What we're going to do in this room is to have you all at one end.

I'm going to ask that maybe the people in the back to come out doesn't matter?

Over here?

We need to be able, yes, it's going to be at this end of the room, but we need to stop the meeting and start recording.

Ok.

Can everybody move down to this end of the room just for the purpose of the subcommittee?

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm not going to be with you for long, but I'm sure there's a natural leader in this group.

I'm sure there are several natural leaders in this group, and what we'd like you to do as the first order of business is choose a chairperson.

I also want to make sure that

You need the Mike.

Our telephone is ok.

Let me say this again.

Move up a little bit.

Move up a little bit, ok.

Let me grab a dog here.

There we go.

Ok.

All right.

Sorry.

I apologize.

I'm going to be I can't stay here long, but what we would appreciate your doing, and I'm sure there are a lot of natural leaders in this room, that if you could please select a chairperson who either could take notes or who could

delegate that responsibility to someone else, and I assume that we do have the connection to Judith Harkins.

Right, Judy on the phone?

[inaudible].

You're a little bit weak there, Judy.

We'll see if we can turn the volume up on you a little bit.

And if the chairperson could occasionally just ask if Judy has a comment or something, because the Mikes have to be adjusted accordingly.

So if someone would like to start this ball rolling, that would be terrific.

Of course, nobody else wants to do the work.

I'd be happy to chair, unless someone else wants to nominate someone else.

Ok.

That's great.

That means we can get on to business.

I'm blushing, though.

Ok.

So from what I understand from Scott, really the main order of business can everyone hear me ok?

Ok.

It's for us to come up with priorities.

And I'm sure that we have quite diverse priorities here, and certainly, I'd love if we can just start brainstorming.

Perhaps we can nominate someone to prescribe for us.

 or we can assign for someone to scribe for us.

That would be terrific.

Then we can have a good visual record of what we've got up there.

Let's try, if we can, not to restate something that's already been said.

I find this very useful sometimes in meetings that if you feel very strongly, to just say "I agree."

That's great.

And then we can move on.

If you do have something to say in terms of clarifying an issue that we've put up or putting up something that is actually somewhat different, please do speak up.

And then, if we can possibly, once we set priorities, I thought it was Susan Palmer's idea that if we do have ideas about how to deal with some of those priorities, that we can hopefully get there this afternoon as well.

But for now, let's concentrate on putting the priorities up.

And if you have ideas about how to deal with them, please jot down some notes, and then if we get there, we can put them up.

Otherwise, we can talk about them once we have list serves up.

Yes, Julie?

 Julie Carroll.

Could we just identify who is here?

 Good idea.

 Thank you.

 Why don't we start immediately to my right, to your left, Julie, and then we'll go around the table counterclockwise.

My name is Eugene Seagriff, product accessibility manager at Panasonic and I'm a member of the public here at the meeting.

 Julie Carroll, information technology technical assistance and training center.

 Frederico of WGBH.

Judith Verdwara, WYND communications.

Andy Lange.

Julie, student.

Brenda Battat, for self help of hard of hearing people.

Clay Bowl for the national association real estate association.

Karen Slitakoss.

Could I ask you to spell your last name.

Slitakoss.

Paul Edwin with Sprint.

Stewart with Maryland Relay.

Lisa Baden.

David [inaudible], council for the blind.

[inaudible] with HewlettPackard.

Joe Gordon from the league of hard of hearing.

Chrostowski.

Gil Becker.

That gets back to me, Micaela Tucker from Nokia.

And Judy?

Judy Harkins, Gallaudet university.

Is Jim Tobias online?

I don't think he's on right now.

I think he'll be on later.

Ok, thanks, Judy.

Also, we have Bob Segalman who is supposed to be on with us.

He'll be back in about 15 or 20 minutes.

So when he gets back, we'll introduce him.

Yes, is it

Pam.

Pam.

Since Scott had specifically said that audience members were invited to join in the committee thing, are any of the people sitting out there to be active in the committee?

Is it just that there wasn't room at the table or what?

That is a good question.

I'm not sure of the answer to that.

[inaudible].

Yes.

Do I have a microphone?

Let's see.

Yes.

Yes, public members are invited to participate in the subcommittee discussions.

Membership, though, is at the discretion of the chair of the full committee, and we hope that we won't get so many members that it will make the committees subcommittees unwieldy, but I think that would probably be the only limitation on

membership, if we got to the point where there were so many people wanting to be a member of a particular subcommittee, then we'd probably have to put a limit on it.

