

programming.

**(e) Exemptions for prior contracts.**

(1) **In general.** Nothing in this section shall affect any contract that grants exclusive distribution rights to any person with respect to satellite cable programming and that was entered into on or before June 1, 1990, except that the provisions of paragraph (c) (1) of this section shall apply for distribution to persons in areas not served by a cable operator.

(2) **Limitation on renewals.** A contract that was entered into on or before June 1, 1990, but that was renewed or extended after October 5, 1992, shall not be exempt under paragraph (e) (1) of this section.

**(f) Application to existing contracts.** All contracts, except those specified in paragraph (e) of this section, related to the provision of satellite cable programming or satellite broadcast programming to any multichannel video programming distributor must be brought into compliance with the requirements specified in this subpart no later than November 15, 1993.

6. Section 76.1003 is added to Subpart O to read as follows:

**§76.1003 Adjudicatory Proceedings**

Any competing multichannel video programming distributor aggrieved by conduct that it alleges to constitute a violation of the regulations set forth in this subpart may commence an adjudicatory proceeding at the Commission.

**(a) Notice required.** Any aggrieved multichannel video programming distributor intending to file a complaint under this section must first notify the potential defendant cable operator, and/or the potential defendant satellite cable programming vendor or satellite broadcast programming vendor, that it intends to file a complaint with the Commission based on actions alleged to violate one or more of the provisions contained in §§76.1001 or 76.1002. The notice must be sufficiently detailed so that its recipient(s) can determine the specific nature of the potential complaint. The potential complainant must allow a minimum of ten (10) days for the potential defendant(s) to respond before filing a complaint with the Commission.

**(b) General pleading requirements.**

Program access complaint proceedings are generally resolved on a written record consisting of a complaint, answer and reply, but may also include other written submissions such as briefs and written interrogatories. All written submissions, both substantive and procedural, must conform to the following standards:

(1) Pleadings must be clear, concise, and explicit. All matters concerning a claim, defense or requested remedy, should be pleaded fully and with specificity.

(2) Pleadings must contain facts which, if true, are sufficient to constitute a violation of the Act or Commission order or regulation, or a defense to such alleged violation.

(3) Facts must be supported by relevant documentation or affidavit.

(4) Legal arguments must be supported by appropriate judicial, Commission, or statutory authority.

(5) Opposing authorities must be distinguished.

(6) Copies must be provided of all non-Commission authorities relied upon which are not routinely available in national reporting systems, such as unpublished decisions or slip opinions of courts or administrative agencies.

(7) Parties are responsible for the continuing accuracy and completeness of all information and supporting authority furnished in a pending complaint proceeding. Information submitted, as well as relevant legal authorities, must be current and updated as necessary and in a timely manner at any time before a decision is rendered on the merits of the complaint.

**(c) Complaint.**

(1) A program access complaint shall contain:

(i) The name of the complainant and each defendant;

(ii) The type of multichannel video programming distributor that describes complainant, the address and telephone number of the complainant, whether the defendant is a cable operator, satellite broadcast programming vendor or satellite cable programming vendor (describing each defendant), and the address and telephone number of each defendant;

(iii) The name, address and telephone number of complainant's attorney, if represented by counsel;

(iv) Citation to the section of the Communications Act and/or Commission regulation or order alleged to have been violated;

(v) A complete statement of facts, which, if proven true, would constitute such a violation;

(vi) Any evidence that supports the truth or accuracy of the alleged facts;

(vii) Evidence that supports complainant's belief that the defendant, where necessary, meets the attribution standards for application of the program access requirements;

(viii) Evidence that the complainant competes with the defendant cable operator, or with a multichannel video programming distributor that is a customer of the defendant satellite cable programming or satellite broadcast programming vendor;

(ix) In complaints alleging discrimination, documentary evidence such as a rate card or a programming contract that demonstrates a differential in price, terms or conditions between complainant and a competing multichannel video programming distributor or, if no programming contract or rate card is submitted with the complaint, an affidavit signed by an officer of complainant alleging that a differential in price, terms or conditions exists, a description of the nature and extent (if known or reasonably estimated by the complainant) of the differential, together with a statement that defendant refused to provide any further specific comparative information;

