

Philip J. Macres  
Daniel P. Brooks  
Direct Phone: 202.373.6770  
Direct Fax: 202.373.6001  
philip.macres@bingham.com  
daniel.brooks@bingham.com

August 13, 2013

**VIA ECFS**

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

**Re: Notice of *Ex Parte* Presentation, CG Docket Nos. 13-24 & 03-123**

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On August 12, 2013, Claude Stout, Executive Director, Telecommunications for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Inc. (“TDI”) and Chair, Deaf and Hard of Hearing Consumer Action Network (“DHHCAN”); Lise Hamlin, Director, Public Policy Advocacy, Hearing Loss Association of America (“HLAA”); Cheryl Heppner, National Advocacy Director, Association of Late Deafened Adults, Inc. (“ALDA”) and Vice-Chair, DHHCAN; and Linda Kozma-Spytek, Research Audiologist, Gallaudet University Technology Access Program (“TAP”) (collectively, the “Consumer Groups and TAP”) along with Daniel Brooks and the undersigned of Bingham McCutchen LLP on behalf of TDI met separately with Nicholas Degani, Legal Advisor to Commissioner Pai; Priscilla Delgado Argeris, Legal Advisor to Commissioner Rosenworcel; and Dave Grimaldi, Chief Counsel and Legal Advisor to Commissioner Clyburn along with Robert Aldrich and Eliot Greenwald of the Consumer and Government Affairs Bureau to discuss the draft order regarding Internet Protocol Captioned Telephone Service (“IP CTS”) that the Consumer Groups and TAP understand the Commission is considering in the above-referenced proceedings.<sup>1</sup>

During the meetings, we expressed our strong support for the steps that the Commission has taken to combat IP CTS fraud, waste, and abuse. We also

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Misuse of Internet Protocol (IP) Captioned Telephone Service; Telecommunications Relay Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities*, CG Docket Nos. 13-24 & 03-123, Order and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 28 FCC Rcd 703 (2013) (“*Interim IP CTS Order*”).

Beijing  
Boston  
Frankfurt  
Hartford  
Hong Kong  
Lexington (GSC)  
London  
Los Angeles  
New York  
Orange County  
San Francisco  
Santa Monica  
Silicon Valley  
Tokyo  
Washington

Bingham McCutchen LLP  
2020 K Street NW  
Washington, DC  
20006-1806

T +1.202.373.6000  
F +1.202.373.6001  
bingham.com

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary  
August 13, 2013  
Page 2

expressed our support for prohibiting referrals for rewards programs and other financial incentives; adopting equipment labeling requirements for providers; and requiring that self-certifications for hearing loss be drafted in layman's terms. We praised the Commission for declining to impose quantitative dB hearing loss threshold requirements. As explained in greater detail in previous filings, imposing quantitative dB hearing loss threshold requirements would leave countless consumers with a legitimate need for IP CTS ineligible for service, including individuals with poor speech discrimination, individuals with Meniere's disease, those who can hear well only in quiet settings, people with central auditory processing disorders, and numerous others.<sup>2</sup>

We discussed the requests made in the *ex parte* letter filed by the Consumer Groups and TAP on August 9, 2013, a copy of which is attached as Attachment 1 hereto, as well as related support and perspectives. We noted that the default captioning-off rule has proven highly disruptive to IP CTS users, as evidenced by the thousands of comments filed urging the Commission not to impose a permanent default captioning-off rule. As an example, we distributed an IP CTS user's filing that expressed the various issues the user faces with the default-off

---

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., Comments of TDI *et al.*, CG Docket Nos. 13-24 and 03-123, at 10-12 (filed Feb. 26, 2013), *available at* <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/view?id=7022125431>; Letter from Tamar E. Finn to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, FCC, CG Docket No. 03-123 (filed Dec. 19, 2012), *available at* <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/view?id=7022087133>; Letter from Tamar E. Finn to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, FCC, CG Docket No. 03-123 (filed Dec. 21, 2012), *available at* <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/view?id=7022089035>; Letter from Philip Macres to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, FCC, CG Docket No. 03-123 (filed Dec. 27, 2012), *available at* <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/view?id=7022092789>; Letter from Philip Macres to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, FCC, CG Docket No. 03-123 (filed Jan. 7, 2013), *available at* <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/view?id=7022100105>; Letter from Philip Macres to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, FCC, CG Docket No. 03-123 (filed Jan. 7, 2013), *available at* <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/view?id=7022100110>; Letter from Tamar E. Finn to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, FCC, CG Docket No. 03-123 (filed Jan. 8, 2013), *available at* <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/view?id=7022100603>; Letter from Philip Macres to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, FCC, CG Docket No. 03-123 (filed Jan. 11, 2013), *available at* <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/view?id=7022102521>; see also *Interim IP CTS Order* at ¶ 47.