But otherwise, people are welcome to join the subcommittee. I would submit that those who are here who would like to participate in this discussion, please go ahead and go ahead and introduce yourself, and as well, I think then if there are people who would like to be actively members of the subcommittee, that you bring that up with the subcommittee and that my only stipulation, and I would ask for comment on this, would be that if you would like to be an active participant in the subcommittee, that you are just that, active.

So can we have those of you who would like to participate come up and introduce yourselves?

Judy, can we grab your

Microphone?

Yes.

Thank you.

My name is Anamarie Lutz, and I'm here today really as a member of the cochlear implant association.

I'm a cochlear implant and hearing aid user.

So I'm interested in this subcommittee, naturally, because I think some of the issues on compatibility and access will come up here.

But I did not ask to be an official member of the committee because I am hoping that we will be able to coordinate with self help for hard of hearing people, and I didn't want to cause too many seats to be filled.

But I'd like to observe, just so that people who have cochlear implants are also aware of what is developing.

That's really my only reason.

Great.

Thank you.

Thank you.

Good morning, everyone, I'm Dennis Catalano, I'm an M.D., Ph.D., retired from Medicare.

I work a lot with handicapped children, especially with people who have multifaceted handicaps, autism, ought Tim spectrum disorders, and I would like to ask the committee keep the multifact views of disabilities rather than just single issue views, because there are so many hundreds of thousands and millions of people who are involved with this who need the help of these single issues for them to function, to get jobs, and to participate in society.

And certainly, that's in keeping with the A.D.A. mandate.

And I would like to be on the committee, please.

Thank you.
 I just wanted to introduce myself.
I'm not a committee member.
I'm Pam Gregory.
I'm the chief of the disability rights office at the FCC
 Thanks, Pam.
 Hi, I'm Kathleen.
I used to work with Scott Marshall at the disability rights
council and now I'm working for a software company in Herndon,
Virginia, called Microstate.
And my company is very much interested in being active on this
committee, partly because a lot of the technology that you're
going to be addressing runs on software, and software has to be
coded by software engineers.
And the software engineers and the project managers like myself
are on a very steep learning curve right now.
In fact, the w3 con wc3 consortium has radically changed a
lot of it.
We're moving to standards like XML which are going to
facilitate some of the wireless applications that are coming
up.
So I hope that my participation can be two-way, that I can
carry information back, and that I can help provide the
perspective of the software engineers.
Thank you.

 Thank you.

 Hi, my name is Jay Fciratte.
I'm representing interpreters for the deaf and I do not want to
be a member of the committee, because I do not have time at the
current, but I would like to be a resource regarding
interpreting relay services.

 Hi, I'm Steve burger, and I'm representing Seamens and we're
participating in the TAC, particularly telecommunication, but
also I.T. issues, and I would like to participate on the
committee.

 Hi.
I'm Bernie bond with BellSouth, and of course, we are
interested in access issues, and I'd be happy to provide
resources or do whatever help you need from BellSouth.

 Would you restate your last name, I'm sorry?

Bond, bond.

Thanks.
Is there anyone else who would like to come forward?
Ok.
Thank you very much for introducing yourselves, and I will
I've taken note of those who said they would like to be on the
committee, and please, actually, if you could come up to me
when we reconvene or just before we reconvene with the rest of
the group, I'll make sure that I get your information so that
we can stay in contact.
Ok?
Ok.
Are there any other points of order before we get started,
asking for priorities, brainstorming?
Ok.
I think out of respect for the people who are watching the
interpreter or watching the transcription, let's make sure we
don't speak over each other, speak one at a time, and also,
take time, because am I pronouncing it right, Maricela
Maricela.
Maricela is also doing her transcribing, so let's not make
her work too hard.
At this point, we're open for recommendations for priorities.

[inaudible].

Would you like to?

First of all, we want to state time limits in that whatever
you want to you know, brainstorm as many as brainstorms as
you can.
Brainstorms are supposed to be the three f's, fast, free, and
whatever one is fast, the other one is free thinking,
whatever comes to mind, and I think freewheeling.
But anyway, there's no judgment in brainstorming, because
usually, whatever one person is saying is going to someone
else is going to get an idea from saying something else, and
then we can go and prioritize.
But the important thing is that there's no judgment into the
brainstorming.
And then also, it is ok for me to misspell.
There's something about being in front of an easel and trying
to write.
And then the last thing is that if you want to give it a time
limit, so maybe 10 minutes of brainstorming, and somebody be

timing.

