webinar and asked if it will discuss video programming. He commented that the American Foundation for the Blind has been launching the 21st Century Agenda on Aging and Vision Loss, which people can find out more about at AFB.org/aging. Ms. Peltz Strauss said that the webinar will discuss video programming. Member Richert asked the FCC to emphasize the value of video description during this webinar. Member Herrera asked if the FCC will report to consumers which providers voluntarily provide the FCC with information on phone numbers that are spoofed or fake and are likely illegal robocallers. Mr. Stone responded that this is an option but has not yet been set up. Member Herrera asked to which agency consumers should report Internal Revenue Service (IRS) scams made through illegal robocalls. Mr. Stone responded that the FCC and IRS are both good resources in these scenarios. The FCC is currently updating its outreach and guidance on robocalls.

Remarks of Commissioner Mignon Clyburn

FCC Commissioner Clyburn thanked members for their work and noted that the CGB update underscored how important the CAC's work and input is. The CAC is the FCC's eyes and ears in communities, especially those that are underserved by market forces, and is also the FCC's conscience. Commissioner Clyburn also spoke on the issue of illegal robocalls.

Questions from the CAC

Member Herrera stated that she believes that Commissioner Clyburn has been the conscience on the FCC for years and asked if she has any thoughts on how the CAC can be an effective conscience. Commissioner Clyburn said they need to continue to make the business case for everything they do and to expand outreach to entities whose delivery of services would be improved by a more connected model. Member Herrera also thanked Commissioner Clyburn for approving the prison phone call reform during her stint as Acting Chairman. Commissioner Clyburn commented that she wants the FCC to help empower cities and gain a better understanding with providers to provision services that can improve people's lives.

What's Next after the Incentive Auctions
Charles E. Meisch, Jr. Senior Advisor – Communications and Policy, Incentive Auctions Task Force

Charles Meisch, Senior Advisor, Communications and Policy, Incentive Auctions Task Force, gave the presentation. The incentive auction repurposed 84 megahertz (MHz) of spectrum from the ultra-high frequency (UHF) TV band for mobile broadband use, 70 MHz of which was auctioned for licensed use. The forward auction made $19.8 billion in gross revenue; $10 billion went towards winning broadcasters, many of whom have now announced their plans for the money. Many plan to reinvest the funds in their facilities and programming or for projects related to localism and news gathering. $7.3 billion went to the Department of Treasury for deficit reduction. $1.75 billion will go towards reimbursing broadcasters still on the air that have been reassigned to new channels. The auction had

175 winning stations, 145 of which successfully bid to go off air. This means that these stations relinquished their current licenses for a monetary payout. 92% of these 145 stations have expressed interest in sharing a channel with another station in their market and have seven months to continue channel sharing negotiations if interested. The remaining 30 winners were band-changing winners, and so relinquished their current licenses in exchange for a smaller monetary payout and a license to operate on a different channel lower in the TV band. The forward auction had 50 different winning bidders, the largest of which were T-Mobile and DISH. The licensing process for these new licenses is now underway and the first batch of applications has been accepted for filing and public review. *

The auction officially closed in the middle of April. In the post-auction transition process, the FCC and the broadcast industry will work to clear the 600 MHz wireless band by reassigning stations to new channels. 987 stations have been reassigned, including the 30 band-changing winners. The FCC has put together a schedule for these reassignments, which breaks all 987 stations into ten phases to be completed over the next 38 months. As a result, the FCC has started some consumer outreach and education efforts. The FCC wants to ensure that the hardest-to-reach consumers and households receive this information and wants to understand how to best support national partners in consumer education.

The FCC's outreach efforts thus far include a post-auction Q&A section on their consumer webpage, which will be updated depending on calls made to the consumer call center. The FCC will assign regional coordinators to ten geographic regions in order to coordinate information sharing during the post-auction transition process. The FCC is creating a consumer guide regarding unlicensed wireless microphones, which should be ready soon. The FCC is gathering data on stations that will be going off air before November 2018, and once it has enough information on which stations will be going where it can begin doing advance work in these markets. Mr. Meisch will continue to reach out to partners through presentations to the FCC's DAC and Intergovernmental Advisory Committee. The FCC doesn't yet know the auction's impact on Low-Power Television (LPTV) and the viewpoint diversity in the media landscape, but will have a better idea once it's clear which stations will be displaced.

Questions from the CAC

Member Alkebsi asked if post-auction information will be made available in American Sign Language. Mr. Meisch responded that he would check, and added that the information on the FCC's website is 508-compliant. Member McEldowney commented that the information should be provided in the languages used by stations changing channels or going off of the air.