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary  
August 13, 2013  
Page 3

rule, a copy of which is attached as Attachment 2 hereto.<sup>3</sup> We recommended that the Commission invite IP CTS providers to bring in their IP CTS telephones and demonstrate to FCC staff members how outgoing and incoming calls are placed and received with these IP CTS telephones. We believe that such a demonstration would provide FCC staff members with additional understanding and insight as to the problems that many IP CTS users experience with the default captioning-off setting and how the interim rule interferes with the processing of their calls.

In addition, we explained that because IP CTS users do not benefit from high-gain amplified phones in the same way that they do from IP CTS phones and because these phones have no required standard measurement method to assure they work as advertised, imposing a minimum charge of \$75 on IP CTS phones would not prompt consumers to purchase high-gain amplified phones instead of IP CTS phones. We reiterated that the record is devoid of evidence that a sufficient quantity of IP CTS misuse exists to support adopting a permanent default captioning-off rule and expressed our concern that the Commission appears to be justifying certain proposals in the draft order based on anecdotal and hearsay information that has no record support.

During the meeting, it became clear that the Commission is concerned that (i) independent third-party professionals may not be qualified to evaluate an individual's hearing loss and (ii) captions are being used when high-gain amplification alone would suffice. To address these concerns, the Consumer Groups and TAP believe that, rather than imposing a minimum charge of \$75 on IP CTS users seeking to purchase an IP CTS phone, the Commission can require (1) the independent third-party professionals to certify to the FCC that they are qualified to evaluate an individual's hearing loss and (2) IP CTS providers to educate consumers to use captioning only if they cannot communicate effectively with amplification alone. Specifically, we propose that the Commission amend the IP CTS regulations as follows:

- (1) Amend Proposed Rule 64.604(c)(9)(v)(A)<sup>4</sup> to also require that independent third-party professionals certify to the FCC that they are qualified to evaluate the impact of hearing loss on an individual's telephone communications needs; and

---

<sup>3</sup> See Comments of Theresa Cascio, CG Docket No. 13-24 (filed Aug. 9, 2013) (attached as Attachment 2 hereto), *available at* <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/view?id=7520937162>.

<sup>4</sup> See *Interim IP CTS Order* at App. E.

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary  
August 13, 2013  
Page 4

(2) Amend Proposed Rule 64.604(c)(9)(v)<sup>5</sup> to also require that IP CTS providers, in order to be eligible to receive compensation from the TRS Fund, educate IP CTS consumers not to use captioning when they could communicate effectively using only high-gain amplification.

Consumer Groups and TAP believe these narrowly tailored amendments to the applicable IP CTS regulations would be more appropriate than imposing a \$75 minimum charge for IP CTS telephones, which we have shown would be unlawful.

We would be happy to answer any questions the Commission may have concerning this proposal.

Respectfully submitted,

*/s/ Philip Macres*

Philip J. Macres  
Daniel P. Brooks

Counsel for TDI

cc (via email):

Priscilla Delgado Argeris  
Nicholas Degani  
Dave Grimaldi  
Robert Aldrich  
Eliot Greenwald

---

<sup>5</sup> *See id.*

**Attachment 1**

Philip J. Macres  
Daniel P. Brooks  
Direct Phone: 202.373.6770  
Direct Fax: 202.373.6001  
philip.macres@bingham.com  
daniel.brooks@bingham.com

August 9, 2013

**VIA ECFS**

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

**Re: *Ex Parte* Letter, CG Docket Nos. 13-24 & 03-123**

Dear Ms. Dortch:

Telecommunications for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Inc. (“TDI”), Deaf and Hard of Hearing Consumer Advocacy Network (“DHHCAN”), Hearing Loss Association of America (“HLAA”), Association of Late-Deafened Adults (“ALDA”), Cerebral Palsy and Deaf Organization (“CPADO”), California Coalition of Agencies Serving the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (“CCASDHH”) and Gallaudet University Technology Access Program (“TAP”), (together, the “Consumer Groups and TAP”), submit this *ex parte* letter to urge revisions to certain proposals made in a draft order regarding the final Internet Protocol Captioned Telephone Service (“IP CTS”) rules that the Consumer Groups and TAP understand the Commission is considering in the above-referenced proceedings.<sup>1</sup> The Consumer Groups and TAP emphasize that the revisions requested herein to the draft order reflect the interests of IP CTS consumers and not those of IP CTS providers.

**The Commission Should Not Eliminate the Third Party Professional Certification Requirement**

The Consumer Groups and TAP understand that the draft order proposes to eliminate the independent, third party professional certification that is required

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Misuse of Internet Protocol (IP) Captioned Telephone Service; Telecommunications Relay Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities*, CG Docket Nos. 13-24 & 03-123, Order and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 28 FCC Rcd 703 (2013) (“*Interim IP CTS Order*”).

Beijing  
Boston  
Frankfurt  
Hartford  
Hong Kong  
Lexington (GSC)  
London  
Los Angeles  
New York  
Orange County  
San Francisco  
Santa Monica  
Silicon Valley  
Tokyo  
Washington

Bingham McCutchen LLP  
2020 K Street NW  
Washington, DC  
20006-1806

T +1.202.373.6000  
F +1.202.373.6001  
bingham.com

when a consumer accepts IP CTS equipment for less than \$75 from any source other than a governmental program that distributes the equipment. Instead, the draft order proposes to require that IP CTS phones be priced at \$75 or more in order for providers to be eligible to receive compensation from the Interstate Telecommunications Relay Service Fund (“TRS Fund”).<sup>2</sup> Because this proposed requirement effectively imposes a minimum charge of \$75 on IP CTS users seeking to purchase IP CTS phones<sup>3</sup> and because a \$75 minimum charge requirement is not imposed on users of conventional voice telephones, this proposal violates Section 225 of the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”), which mandates that “users of telecommunications relay services pay rates no greater than the rates paid for functionally equivalent voice communications services.”<sup>4</sup> This potential ADA violation is exacerbated by the fact that IP CTS users—unlike users of conventional voice telephone service—already have to purchase broadband Internet access service in order to use IP CTS. In addition, requiring IP CTS consumers to pay yet another fee to obtain functionally equivalent phone service, which is in addition to the ordinary telephone, local telephone service, long-distance telephone service, and perhaps international telephone service costs a hard-of-hearing IP CTS user already incurs, would be flatly inappropriate under the ADA.

Moreover, state distribution programs cannot be solely relied upon to resolve this problem. In particular, while the rule would not apply to equipment obtained through a governmental program, state distribution programs would not ameliorate the overall harm caused by imposing a minimum charge of \$75 on IP CTS users seeking to purchase IP CTS phones. A number of states do not have equipment distribution programs. And those that do often contract with one provider and therefore, IP CTS consumers in those states only have the option of using the IP CTS telephones offered by each state’s designated IP CTS provider. As a result, if an IP CTS consumer in a particular state preferred an IP CTS phone that was offered by a provider that was not the state’s designated IP CTS provider, that consumer could not obtain that phone under that state’s program. Stated differently, state distribution programs that do exist generally fail to promote competition among IP CTS providers and some even require that when a recipient

---

<sup>2</sup> For the reasons discussed below, the Consumer Groups and TAP urge the Commission to maintain the *status quo* with respect to the third party professional certification requirement. Specifically, if an IP CTS consumer gets a third party certification, the user should be able to get the IP CTS phone for less than \$75.00.

<sup>3</sup> No IP CTS phones would be available at a price of less than \$75.

<sup>4</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 225(d)(1)(D).