 I'll tell you what, actually, if you want to take just
take a minute now before we start throwing things up, because
you reminded me that one of the best things in brainstorming is
just to write notes down for yourself.
So let's just take, actually, two minutes and just jot down
ideas for yourself.
And then we can start throwing them up.

 Ok.
We'll stop there, and you can, of course, keep brainstorming,
and I'm sure that listening to other people, you'll come up
with even more ideas.
Does anybody want to throw out some ideas?
Judy.

 Mine is related to telecommunications.
I think what I wanted to propose is that there are any other
areas related to security, I think the FCC really, really
needs to come up with a functional equivalent, functional
equivalent, an issue that comes up periodically in FCC rules
and orders, I think it would help all of us to write a
definition of functional equivalent or functionality
equivalent.

 And also, when we break on your ideas, can you also let us
know if we properly capture the idea?
Ok.
Other Judy, did we not capture it?

 I have a functional lead equivalent.

 Functional lead equivalent.

 Did we get it?
Ok.
I'm going to get Gil, and then Brenda.

 Yeah, my name is Gil Becker.
Recently, the national organization for state relay
administration held a meeting and our biggest issue was
national outreach and getting the word out to the millions of
Americans that don't know about relay services.
The law that was created title for talks about phone companies
being responsible for providing information to the general

public, and that's not really happening on a consistent nationwide basis.

There is a funding mechanism available, that's through the neck, the national carriers exchange association, they collect funds for the relay.

The FCC understands the importance of national outreach, and they've agreed, that yes, that money can come from that fund and we just need to make a recommendation and find a mechanism to make that happen.

And I'm hoping to see some results before the national implementation of fed 111 this coming October.

And I could go on and on, but I'll leave it there, since I was told to be fast.

Can you give us a good short phrase for Maricela?

T.R.S. national outreach.

Brenda?

Mine has to do with 255 and enforcement.

It's complaint driven, and my understanding is that particularly from the constituency I represent, there are not many complaints, and yet, I know that there's not a lot of satisfaction out there, particularly related to hearing aid compatibility in wireless phones.

So I would like to see some honest appraisal of how 255 is working.

And I'd like to see more teeth in the complaint process.

Is that 215?

I think so.

One is Brenda two issues, one, honest appraisal of progress?

Mmhmm.

Enforcement.

Honest appraisal of enforcement or honest appraisal of progress?

I think the complaint is how to provide better, we have to work on that area, more outreach on how to make a complaint.

So better
Filing complaints.

Better education on complaint filing?

Mmhmm.

And then, I think we captured a second one with an honest appraisal of
Of how well it's working.

Of how well it's working in progress.

Of what?

The first one, honest appraisal.
Honest appraisal is one by itself.
And then make another, a number four, the better education on the complaint process.
Of 255.
Thanks, Larry.
I've got Paul next, and then Pam.
And then Larry.
And then Dennis.
And then Julie.

Paul Ludwick with sprint.
I'd like to start at the beginning.
Part of the problem with selecting, using, and making services and functionality work is getting access to the network.
And right now, I think there's a problem with basic access to the network.
I can pick up the phone and I can hear dial tone, and I can call a number, and I can hear the busy signal or I can receive the intercept announcement that tells me that number's been changed, but there are a lot of people that can't.
So I think starting out at a lower level making sure that things the basic network functionality is available to all parties is a good starting point for me.
So I think that's what I'd like to do.
If you could make that better access to basic network functionality, I think I'd be a little bit more comfortable with it.

Network?

Functionality.
You thank you.

Ok.
Pam?

I'd like to see
Can you use the microphone, please?

Sorry.
One of the main things that I'm concerned about is it goes
with all of this is quality assurance, for us to set up some
type of quality assurance.
To do that, we have to go back to part of the first one,
definitions, better definitions and measurements so that we can
 whether it be equipment, whether it happens to be T.R.S.
services, if we have the same definitions and the same
measuring tools and the same measurements to be used by
everybody, like ntrs, or for hearing aid compatibility that we
can do across the board, do quality assurance, and then see how
everything the basic things are going, that also then helps
us get the complaints back.
So quality assurance, definition, another one, clear definition
of measurement, measurements.