Update on Robocall Strike Force
Linda Vandeloop, Asst. VP External Affairs, AT&T

Linda Vandeloop, Assistant Vice President of External Affairs at AT&T, gave the presentation. The Robocall Strike Force brought together key members of the ecosystem with the ability to make contributions towards combating robocalls. Working together allowed these entities to develop much

more robust mitigation tools than they would have been able to do on their own. AT&T is no longer leading the Strike Force; rather, this leadership has now been filled by associations and standards bodies that are better organized to complete the work identified in the Strike Force's initial report. The Strike Force is focused in the areas of authentication, empowering consumer choice, regulatory support, and detection, assessment, traceback, and mitigation.

The Strike Force published a report on April 28th with more information on past and future actions. For example, ATIS published the Signature-based Handling of Asserted information using toKENs (SHAKEN) framework for caller ID authentication and partnered with Neustar to offer an industry testbed of the framework. ACT launched a public-facing website and held a workshop with the intent of encouraging app developers to develop robocall-related apps. Some Strike Force members have introduced their own robocall mitigation tools, such as Call Protect by AT&T and Scam ID by T-Mobile. Additional do-not-originate trials have taken place and have been proven effective. The Industry Traceback Group's membership now only needs one more member to meet the commitment made in the Strike Force's original report. The FCC has been very supportive in terms of regulatory support and has issued an NPRM and notice of inquiry (NOI) to allow carriers to block suspected illegal robocalls, which will be very helpful to industry members. Ms. Vandeloop thanked the CAC for their work in consumer education.

Questions from the CAC

Member Grant expressed the concern that tools used to mitigate robocalls won't be effective against ringless voicemail technology. Member Schwantes asked if the Strike Force will report on their work in six months. Ms. Vandeloop responded that there are currently no plans for a formal update report but that informal updates will likely happen. Member McEldowney thanked Strike Force members for their work. Member Herrera asked if there is a simple way to let consumers know which carriers have voluntarily completed actions to address robocalls. This information could act as another consumer empowerment tool. Ms. Vandeloop responded that industry can look into this further but should be careful not to give too much information to robocallers. She added that carriers can also empower consumers by being very vocal about the robocall mitigation tools they offer. Rick Ellrod from Fairfax County commented that it could be a good idea to make the basic information publically available but to not include any technical information that could be used by robocallers against carriers. Member Richert asked if there are currently tools available to allow consumers to only receive calls from origins that they have identified in advance. Ms. Vandeloop responded that there are tools that mark blacklisted numbers as spam for consumers. Member Rupy added that some providers also offer whitelist services. He emphasized that there are many different tools available, and that consumers should be empowered to choose the tools that work best for them.

Update on Using Complaint Data and the CHC
James Brown, Consumer Data Officer, CGB

James Brown, Consumer Data Officer for the CGB, gave the presentation. The Consumer Help Center (CHC) was launched in 2014 and is made up of three areas: education materials, filing consumer

complaints, and consumer complaint data. Consumers can file complaints at any time from any device on consumercompliants.fcc.gov. Complaints are filed into six main categories: TV, phone, internet, radio, access for people with disabilities, and emergency communications. Consumers who don't have a specific complaint have the opportunity to share their experiences about telecommunications services through the CHC. The FCC can use this information to inform future policies and decisions. Consumers will be asked to fill out a form once they file a complaint, and the questions on this form will depend on the issue identified. The FCC's response to the complaint depends on the complaint. Some potential responses include sending the consumer a consumer guide to explain the issue, letting the consumer know if there is another agency better suited to address the issue, using the complaint information internally to improve FCC actions, and serving the complaint on an involved provider. In all of these cases, the FCC will continue to update the consumer through email. The CHC has a consumer support line available Monday through Friday.

The FCC launched the Consumer Complaint Data Center about a year ago, which uses Socrata to release consumer complaint data daily. This data contains a complete list of complaints as well as certain fields for each complaint. A specific data set is provided for unwanted calls. This data set is used by companies that provide blocking technologies to consumers. The consumer complaint data is available through www.fcc.gov/consumerhelpcenterdata. The Data Center provides charts and graphs that are updated daily; members of the public can create their own visuals once they access the data sets.