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary  
August 9, 2013  
Page 3

of an IP CTS phone moves out of state that the phone be returned. To make matters worse, a state cannot be relied on to continue or properly fund its distribution program because a state legislature could change or suspend the funding at any time.

Finally, there is no need to eliminate independent, third party certification requirement under the *Interim IP CTS Order* because a less drastic measure could be taken to address the Commission's concerns. Specifically, while the Commission is concerned that certifications are being provided by third parties who are not knowledgeable on hearing issues, the Commission could readily address this concern by simply requiring that certifying parties who are "qualified to evaluate an individual's hearing loss in accordance with applicable professional standards"<sup>5</sup> attest that they have an understanding of hearing loss. If certifying third parties and/or IP CTS providers engage in fraud or otherwise abuse the certification process, the Commission could bring enforcement actions against these parties and/or providers.<sup>6</sup>

### **The Commission Should Eliminate the Default-Off Rule**

As discussed in previous filings,<sup>7</sup> the Consumer Groups and TAP reiterate that the Commission should not impose a default captioning-off rule. Apart from the fact

---

<sup>5</sup> *Interim IP CTS Order* ¶ 24.

<sup>6</sup> In the event that the Commission decides to eliminate the independent, third party certification requirement and require all IP CTS users to pay a minimum charge of \$75 for IP CTS phones (which it should not for the reasons discussed above), the Commission should, as a last alternative, make an exception for low-income consumers whose income falls below four times the federal poverty guidelines.

<sup>7</sup> See Comments of TDI *et al.*, CG Docket Nos. 13-24 and 03-123, at 12-13 (filed Feb. 26, 2013); Reply Comments of TDI *et al.*, CG Docket Nos. 13-24 and 03-123, at 2-5 (filed Mar. 12, 2013); Letter from Philip J. Macres to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, FCC, CG Docket Nos. 13-24 and 03-123 (filed Apr. 26, 2013); Letter from Philip J. Macres to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, FCC, CG Docket Nos. 13-24 and 03-123 (filed May 13, 2013); Letter from Philip J. Macres to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, FCC, CG Docket Nos. 13-24, 10-51, and 03-123 (filed June 20, 2013); Letter from Philip J. Macres to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, FCC, CG Docket Nos. 13-24, 10-51, and 03-123 (filed June 26, 2013); Letter from Philip J. Macres to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, FCC, CG Docket Nos. 13-24 and 03-123 (filed Jul. 30, 2013).

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary  
August 9, 2013  
Page 4

that the record is devoid of sufficient evidence to justify this requirement, the interim default captioning-off rule has proven highly disruptive to many IP CTS consumers, thereby depriving them of their ability to secure functionally equivalent telecommunications services through IP CTS. The default captioning-off rule would also contravene Section 225 of the ADA because forcing IP CTS consumers to turn captions on for every call is not functionally equivalent to a hearing user's ability to pick up a telephone and place a call.<sup>8</sup>

Moreover, as indicated in previous filings, the default captioning-off rule may be inconsistent with other FCC rules and policy objectives as well.<sup>9</sup> For instance, because default captioning on is readily achievable, the default-off rule violates the "readily achievable" and "accessibility" mandate under Section 255<sup>10</sup> that prohibits manufacturers from "decreasing [the] accessibility" or usability of customer premises equipment, such as an IP CTS telephone.<sup>11</sup> Consequently, the Commission's default-off requirement brazenly contravenes this Congressional mandate.

The default captioning-off rule is especially problematic to IP CTS users who live alone or live in a household where everyone is hard of hearing. While the Commission adopted the interim default-off rule to deter use of captioned telephones by persons who are not hard of hearing, such a deterrent is not appropriate and cannot be justified for inclusion in the final rules in these circumstances. Any Commission concern that someone might visit such a household and make a call without turning the captions off is too remote. In fact, no record evidence exists that a sufficient quantity of such misuse supports the default-off rule in these circumstances. Moreover, as a general matter, the burden the default-off rule imposes on IP CTS users far outweighs concerns about misuse, which are likely minimal.<sup>12</sup> The rule also sets the stage for potentially dangerous consequences to IP CTS users in emergency situations.

---

<sup>8</sup> See, e.g., Letter from Philip J. Macres to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, FCC, CG Docket Nos. 13-24 and 03-123 (filed Apr. 26, 2013).