Clear definition?

Clear definitions of measurements, like all the things in
order.
Like what really is A.S.A., what really is you know, so that
we can then use those measurements in our quality assurance.

Standardization.

Standardization, thank you.
Thank you, Clayton.
Standardization.
And that really has to come from the FCC, because I know
with T.R.S., because the providers always say, well, we feel
that the FCC means this is how this is measured, and no two
providers do it the same.

Larry?

Larry Goldberg here.
I say you get more ideas as people speak.

I think for a number of the preceding comments, it was related to preceding comments, it was related to 255 issues and T.R.S. issues, but also all of them need to relate to segment 15, the captions and quality assurance, but that wasn't the one I originally thought of.

A difficult issue the commission will need to grapple with is Internet regulation.

And as much as the Internet has been pretty much hands-off, as more and more media go on the Internet, and as more people use the Internet for making phone calls, the commission's going to need to deal with the fact that all of these regulated environments are now going into an unregulated sector.

So simply said Internet regulation for phone and media.

 Ok.

I've got Dennis, and then Julie, and Robert to be next on the list.

Ok.

Dennis, you want to

 Yeah.

 We can get you a microphone.

 Thank you.

I'd like to further go a step back from what Paul commented on, which I think was very correct, and even ask that such an unusually August group of technically skilled providers provide the committee and ultimately, the big committee, with their technologies as they see them now, as they have used them and what they anticipate in the future.

And to try and match that with a compatible list of the identifiable needs of the people that are going to use these technologies by their needs, speech, hearing, sight, those that are mentally retarded should not be left out of this group.

And I think that would give us a very fresh start as to what we can do and who it is going to be applied to.

 So can you give us a quick buzz word we can put up there?

 Identify the providers' skills and the recipients' needs and match the two.

 Ok.

Next, we have Julie.

 Julie Carroll.

Think there's a great need for more technical assistance and guidance for consumers and what their rights are.
We've been hearing for quite a while that the FTC is not getting complaints from consumers, and I think part of the reason is they don't fully understand what exactly is a telecommunications service, what is it they're entitled to, and where is the line drawn.
So more technical assistance for consumers.
And guidance on what are telecommunication services and what are not telecommunication services.
Where are you?

 [inaudible].

 I'm sorry.
Technical assistance for consumers about their rights.
In other words, not you know, how to complain, but what is it you have a right to complain about.

 And the second one?

 And the second one is more technical assistance and guidance on telecommunications services.
What is a telecommunications service and what is not.

 Now, on my list right now, I have Robert and then Andrew and then Katherine and then Brenda.
Anybody else want to get on the list?
Ok.
And then Paul again.
Ok.
Robert?

 A little background first.
The telecommunication industry association was comprised of two parts.
We had a multimedia telecommunications association, which addressed accessibility from the business equipment standpoint while the T.I.A. group at that time addressed the accessibility from both the business and the consumer issues.
 business equipment and the consumer issues.
The business side, though, I'd like to talk about briefly and suggest something.
I heard mentioned, one gentleman who spoke before said about jobs and how important accessibility is for individuals with that are disabled to attain employment.

So one of the issues I'd like to address is the issue that surfaced under the section 508 proceedings, that was with TTY access on each telephone.

TTY is a problem to equipment manufacturers because the equipment manufacturers in the business community, let's talk about, does not operate in the manner that TTY equipment operates.

TTY equipment is basically designed to connect directly to the public telephone network versus the electronic business telephone systems.

Each manufacturer has their own proprietary design.

There is nothing similar in those designs other than maybe the simple analog system you have at home referred to as a pots telephone.

Talking about accessibility and using TTY, there are many issues facing equipment manufacturers.

And the desire for the TTY community, I'll call it, to have messaging, for example, when you are faced with issues such as capture rate of TTY calls, lines that are associated with TTY are listed, however, they're also used for voice.

And it's difficult to capture a call on the basis of what is then a voice coming in or is it a TTY call.

Secondly, it's my understanding that the TTY calls require a connection so that you cannot pick up, answer the call, place it on hold.

So you have issues like this that face the business equipment user that need to be addressed, they need to be addressed with standards that the telecommunication equipment manufacturers can design to and the TTY equipment manufacturers can design to.

The issue I suppose is creating standards that allow both communities to be served.

Standards that allow can you repeat that?