Questions from the CAC

Member Grant asked if the FCC has considered putting a place for age or year of birth on the consumer complaint forms. Although this information shouldn't be required, it could be useful. She commented that she is not sure that a consumer would understand that telecommunications complaints include complaints about internet service providers. She commented that the phrase "not all complaints are actionable or constitute a rule violation" in the CHC section titled How Your Complaint is Handled could be made clearer. Member McEldowney asked about the options for consumers with a primary language other than English. Mr. Brown responded that the current option is for the consumer to call the CHC hotline and give their complaint over the phone. However, the FCC is working to provide the complaint form in other languages. Member McEldowney asked if consumer guides are provided in multiple languages. Mr. Brown responded that consumer guides are at least provided in English and Spanish. Member Wein asked if it would be possible to provide the company name in the publically available complaint data. Mr. Brown responded that this is being considered. Member Herrera commented that providing the company name could be misleading in cases where the complaint is not against a carrier but rather the unknown company making unwanted robocalls. Mr. Brown commented that the company name is only required in certain types of complaints.

Member Herrera asked if unwanted calls are filed under phone or telemarketing issues. Mr. Brown responded that phone issues encompass all unwanted calls, and that telemarketing issues carve out those specifically related to telemarketing. Consumers can also get a graph representation of what percentage of phone issues are unwanted calls. Member Herrera asked if this data can be sorted by date

or geography to show trends. Mr. Brown responded that it can. Although currently individuals would have to make charts and graphs showing trends by date, the FCC could look into creating some stock graphs and charts. Member Wein asked if there is a way for consumers to file a complaint for multiple different robocalls in one form. Mr. Brown responded that although consumers currently need to file a different form for each complaint, this issue is being considered. He added that the number of questions in the robocall complaint form has been reduced to make it easier for consumers. Chair Bartholme said that if the CAC's robocall recommendation passes later in the meeting, he would like to discuss with Mr. Brown complaint entry ideas that the CAC has about streamlining that process.

Overview: the March 2017 Robocall Blocking NPRM/NOI
Jerusha Burnett, Attorney Advisor, Consumer Policy Division, CGB

Jerusha Burnett, Advisory Advisor for the Consumer Policy Division of the CGB, gave the presentation. One of the major impetuses for the robocall blocking NPRM/NOI was a request from the Robocall Strike Force, which specifically asked the FCC to amend the call completion rules to clarify that providers could block certain robocalls without violating call completion obligations. The NPRM proposes rules that would allow provider-initiated blocking of certain calls without including those blocked calls in call completion rates. It proposes codification of the 2016 CGB PN and allowing voice service providers to block calls originating from certain categories of unassigned numbers. The 2016 CGB PN clarifies that providers can block calls where the owner of the number purportedly originating the call asks for those calls to be blocked. The PN also asks that this kind of call-blocking information be shared between providers. The FCC made it clear that it wanted to help efforts already underway to share this information. Unassigned numbers include numbers that are invalid, numbers that are valid but that are not yet allocated to a voice service provider, and numbers that have been allocated to a voice service provider but that are not currently assigned to a subscriber.

The NOI seeks information beyond the NPRM to allow broader blocking based on objective criteria beyond unassigned numbers. The objective criteria includes things such as soliciting and reviewing information from other carriers, performing historical and real-time call analytics, contacting the subscriber of a spoofed number, and creating caller ID authentication standards. Provider-initiated blocking is complicated by the fact that a consumer might have different levels of calls that they are willing to receive. The NOI considers whitelisting legitimate callers to keep them from being blocked and ways for a legitimate caller to contact a provider if they suspect that they are being wrongfully blocked. The NPRM and NOI were adopted on March 23rd, and the summary was published in the Federal Register on May 17th. Comments will be due July 3rd, and reply comments July 31st.

Questions from the CAC

Margot Saunders from the National Consumer Law Center (NCLC) asked how the FCC would determine if a robocaller had actually received consent. Ms. Burnett responded that the FCC would appreciate comments on this matter. Member Herrera asked if companies should be required to complete or to disclose that they have voluntarily completed robocall mitigation actions. Ms. Burnett responded that

this question is not before the FCC in this specific matter, but that they would appreciate comments on this question. Stephanie Podey from NCTA asked how the NPRM and NOI's proposals differ from the Strike Force's recommendations. Ms. Burnett responded that the major difference is that the NPRM and NOI have more detail on things such as protecting legitimate callers.