(x) If a programming contract or a rate card is submitted with the complaint in support of the alleged violation, specific references to the relevant provisions therein;

(xi) In complaints alleging exclusivity violations:

(A) The identity of both the programmer and cable operator who are parties to the alleged prohibited agreement,

(B) Evidence that complainant can or does serve the area specified in the complaint, and

(C) Evidence that the complainant has requested to purchase the relevant programming and has been refused or unanswered;

(xii) In complaints alleging a violation of §76.1001, evidence demonstrating that the behavior complained of has harmed complainant; and

(xiii) The specific relief sought.

(2) Every complaint alleging a violation of the program access requirements shall be accompanied by a sworn affidavit signed by an authorized officer or agent of the complainant. This affidavit shall contain a statement that the affiant has read the complaint and that to the best of the affiant's knowledge, information and belief formed after reasonable inquiry it is well grounded in fact and is warranted under Commission regulations and policies or is a good faith argument for the extension, modification or reversal of such regulations or policies, and it is not interposed for any improper purpose. If the complaint is signed in violation of this rule, the Commission upon motion or its own initiative shall impose upon the complainant an appropriate sanction.

(3) The following format may be used in cases to which it is applicable, with such modifications as the circumstances may render necessary:

---

---

BEFORE THE  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20554

In the matter of

Complainant,

v.

Defendant.

File No. (To be inserted by the Commission)

[Insert Subject/Nature of Issue:  
Discrimination; Exclusivity; Undue Influence;  
Unfair Practice]  
Program Access Complaint

TO: The Commission.

The complainant (here insert full name of complainant, and if a corporation, the corporate title of such complainant)

1. (Here state the complainant's method of multichannel video program distribution; post office address, and telephone number of the complainant).
2. (Here insert the name, whether a cable operator, satellite broadcast programming vendor or satellite cable programming vendor, address and telephone number of each defendant).
3. (Here insert fully and clearly the specific act or thing complained of, together with such facts as are necessary to give full understanding of the matter, including relevant legal and documentary support).

Wherefore, complainant asks (here state specifically the relief desired).

(Date)

(Name of complainant)

(Name, address, and telephone number of attorney, if any)

---

---

(4) The complaint must be accompanied by appropriate evidence demonstrating that the required notification pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section has been made.

**(d) Answer.**

(1) Any cable operator, satellite cable programming vendor or satellite broadcast programming vendor upon which a program access complaint is served under this section shall answer within thirty (30) days of service of the complaint, unless otherwise directed by the Commission.

(2) The answer shall advise the parties and the Commission fully and completely of the nature of any and all defenses, and shall respond specifically to all material allegations of the complaint. Collateral or immaterial issues shall be avoided in answers and every effort should be made to narrow the issues. Any defendant failing to file and serve an answer within the time and in the manner prescribed by these rules may be deemed in default and an order may be entered against defendant in accordance with the allegations contained in the complaint.

(3) The answer shall state concisely any and all defenses to each claim asserted and shall admit or deny the averments on which the adverse party relies. If the defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of an averment, the defendant shall so state and this has the effect of a denial. When a defendant intends in good faith to deny only part of an averment, the answer shall specify so much of it as is true and shall deny only the remainder. The defendant may make its denials as specific denials of designated averments or paragraphs, or may generally deny all the averments except such designated averments or paragraphs as the defendant expressly admits. When the defendant intends to controvert all averments, the defendant may do so by general denial.

(4) Averments in a complaint are deemed to be admitted when not denied in the answer.

(5) An answer to an exclusivity complaint shall provide the defendant's reasons for refusing to sell the subject programming to the complainant. In addition, the defendant may submit to the Commission its programming contracts covering the area specified in the complaint with its answer to refute allegations concerning the existence of an impermissible exclusive contract. If there are no contracts governing the specified area, the defendant shall so certify in its answer. Any contracts submitted pursuant to this provision may be protected as proprietary pursuant to paragraph (h) of this section.