<sup>9</sup> See, e.g., Reply Comments of TDI *et al.*, CG Docket Nos. 13-24 and 03-123, at 2-5 (filed Mar. 12, 2013).

<sup>10</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 255.

<sup>11</sup> See Reply Comments of TDI *et al.*, CG Docket Nos. 13-24 and 03-123, at 3 (filed Mar. 12, 2013).

<sup>12</sup> See, e.g., Letter from Philip J. Macres to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, FCC, CG Docket Nos. 13-24, 10-51, and 03-123 (filed June 26, 2013).

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary  
August 9, 2013  
Page 5

The default-off rule was also haphazardly instituted because the Commission never proved through usability studies or other means that a default-off rule would not unduly burden consumers prior to adopting such a rule.<sup>13</sup> While the Commission imposed the default off rule to prevent misuse of IP CTS phones,<sup>14</sup> the Commission's strengthened notification and labeling requirements should allay those concerns. For these reasons, the default-off rule should be eliminated.

While Consumer Groups and TAP understand that the Commission is considering a hardship exception to the default-off rule that would permit the use of default captions on if an IP CTS user obtains a certification from a physician that the user has difficulty pushing a button to activate the captions due to a cognitive or mobility disability, Consumer Groups and TAP believe that such a requirement would be tremendously burdensome. IP CTS consumers would have to bear the cost and burden of having an appointment with a physician to obtain the certification. Physicians would also have to bear the burden of having to familiarize themselves with this hearing loss issue and IP CTS. Less burdensome alternatives are clearly available, such as allowing other expert professionals to provide the certification or a diagnosis that an IP CTS user has a condition that likely interferes with his or her ability to operate and change settings on electronic devices.

For the foregoing reasons, the Commission should revise the draft IP CTS order and rules as requested herein.

Respectfully submitted,

*/s/ Philip Macres*

Philip J. Macres  
Daniel P. Brooks

Counsel for TDI

cc (via email):

Acting Chairwoman Clyburn  
Commissioner Pai

---

<sup>13</sup> See Comments of TDI *et al.*, CG Docket Nos. 13-24 and 03-123, at 13 (filed Feb. 26, 2013).

<sup>14</sup> See *Interim IP CTS Order* at ¶ 55.

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary  
August 9, 2013  
Page 6

Commissioner Rosenworcel  
Priscilla Delgado Argeris  
David Grimaldi  
Nicholas Degani  
Karen Strauss  
Gregory Hlibok  
Eliot Greenwald  
Elaine Gardner

**Attachment 2**

Secretary Dortch,

Marlene H. Dortch

Secretary

Federal Communications Commission

445 12th Street, SW

Washington, DC 20554

CG Docket Nos. 13-24 and 03-123

I am a senior citizen & live alone. I am not able to make phone calls because of this change. When i make phone calls to government offices or doctors offices or hospitals I get a computer & menu. The computer starts talking before the captions start. So I don't have a clue which buttons to push & then the computer hangs up on me because I don't make my selection fast enough. I have not found a place of business that doesn't use these computer menus. I have had countless people hang up on me rather than wait for me to answer. Suffice it to say most everything I would use a phone for must be done in person. so I spend an awful lot of my limited income in gas to drive place to place because I can't use the telephone even though I spend \$50 on a landline & another \$50 for internet. Deaf people are not necessarily rich & you are forcing us to spend more money than hearing people but we still can't come even close to the phone service they enjoy.

I am writing to express my concern about a recent change to captioned telephone service that requires my phone to always be in the "captions off" mode. As someone who depends on captioning in order to communicate with others over the telephone, this is extremely inconvenient.

I have a profound hearing impairment and hearing over the telephone is particularly difficult for me. Captioned telephone service makes an enormous difference in my life. I know that in an emergency I will be able to get the help I need. There is no one else in my home who uses my captioning telephone, so forcing me to keep the captioning in the "off" setting is unwarranted. I now must take extra steps in order to have a phone conversation similar to anyone without difficulty hearing on the phone.

I hope that the FCC will reconsider this change based on the needs of people like me. Theresa Cascio