Robocalls Outreach & the Unwanted Calls Page
Anita Dey, Assistant Bureau Chief, CGB

Anita Dey, Assistant Bureau Chief of the CGB, gave the presentation. The CGB has been issuing alerts on gift cards, utility scams, financial scams, and IRS scams. On March 27th, the CGB issued an alert on the Can You Hear Me scam. This struck a nerve with the public; the alert garnered 10,533 Facebook clicks, 1,955 Twitter engagements, and 4,815 page views. This is about 20 times more page views than the January financial scams alert received. Alerts explain the scam, tell consumers where to report it, and offer specific and general tips on ways for consumers to protect themselves. The CGB draws from a variety of internal and external sources to understand which scams are impacting consumers the most and coordinates with other agencies to develop scam alerts. The CGB is currently considering what its next alert should be and would welcome input from the CAC on what scams to focus on, as well as other protection tips and ways to best spread the alerts. Alerts are currently distributed through social media as well as to different consumer groups. CAC input on consumer education materials is also welcome. On February 16th, the CGB held a robocalls webinar, which discussed the TCPA, how it's enforced, and technological solutions. Robocalls will also be included as a topic for the FCC's Older Americans Month campaign. This month, teams will be going to senior centers and DC's Annual Senior Symposium to hand out information.

Questions from the CAC

Member Rupy asked if there are any analytics available on the number of visits to the tool section of the FCC's unwanted calls webpage. Ms. Dey responded that she doesn't know how specific this data gets, but will check. Ms. Saunders asked if the FCC envisions that identified robocallers will receive enforcement action. Chair Bartholme stated that links to the archived robocalls webinar and upcoming Older Americans Month webinar would be sent to CAC members.

Introducing the Broadband Deployment Advisory Committee
Brian Hurley, Designated Federal Officer, WCB

Brian Hurley, Designated Federal Officer for the Broadband Deployment Advisory Committee (BDAC), gave the presentation. The BDAC is chartered under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) and was officially established March 1st, 2017. The BDAC's mission is to make recommendations to the FCC on how to accelerate broadband deployment by reducing regulatory barriers to infrastructure investment. On January 31st, the FCC released a PN soliciting nominations for the BDAC. The FCC sought representatives from the communications industry, state and local regulators, and community and consumer organizations. The FCC received over 380 nominations. On April 6th, the FCC announced the

BDAC's membership and working groups. The BDAC's Chair is Elizabeth Pierce, CEO of Quintillion, and the Vice Chair is Kelleigh Cole, the Broadband Outreach Director for the State of Utah.

The BDAC held its first in-person meeting on April 21st and plans to hold its next on July 20th. The BDAC hopes to develop two model codes for state and municipal governments as part of the deliverables by the end of the year. These model codes should be able to apply to a diverse range of states and municipalities. The BDAC's working groups will include BDAC members as well as additional applicants. These working groups are the Model Code for Municipalities Working Group, Model Code for States Working Group, Competitive Access to Broadband Infrastructure Working Group, the Removing State and Local Regulatory Barriers Working Group, and the Streamlining Federal Siting Working Group. Mr. Hurley thanked CAC members who have agreed to be members on BDAC's working groups.

Questions from the CAC

Member McEldowney asked if the model code for municipalities will look at the ability of municipalities to establish their own broadband. Mr. Hurley responded that it will be up to the working group to decide the components of the code. Member Herrera asked if the Model Code for Municipalities Working Group contains any members of a community that has launched its own broadband. Member Morris asked how the relationship between the BDAC process and the FCC's rulemaking proceedings about the same issues differs. Mr. Hurley responded that the FCC released a PN stating that comments and presentations made in the context of the BDAC are exempt from the ex parte rules that apply in different rulemaking proceedings. If at a later point it's determined that something discussed in BDAC might be useful to another rulemaking, that information will be put into that rulemaking's record. Member Herrera asked if FCC staff is planning to provide any analysis on whether restricting preempting local governments as a way of reducing barriers to broadband deployment has led to more broadband deployment as opposed to areas with stronger regulatory regimes. Mr. Hurley responded that the FCC will be working with BDAC working groups to understand which information is important to them. Mr. Ellrod asked if the BDAC will conduct a cost-benefit analysis prior to issuing a recommendation. Mr. Hurley responded that this will be decided by the BDAC. Mr. Ellrod asked what specific procedures and methods are being put in place to ensure that input from local governments is fully heard and taken into account by the BDAC. Mr. Hurley responded that members of local governments have been included in the BDAC's working groups. Chair Bartholme commented on his hope that Mr. Hurley and Mr. Marshall will be able to coordinate discussions between CAC and BDAC members.