(6) An answer to a discrimination complaint shall state the reasons for any differential in prices, terms or conditions between the complainant and its competitor, and shall specify the particular justification set forth in §76.1002(b) relied upon in support of the differential.

(i) When responding to allegations concerning price discrimination, except in cases in which the alleged price differential is de minimis (less than or equal to five cents per subscriber or five percent, whichever is greater), the defendant shall provide documentary evidence to support any argument that the magnitude of the differential is not discriminatory.

(ii) In cases involving a price differential of less than or equal to five cents per subscriber or five percent, whichever is greater, the answer shall identify the differential as de minimis and state that the defendant is therefore not required to justify the magnitude of the differential.

(iii) If the defendant believes that the complainant and its competitor are not sufficiently similar, the answer shall set forth the reasons supporting this conclusion, and the defendant may submit an alternative contract for comparison with a similarly situated multichannel video programming distributor that uses the same distribution technology as the competitor selected for comparison by the complainant. The answer shall state the defendant's reasons for any differential between the prices, terms and conditions between the complainant and such similarly situated distributor, and shall specify the particular justifications in §76.1002(b) relied upon in support of the differential. The defendant shall also provide with its answer written documentary evidence to support its justification of the magnitude of any price differential between the complainant and such similarly situated distributor that is not de minimis.

(iv) Any documents or contracts submitted pursuant to this subparagraph may be protected as proprietary pursuant to paragraph (h) of this section.

(7) An answer to a complaint alleging an unreasonable refusal to sell programming shall state the defendant's reasons for refusing to sell to the complainant, or for refusing to sell to the complainant on the same terms and conditions as complainant's competitor, and shall specify why the defendant's actions are not discriminatory.

(e) Reply.

Within twenty (20) days after service of an answer, the complainant may file and serve a reply which shall be responsive to matters contained in the answer and shall not contain new matters. Failure to reply will not be deemed an admission of any allegations contained in the answer, except with respect to any affirmative defenses set forth therein. Replies containing information claimed by defendant to be proprietary under paragraph (h) of this section shall be submitted to the Commission in confidence pursuant to the requirements of Section 0.459 of this chapter and clearly marked "Not for Public Inspection." An edited version removing all proprietary data shall be filed with the Commission for inclusion in the public file within five (5) days from the date the unedited reply is submitted, and shall be served on the

defendant.

**(f) Motions.**

Except as provided in this section, or upon a showing of extraordinary circumstances, additional motions or pleadings by any party will not be accepted.

**(g) Discovery.**

(1) The Commission staff may in its discretion order discovery limited to the issues specified by the Commission. Such discovery may include answers to written interrogatories or document production.

(2) The Commission staff may in its discretion direct the parties to submit discovery proposals, together with a memorandum in support of the discovery requested. Such discovery requests may include answers to written interrogatories, document production or depositions. The Commission staff will then hold a status conference with the parties, pursuant to paragraph (j) of this section, to determine the scope of discovery. If the Commission staff determines that extensive discovery is required or that depositions are warranted, the staff will advise the parties that the proceeding will be referred to an administrative law judge in accordance with paragraph (m) of this section.

**(h) Confidentiality of proprietary information.**

(1) Any materials generated or provided by a party in the course of adjudicating a program access complaint under this provision may be designated as proprietary by that party if the party believes in good faith that the materials fall within an exemption to disclosure contained in the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. §552(b). Any party asserting confidentiality for such materials shall so indicate by clearly marking each page, or portion thereof, for which a proprietary designation is claimed. If a proprietary designation is challenged, the party claiming confidentiality will have the burden of demonstrating, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the material designated as proprietary falls under the standards for nondisclosure enunciated in the FOIA.