Standards that the equipment manufacturers can adhere to and then serve the needs of the disability, some common ground there that both of us can go down to provide the equipment that's needed.

Maricela, did that help?

[inaudible].

Yes.
Yes.

Hi, this is Pam Gregory from the FCC
And I just wanted to remind anyone in the audience and the
members who may not know this that the FCC also has a
telecommunications advisory committee, and it has three
subcommittees.
One of the subcommittees is on technology access for people
with disabilities, so there might be chances for Lee Jason
with this other committee.

This is Judy Harkins, can I say something at this point?

Yes, Judy, I'll insert you before I go on to Andrew if
that's ok with Andrew.
Yes, it's ok with him.

A quick follow-up to Pam's comment about the technological
committee.
Gregg UnderHeiden is the Chairman that of subcommittee, and I
would like to be a liaison of that committee if that's ok.

Does that sound good?
That sounds good to the committee, Judy.
You've got it.
Thank you.
Ok.
Andrew?

Hi.
I have three things I'd like to touch on.
Actually, they're all related.
So the first one is that I would like the FCC to encourage
the NACA, national exchange carriers association, to consider
reimbursement on what I call alternative ways of
communicating.
And by that, I mean NACA could look into reimbursing companies
that provide services for students in classrooms where they
need tech interpreting.
As an alternative to relay, provide what I call relay
captioning.
And this is where I tested a system last week and I was very
impressed with it, that you have a conference call, like this,
for example, and I have a laptop, and I log on to a web site,
the stenographer is listening in on the conference call and
she's typing everything that's being said in the room and it
shows up on my laptop.

And all I am is connected to the web site and the captioning, the stenographer is out somewhere else.
Then we switched over and I tried to make a relay call using that method, and it was incredible, absolutely incredible.
It went so smooth.
And it was great.
This is something that could be an alternative way of doing relay calls, instead of having a TTY, use a captioner, and boy make a phone call and it would show up on my laptop.
The other one is I would like the FCC to encourage naca to reimburse companies who provide video relay service.
Right now there a restriction to reimbursement where companies who can get reimbursed for that have to be considered a common carrier.
And that's preventing a lot of other companies who want to provide V.R.I. or V.R.S., but they can't, because they're not going to get reimbursed and they have to go through a common carrier.
So if companies could get reimbursed by naca, that would promote a lot more video effort out there.
So oh, Judy pointed out a very good point to me.

I did capture your two points?
One, is for FCC to complete reimbursements for means of communication, and the second one is for reimbursement to companies who consider other means of communication.

 Right.

 Ok.

 Right.
Judy pointed out to me that NACA doesn't have the authority to make that decision, but the FCC is the one who issues that to NACA.
And the other one is the video relay, to reimburse companies who do video relay that are not considered common carriers.

 Ok.
Just an update on where we are in terms of time.
My watch is fast, but I think that's a good thing in this case.
We've been going for about 20 minutes, and so but I think we're still getting a lot of new ideas up, so I propose that we go for another 10 minutes with ideas, and then we can stop and prioritize.

Does that sound ok?

Can I say something?
My concern is mostly with voice with access and also to get the screen to read back to me because of my special impairment.

So
Did you get that?

Shelley, I've got two issues from you.
Let me know if I've captured this correctly.
One is better voice would you say better voice capturing?
Better voice web access?

Yes.

And then I also heard you say better screen reading?

Yes, so that the print on the screen can be read back to me by audio, or anybody else who needs it.

Can I explain what she's talking about?

Yes, please.

If researching in a library, if she could get
Do you mind using the microphone?
That way, everyone can hear.

When Shelley goes to do research in the library, even if she can access the web in the library, by voice, which she can't, because it's not available, even if she could, when things come up, if she could highlight portions of it and have them read back to her, but it's not even available, voice surfing, or to have it read back to her.
It may be out there, we don't know, and that could be a whole other issue with where do you find out these things.
But the schools, the colleges don't have it.

Ok.
So
[inaudible].

Yes.

Yes.

If I was next, that ties in to what I was going to say.

Yes, Katherine, you are.