Consideration of Robocall Recommendation
Ed Bartholme & Kevin Rupy, Co-Chairs, Robocall Working Group

Chair Bartholme and Member Rupy, Co-Chairs of the Robocall Working Group, led the discussion. The Unwanted Calls Recommendation was distributed to CAC members prior to the meeting as part of the meeting packet. Earlier in the day, Chair Bartholme emailed two amendments to the recommendation to CAC members. Member Berlyn made a motion to move the recommendation for discussion, which was seconded. Member Richert asked if item 4 of the recommendation includes the accessibility of the

online delivery of the complaint forms. Chair Bartholme confirmed that it does include this. Members confirmed that item 7 would allow for consumers to report multiple unwanted calls. Member Herrera asked if an amendment could be made to item 9 saying that app developers should work with device manufacturers to create some sort of one-touch system for consumers to block unwanted robocallers. Chair Bartholme responded that the scope of the recommendation is more focused on consumer complaints rather than the ability to block robocalls. However, the Working Group plans to tee up pieces on robocall blocking in future recommendations. Member Witanowski added that CTIA's robocalls webpage provides videos showing consumers how to block robocalls on each platform. Member Herrera dropped the amendment request and commented that a follow-up recommendation focused on blocking strategies for consumers would be helpful.

Member Alkebsi asked how items 4 and 9 of the recommendation relate to each other, because item 9 doesn't discuss the accessibility of the app. Chair Bartholme responded that to his understanding, item 4 is about making existing complaint formats and forms accessible. Item 9 is about an app that has not yet been developed, and so he thinks that it would meet accessibility formats and requirements. Member Alkebsi commented that the concern is that accessibility has been treated as an afterthought, and so there would be no harm in making it as clear as possible that the app would need to be accessible. She proposed an amendment to item 9 stating that the development of the app include all accessibility considerations. Members discussed the wording of this amendment, and decided to add a new sentence to the end of item 9 that reads "The app should be accessible to and usable by people with disabilities". A motion to accept the amendment was made by Member Grant, seconded, and unanimously approved. Member McEldowney moved to call the question, which was seconded and unanimously approved. Member Herrera asked if the CAC could ask FCC staff to provide robocall updates at all of the remaining CAC meetings.

Reports from Working Groups

Member Berlyn presented on behalf of the Privacy Working Group. The Working Group was tasked with completing a standard privacy notice; however, due to a Congressional Review Act (CRA), this notice was no longer relevant to the FCC's privacy rules and the Working Group's work on this task was stopped. The Working Group currently has no tasks before it and so will be joining other efforts in the CAC for now. Member Berlyn thanked the Working Group's members for their hard work.

Member Pociask presented on behalf of the Technology Transitions Working Group. The Working Group held a call with an AT&T representative to discuss the withdrawal from the transition trials. The Working Group had been tasked with giving a presentation with the FCC's point of contact; however, this position is still vacant. The group has eight topics teed up, the status of which will be reviewed by Member Pociask and Mark DeFalco.

Member Fazlullah presented on behalf of the Universal Service Fund (USF) and Digital Inclusion Working Group. The Working Group is considering creating a small subsection to work on a recommendation around a small section of the new net neutrality NPRM that may affect Lifeline. The Chairman's Office

has expressed interest in opening a docket on the Lifeline Broadband Provider process. If they do so, the Working Group will consider putting together a recommendation to participate in that docket. The Working Group is keeping track of issues and potential changes to E-rate but is in a wait and see mode regarding this issue. The Working Group has started a discussion around the idea of a more comprehensive approach to infrastructure and cost support for digital inclusion, and whether this would be a stand-alone recommendation from the Working Group or a joint one from several working groups. The Working Group is considering working with other committees on this issue.

Chair Bartholme presented on behalf of the Robocalls Working Group. The Working Group will try to carry forward on the momentum of passing their recommendation and will look at the Robocall NPRM/NOI for possible areas of recommendation. Chair Bartholme would like to see if there are ways to follow up on the recommendation passed in this meeting.

Member Herrera asked for a rough timeline for recommendation development. Chair Bartholme responded that the CAC's next full meeting is scheduled for September 18th. The concept of a recommendation would need to be provided in a sentence or so six weeks prior to this meeting. The language of a recommendation should be completed roughly two weeks prior to the meeting.

Comments from the Public

There were no public comments.

Adjournment

Mr. Marshall thanked Brittany Gomes for her work. There being no other comments, a motion to adjourn the meeting was made, seconded, and passed unanimously. Chair Bartholme adjourned the meeting at 2:06 pm.