(2) Materials marked as proprietary may be disclosed solely to the following persons, only for use in prosecuting or defending a party to the complaint action, and only to the extent necessary to assist in the prosecution or defense of the case:

(i) Counsel of record representing the parties in the complaint action and any support personnel employed by such attorneys;

(ii) Officers or employees of the opposing party who are named by the opposing party as being directly involved in the prosecution or defense of the case;

- (iii) Consultants or expert witnesses retained by the parties;
- (iv) The Commission and its staff; and
- (v) Court reporters and stenographers in accordance with the terms and conditions of this section.

(3) The persons designated in paragraph (h) (2) of this section shall not disclose information designated as proprietary to any person who is not authorized under this section to receive such information, and shall not use the information in any activity or function other than the prosecution or defense in the case before the Commission. Each individual who is provided access to the information by the opposing party shall sign a notarized statement affirmatively stating, or shall certify under penalty of perjury, that the individual has personally reviewed the Commission's rules and understands the limitations they impose on the signing party.

(4) No copies of materials marked proprietary may be made except copies to be used by persons designated in paragraph (h) (2) of this section. Each party shall maintain a log recording the number of copies made of all proprietary material and the persons to whom the copies have been provided.

(5) Upon termination of the complaint proceeding, including all appeals and petitions, all originals and reproductions of any proprietary materials, along with the log recording persons who received copies of such materials, shall be provided to the producing party. In addition, upon final termination of the complaint proceeding, any notes or other work product derived in whole or in part from the proprietary materials of an opposing or third party shall be destroyed.

**(i) Other required written submissions.**

(1) The Commission may, in its discretion, require the parties to file briefs summarizing the facts and issues presented in the pleadings and other record evidence. These briefs shall contain the findings of fact and conclusions of law which that party is urging the Commission to adopt, with specific citations to the record, and supported by relevant authority and analysis.

(2) The Commission may require the parties to submit any additional information it deems appropriate for a full, fair, and expeditious resolution of the proceeding, including copies of all contracts and documents reflecting arrangements and understandings alleged to violate the program access requirements set forth in the Communications Act and sections 76.1001 and 76.1002, as well as affidavits and exhibits.

(3) Any briefs submitted shall be filed concurrently by both the complainant and defendant at such time as is designated by the staff. Such briefs shall not exceed fifty (50) pages.

(4) Reply briefs may be submitted by either party within twenty (20) days from the date initial briefs are due. Reply briefs shall not exceed thirty (30) pages.

(5) Briefs containing information which is claimed by an opposing or third party to be proprietary under paragraph (h) of this section shall be submitted to the Commission in confidence pursuant to the requirements of §0.459 of this chapter, and shall be clearly marked "Not for Public Inspection." An edited version removing all proprietary data shall be filed with the Commission for inclusion in the public file within five (5) days from the date the unedited version is submitted and served on opposing parties.

**(j) Status conference.**

(1) In any program access complaint proceeding, the Commission staff may in its discretion direct the attorneys and/or the parties to appear for a conference to consider:

(i) Simplification or narrowing of the issues;

(ii) The necessity for or desirability of amendments to the pleadings, additional pleadings, or other evidentiary submissions;

(iii) Obtaining admissions of fact or stipulations between the parties as to any or all of the matters in controversy;

(iv) Settlement of the matters in controversy by agreement of the parties;

(v) The necessity for and extent of discovery, including objections to interrogatories or requests for written documents;

(vi) The need and schedule for filing briefs, and the date for any further conferences; and

(vii) Such other matters that may aid in the disposition of the complaint.

(2) Any party may request that a conference be held at any time after the complaint has been filed.

(3) Conferences will be scheduled by the Commission at such time and place as it may designate, to be conducted in person or by telephone conference call.

(4) The failure of any attorney or party, following reasonable notice, to appear at a scheduled conference will be deemed a waiver and will not preclude the Commission from conferring with those parties or counsel present.

(5) During a status conference, the Commission staff may issue oral

rulings pertaining to a variety of interlocutory matters relevant to the conduct of a program access complaint proceeding including, inter alia, procedural matters, discovery, and the submission of briefs or other evidentiary materials. These rulings will be promptly memorialized in writing and served on the parties. When such rulings require a party to take affirmative action not subject to deadlines established by another provision of this subpart, such action will be required within ten (10) days from the date of the written memorialization unless otherwise directed by the staff.