I would like to back up Kelly on that and move it into the category of web access which falls into the unregulated gray area.
Most web sites are not accessible through screen readers or through the technology that Kelly would like to use.
Design is voluntary at this point, which you know, may or may not be the best way to go, but perhaps when priority for this committee one priority for this committee would be to support and encourage voluntary universal design on the web, and the FCC's office has started an initiative on that, but there might be ways to further that before we have to take a more, you know, regulatory approach to that.
I would call yeah, ok.
Yeah.
The other thing is that a lot of the new coding that's coming out isn't accessible at all.
And developers are going to go ahead and use a lot of graphical interfaces that aren't accessible, so I think eventually it's either going to become an A.D.A. issue or a section 508 issue.
And there was an A.D.A. case against America Online recently that ended up AOL had to make changes and they used the A.D.A. to do it.
But the courts were not really happy about using the A.D.A. to do that.
So I think it's going to be a big issue soon.

Did that capture what you're
Yeah.

Ok.
I have Brenda and then Paul again.
And then David.
Can I add you to the list after Paul?

Yeah.
Anywhere.

Ok.
Oh, and Bob.

I have a couple of things, one is racing against time with hearing aids, because they're taking pay phones out, pay phones are being removed in location because the assumption is everybody is able to use cell phones and there's a huge problem for people with hearing aids and cochlear implants that can't use cell phones.
So what can we do about them putting pay phones out?
And the other issue is we have now been trying for years to find a permanent place for FM frequency allocation for both video description and assisted listening devices to be used in public places that are mandated by the A.D.A.
And we have been slapped around from one frequency to another and it's now again threatened because congress and N.T.I.A. have demanded that certain frequencies be auctioned off and one of the frequencies that's being identified is the one that's used for FM systems.
And that's affecting both the blind community and the deaf and hard of hearing people.
So we've got to find a home for those for that frequency, a home for those devices.

Ok.
So it's finding a permanent frequency location.

Yeah.

And can you repeat the first one?

And the other one is the pay phone pulling out, removing the pay phones on the assumption that everybody is using cell phones.
It's not true.
There are a lot of people who can't because we don't have the technology yet.

For assisted listening devices.
And captioning.

And captioning.

And audio description, sorry.
Maricela, we're going to give you a big hand after this is all over.

Do you mind using the microphone?

That way everyone can hear.

When Shelley goes to do research in the

library, even if she can access the web in the library,

she can't because it's not available, if she could

highlight portions and have it read back to her but it's

not available, voice surfing or to have it read back to

her.

It may be out there, we don't know, and

that could be a whole other issue.

Where do you find out these things.

The schools, the colleges don't have it.

So --

If I was next, that ties into what I

was going to say.

Yes, Kathryn, you are next.

I'd like to back up Kelly on that and

move it into the broader issue of web access which falls

into the unregulated gray area right now.

Most websites are not accessible through

screen readers or the kind of technology that Kelly

would like to use.

Design is voluntary at this point which,

you know, may or may not be the best way to go.

But perhaps one priority for this

committee would be ways to support and encourage

voluntary universal design on the web and the FCC's

D.R.O. office has started an initiative on that but

there might be ways to further that before we have to

take a more, you know, regulatory approach to that.

I would call -- yeah.

OK.

The other thing is that a lot of the new

coding that's coming out isn't accessible at all and

developers are going to go ahead and use a lot of

graphic interfaces that aren't accessible so eventually

it's going to become an A.D.A. issue and there was an

A.D.A. case against America Online recently that ended

up AOL had to make changes and used the A.D.A. to do

it, but the courts weren't happy with using the A.D.A.

to do that.

I think it's going to be an issue soon.

Does that capture what you're --

Yeah.

OK.

I have Brenda and then Paul again.

And then David.

Can I add you to the list after Paul?

Yeah, anywhere.

OK.

And Bob.

I just have a couple of things.

One is I think we're racing against time with the issue and hearing aids because taking pay phones out.

Pay phones are being removed in locations because the assumption is everyone is able to use cell phones.

And there's a huge group of people with hearing aids and cochlear implants whop still can't use cell phones.

What can we do about them pulling the pay phones out.

And the other issue is we have been trying to for years to find a permanent place for FM

frequency allocation for both video description and assistive listening devices to be used in public places that are mandated by the A.D.A. and we have been schlepped around from one frequency to another and it's been threatened because Congress has demanded that certain frequencies be auctioned off and one of the frequencies that's been identified is the one used for FM systems.

That's affecting both the blind community and the deaf and hard of hearing people.

Got to find a home for those -- for that frequency, a home for those devices.

OK.

So we've got two -- one finding a permanent FM location.