**(k) Specifications as to pleadings, briefs, and other documents; subscriptions.**

(1) All papers filed in a program access complaint proceeding must be drawn in conformity with the requirements of §§1.49 and 1.50 of this chapter.

(2) All averments of claims or defenses in complaints and answers shall be made in numbered paragraphs. The contents of each paragraph shall be limited as far as practicable to a statement of a single set of circumstances. Each claim founded on a separate transaction or occurrence and each affirmative defense shall be separately stated to facilitate the clear presentation of the matters set forth.

(3) The original of all pleadings and submissions by any party shall be signed by that party, or by the party's attorney. Complaints must be signed by the complainant. The signing party shall state his or her address and telephone number and the date on which the document was signed. Copies should be conformed to the original. Except when otherwise specifically provided by rule or statute, pleadings need not be verified. The signature of an attorney or party shall be a certificate that the attorney or party has read the pleading, motion, or other paper; that to the best of his or her knowledge, information and belief formed after reasonable inquiry, it is well grounded in fact and is warranted by existing law or a good faith argument for the extension, modification or reversal of existing law; and that it is not interposed for any improper purpose. If any pleading or other submission is signed in violation of this provision, the Commission shall upon motion or upon its own initiative impose upon the party an appropriate sanction. Where the pleading or submission is signed by counsel, the provisions of §§1.52 and 1.24 of this chapter shall also apply.

**(l) Copies; service.**

(1) The complainant shall file an original plus three copies of the complaint with the Commission. However, if the complaint is addressed against multiple defendants, complainant shall provide three additional copies of the complaint for each additional defendant.

(2) An original plus two copies shall be filed of all pleadings and documents other than the complaint.

(3) The complainant shall serve the complaint on each defendant at the same time that it is filed at the Commission.

(4) All subsequent pleadings and briefs, as well as all letters, documents or other written submissions, shall be served by the filing party on all other parties to the proceeding, together with proof of such service in accordance with the requirements of §1.47 of this chapter.

(5) The parties to any program access complaint proceeding brought pursuant to this section may be required to file additional copies of any or all papers filed in the proceeding.

**(m) Referral to administrative law judge.**

(1) After reviewing the complaint, answer and reply, and at any stage of the proceeding thereafter, the Commission staff may, in its discretion, designate any program access complaint proceeding for an adjudicatory hearing before an administrative law judge.

(2) Before designation for hearing, the staff shall notify, either orally or in writing, the parties to the proceeding of its intent to so designate, and the parties shall be given a period of ten (10) days to elect to resolve the dispute through alternative dispute resolution procedures, or to proceed with an adjudicatory hearing. Such election shall be submitted in writing to the Commission.

(3) Unless otherwise directed by the Commission, or upon motion by the Mass Media Bureau Chief, the Mass Media Bureau Chief shall not be deemed to be a party to a program access complaint proceeding designated for a hearing before an administrative law judge pursuant to this paragraph.

**(n) Petitions for reconsideration.**

Petitions for reconsideration of interlocutory actions by the Commission's staff or by an administrative law judge will not be entertained. Petitions for reconsideration of a decision on the merits made by the Commission's staff should be filed in accordance with §§1.104-1.106 of this chapter.

**(o) Interlocutory review.**

(1) Except as provided below, no party may seek review of interlocutory rulings until a decision on the merits has been issued by the staff or administrative law judge.

(2) Rulings listed in this paragraph are reviewable as a matter of right. An application for review of such ruling may not be deferred and raised as an exception to a decision on the merits.

(i) If the staff's ruling denies or terminates the right of any person to participate as a party to the proceeding, such person, as

a matter of right, may file an application for review of that ruling.

(ii) If the staff's ruling requires production of documents or other written evidence, over objection based on a claim of privilege, the ruling on the claim of privilege is reviewable as a matter of right.

(iii) If the staff's ruling denies a motion to disqualify a staff person from participating in the proceeding, the ruling is reviewable as a matter of right.

**(p) Expedited review.**

(1) Any party to a program access complaint proceeding aggrieved by any decision on the merits issued by the staff pursuant to delegated authority may file an application for review by the Commission in accordance with §1.115 of this chapter.

(2) Any party to a program access complaint proceeding aggrieved by any decision on the merits by an administrative law judge may file an appeal of the decision directly with the Commission, in accordance with §1.276(a) and §§1.277(a)-(c) of this chapter, except that unless a stay is granted by the Commission, the decision by the administrative law judge will become effective upon release and will remain in effect pending appeal.

**(q) Frivolous complaints.**

It shall be unlawful for any party to file a frivolous complaint with the Commission alleging any violation of this subpart. Any violation of this paragraph shall constitute an abuse of process subject to appropriate sanctions.

**(r) Statute of limitations.**

Any complaint filed pursuant to this subsection must be filed within one year of the date on which one of the following events occurs:

(1) The satellite cable programming or satellite broadcast programming vendor enters into a contract with the complainant that the complainant alleges to violate one or more of the rules contained in this subpart; or

(2) The satellite cable programming or satellite broadcast programming vendor offers to sell programming to the complainant pursuant to terms that the complainant alleges to violate one or more of the rules contained in this subpart; or

(3) The complainant has notified a cable operator, or a satellite cable programming vendor or a satellite broadcast programming vendor that it intends to file a complaint with the Commission based on a request to

purchase or negotiate to purchase satellite cable programming or satellite broadcast programming, or a request to amend an existing contract pertaining to such programming pursuant to §76.1002(f) that has been denied or unacknowledged, allegedly in violation of one or more of the rules contained in this subpart.

**(s) Remedies for violations.**

**(1) Remedies authorized.** Upon completion of such adjudicatory proceeding, the Commission shall order appropriate remedies, including, if necessary, the establishment of prices, terms, and conditions for the sale of programming to the aggrieved multichannel video programming distributor. Such order shall set forth a timetable for compliance, and shall become effective upon release.

**(2) Additional sanctions.** The remedies provided in paragraph (s) (1) of this section are in addition to and not in lieu of the sanctions available under title V or any other provision of the Communications Act.

6. Sections 76.1004 through 76.1010 are reserved.

\* \* \* \* \*

**SEPARATE STATEMENT**

**OF**

**COMMISSIONER ANDREW C. BARRETT**

**RE: Implementation of Sections 12 and 19 of the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992 -- Program Access Provisions [MM Docket No. 92-265]**

This First Report and Order adopts rules to implement program access requirements under Section 19 [Section 628] of the 1992 Cable Act. [Cable Act] Based on the analysis of the statutory language and the legislative history of this section of the Cable Act, I believe the rules we adopt today comport with the mandate for program access under the Cable Act. As a result of these rules, competing multichannel video program distributors [MVPD], such as wireless cable, SMATV, Direct Broadcast Satellite, and C-Band Home Satellite Dish program distributors, will be able to complain to the FCC if they find discriminatory price differences or discriminatory program distribution practices by vertically integrated cable programmers or satellite broadcast programming vendors [cable programmers]. Consistent with the intent of Section 628(c) of the Cable Act, an MVPD is not required to show harm prior to filing a price discrimination or non-price discrimination complaint with respect to the prohibitions specified under that section in our rules. In such cases, harm is presumed unless proven otherwise by a cable programmer in response to a specific discrimination complaint. Consistent with section 628(c) of the Cable Act, cable programmers will be permitted to respond to MVPD complaints and justify price differences based on costs, legitimate economic benefits attributable to the number of subscribers, creditworthiness, offering of service factors, or any combination of these categories. Cable programmers will be permitted to show how their prices to MVPD operators compare with those charged to similarly situated distributors.<sup>1</sup> In all bona fide [i.e. non-frivolous] cases of discrimination alleged under section 628(c) of the Cable Act, cable programmers will have the burden of proving that their pricing practices are not discriminatory. Commission staff will review these complaints under the procedures outlined in this Order, and will require further discovery, or refer the case to hearing before an Administrative