FM frequency.

And can you repeat the first one?

And the other one is the pay phone pulling out, removing the pay phones on the assumption that everybody is using cell phones.

It's not true.

There are a lot of people who can't
because we don't have the technology yet.

OK.

I didn't get the second one.

Frequency allocation for FM systems.

For assistive listening devices.

And captioning.

And captioning.

An audio description, sorry.

Maricela we're going to give you a big
hand after this is all over.

OK.

We're going to go to Paul and we are
running short on our time so if we can keep it brief and

we can go back and clarify when we're prioritizing if
that's OK with you.

Thanks, Paul.

I think one of the things we ought to
keep our focus on is simply access to voice services.

Data is the future, there's not much doubt

about it, but the future ain't here yet.

It's still voice today.

And there's a lot of enhanced services out there that are network services.

The different handicap groups have problems with.

I mean, they can -- there's a whole raft of them.

They can be anything from audio video conferencing, to operator services, to prepaid services.

There's a whole list of them.

I think we as a committee -- or subcommittee ought to maintain a focus and continue to investigate progress towards access of those enhanced services and also determine what we can do to improve access to those services.

I think it even -- it can cross technologies.

I mean, one that you're probably familiar

with is web access on cellular hand sets.

That's going to be a real issue for

someone to tackle pretty soon about how you make that

accessible to all parties.

So I think there's a big opportunity out

there if we can break it down into smaller pieces and

monitor and improve.

So can we -- enhanced voice services?

I guess that would be a good start.

And Paul, I think you had mentioned the

basic voice services in the very beginning.

I think we've got that captured.

Yeah, I'd like to do one other also.

There's -- and this might not be

appropriate for this group, but just as a matter of

experience I know that most telephone companies and

most -- well, the SS-7 signaling systems support the use

of handicap indicators which could be used if properly

applied, to make call processing actually user specific

or nearly user specific.

User group specific.

If we could, I'd like to do some research

into that a little bit.

So if we can put down handicap indicators?

Well, in billing systems it's mostly text

type of field but in SS-7 messaging it's numeric

indicators that really -- they really haven't been

defined.

They've been out there for 20 years now

but no one's actually used them.

Actually I was thinking like you pick

up your handset and dial the number.

If you're hearing impaired user you might

be routed through a relay service before you actually go

to that party.

So you can use it -- you can use them as

triggers.

I'm going to move on to David and then

we have Bob.

David, I need you to grab the microphone,

please.

Right in front of you.

Hello.

Ah, yeah, it's working.

Let's see.

I keep forgetting his name.

We have -- I have got an article from -- I can't find his name now.

We all got an article, a very good article about problems with network interface incompatibility

and the I bring this up because it's kind of an infrastructure issue yet it crosses over into the accessibility area because if these things are worked out and things start happening like you'd be able to pick up the phone and tell it to do something or dial a number and tell that service to do something, it should also be available in other forms of, you know -- other accessible forms.

So the article, you know, kind of reminded me of that.

And my other issue is things like blue tooth, not so much the carrying of the signal itself or that whole thing, but the receiving devices since they're going to be classifiable I guess as telecommunication devices, the short range telecommunication devices, they probably would fall

under the realm of needing to be accessible.

So devices that are receiving blue tooth communications or that are -- you know, that are communicating by blue tooth need to be looked at in terms of accessibility.

And I think those are my two for now.

Just to clarify it for those of you who don't know blue tooth is an emerging technology.

It's a short range radio that will allow

two different devices to in essence speak to each other without having to be connected by any sort of cable or wire and it could be as basic as a phone being able to connect wirelessly to a P.C. to get e-mail or something like that but it could be as complicated as several different devices all communicating at the same time for broadband access to various kinds of communications.

So thanks, David, for bringing that up.

I think we've got --

One quick thing.

It was Jim Tobias that sent us the article

on the telephone voice technology thing.

Maricela do we -- one issue -- David, please correct me if I'm wrong, one issue he brought up was exploring the access issues connected with blue tooth technology.

Blue tooth, B-L-U-E.

And David, could you restate your first issue?

The issue was that as more -- as more infrastructure issues are solved they have the potential to create more access issues and we need to -- we need to be certain that as we -- as those issues are solved that we monitor the products and services that result from those solutions for accessibility issues.

So we've got Eugene summarizing that as accessibility of emerging technologies?

That's pretty good.

Is that good?