---

<sup>1</sup> Similarly situated distributors are those that operate in the same geographic region, have approximately the same number of subscribers, and have purchased a similar program service. As we review initial complaints, I believe this provision of the rules will require a cable programmer to justify a price difference between an MVPD and a similarly situated cable operator [i.e. number of subscribers and similar program service] in the relevant geographic region.

Law Judge if the facts are too complex.

I write separately to express my views about several aspects of our program access rules. First, due to the low threshold for filing a bona fide Section 628(c) discrimination complaint under our rules, I am concerned that the Commission could receive a "flood" of frivolous complaints. The increase in staff costs and administrative burden imposed by this and other sections of the Cable Act are likely to be severe, even if all complaints are bona fide. Thus, I will closely scrutinize any complaints the staff dismisses as frivolous, and will support severe sanctions in such cases.<sup>2</sup>

Second, I am concerned that the attribution limits we adopt today may unduly limit the ability of minority programmers to launch additional services. The Cable Act is concerned about diversity of programming. I believe such concerns could encompass both diversity of program distribution as well as diversity of program sources.<sup>3</sup> Thus, where a minority programmer is a single majority stockholder, I would support efforts on reconsideration to consider that as an additional factor in our

---

<sup>2</sup> Frivolous complaints filed by MVPDs will be sanctioned by the Commission. I anticipate that the complaint process in this Order could result in a high volume of complaints to the Commission. Thus, I am very concerned that the FCC closely review complaints to ensure they are not frivolous. In this regard, I would hope that MVPDs and cable programmers will attempt to negotiate many of their differences in the marketplace before filing a complaint with the FCC. Once a complaint is filed under these rules, the FCC will require cable programmers to provide the information necessary to refute any bona fide complaints. If discovery is required to obtain the necessary information, I will not hesitate to support such requirements. Thus, cable programmers should be on notice that, where feasible, they should attempt to provide information necessary to justify price differences before a bona fide discrimination complaint arrives at the FCC.

<sup>3</sup> Section 628 addresses diversity of programming concerns with respect to the multichannel video programming market in section (a) and section (d) [exclusive contract public interest factors]. Further, Section 9(a) of the Cable Act concerning commercial leased access contains specific language addressing concerns with respect to the delivery of "diverse sources of video programming" to the public. Section 9(c) states that qualified minority programmers, regardless of their affiliation with a cable operator, may be carried to satisfy up to 1/3 of the operator's leased access requirements. Thus, in order to encourage ongoing diversity in program sources, I believe the Commission could equitably consider applying the broadcast attribution standard for vertically integrated minority programmers who are single majority stockholders.

attribution standards.<sup>4</sup> I also would consider viewing minority-owned program [single majority stockholder] exclusivity arrangements as a legitimate public interest factor that could be allowed by the Commission for a limited start-up period in new markets. Cable programmers have provided capital for new minority program services over the past decade. I believe such services enhance the diversity and quality of program viewing for the public and should continue to be encouraged within the limits of section 628.

Finally, I am concerned that cable programmers receive sufficient time to renegotiate contracts and adjust to these new rules in the marketplace. Thus, I support allowing programmers 120 days after the effective date of this Order to adjust to these new rules.

---

<sup>4</sup> The legislative history of this provision [Cf Senate Report at 78], allows the FCC to use current attribution rules applicable to mass media holdings, or other criteria deemed appropriate. Thus, with respect to nurturing the continued growth of minority programming, I believe the Commission could consider applying the single majority stockholder rule from our broadcast attribution standard. However, consistent with Section 628 of the Act, I remain concerned that price discrimination practices would not be protected by applying such an attribution standard. Thus, I believe further information on pricing practices also would need to be considered before a minority programmer could qualify for this attribution standard.