OK.

OK.

I'm going to go ahead and move to Bob.

I would like to see NTCA interstate reimbursement for outreach activities.

For example, a national public service announcement for relay.

Bob, I think before you got here Gil, were you the one -- Gil brought that up, so I think we have it captured.

Do you have another issue that you'd like to bring up?

OK.

Thanks for bringing that up again though because when we start looking at priorities, it definitely counts if two people brought it up, I think.

I think the next part is going to be the next difficult.

I just wanted to mention two quick, one I know that right now companies, manufacturers, and service providers often look at the FCC as the

organization that is restricting them or governing them in terms of what they do.

I think one thing I've noticed that's
helped over the last three years has been recognition
efforts by the FCC of companies that are really doing
a good job.

So I'd like to see some sort of formal
recognition program, and I may be just missing it, it
may be there.

And then the last one, that I'll bring up
is companies, I think Dennis brought up the idea that
companies really need to bring the new technologies to
the table and talk -- start talking about them before
they're actually on the market, and I can speak for
Nokia and I'm sure many of my competitors in mentioning
there's a major confidentiality issue.

If we're coming out with a product and we
bring it up to a group of people and say what do you
think about it?

It's essentially out there.

So it's no longer secret, and I think that
needs to be something that is considered, even with
N.D.A.'s and things like that, we're not safe.

So David, did you have a comment?

I do a lot of N.D.A. work, and I have a

lot of secrets.

I appreciate that. I think -- we do a
lot of N.D.A. work at Nokia and there are some things
I'm not even allowed to know.

It would be helpful to have a safe harbor
of some sort that we could feel pretty confident that we
could bring some of those ideas and be absolutely sure
they would be safe.

So one summary -- one thing I had up
there was formal recognition program by the FCC

That's great.

That's terrific.

Formal recognition program from the FCC
for efforts towards meeting any of the regulations that
deal with accessibility.

That's fine.

The other one was just some sort of
further research or work on better confidentiality if
we're to bring new inventions and new technologies to
people with disabilities before they hit the market.

OK.

So Pam's told me that we're going to get tape and put these -- all these many, many ideas up.

Before I offer my own suggestion does anyone have a brilliant way that they've used before or

prioritizing many issues that are near and dear to many people's hearts?

Pam.

Some of these can sort of be put together under one heading.

That sounds like a good idea.

Paul?

Everybody gets five, whatever the votes are.

You vote for any five on the list.

Whichever ones have the most votes for them, they're the top priorities.

You work your way down.

How does that sound?

Dennis, you also had a suggestion?

I'm going to restate what Dennis said

because he didn't have a mike.

Also the suggestion from Dennis to look at the priorities that are most basic.

I guess we could make a reference to Paul's -- to Paul and Pam's recommendations.

We've got these current voice services that are not accessible, we've also got some basic definitions out there.

So maybe what we can do is -- how about,

could we maybe try the multi-voting, see how that turns out and have a discussion based on some basics, on the very basic priorities?

Julie?

I can do that if you run through the list one time before we vote.

Yes.

I will definitely.

I'll run through the complete list and then we'll go through them one by one and do multi-voting.

Paul, I'm going to take your suggestion

that you -- people get to vote five times.

Does that sound OK?

There are 27 issues.

Let's do three times.

I think first we're going to do -- see if
we can collapse any of these together.

I need a little clarification on one
point.

The pay phone issue.

My understanding was that there is
diminishing number mainly because they're becoming less
profitable as a result of wireless phone use, not for
any other reason.

Am I mistaken on that?

Yeah, I mean, the fact is that --
that's exactly it, because people are not using them.

But there are a big group of people that
will -- if they take the pay phones out, they won't have
any way of making a phone call because they can't use a
cell phone right now.

So what are they going to do?

We're potentially dealing with a kind of universal access issue where it may not be very profitable for those companies to keep the pay phones there, but if you take the pay phones out then you're disenfranchising a group of people.

And also in the areas, it could be that the person -- I'm talking about the group of people that can't use them because of interference with their hearing aids.

But what about people who can't afford them?

I mean, it doesn't only impact people with disabilities.

It impacts people with low incomes, it impacts other groups as well.

I'm using it as an example to say we really have to find a solution to the hearing aid

compatibility problem.

It's a double problem.

Is it the hearing aid compatibility

issue or the disappearance of pay phones?

Which one.

It's both.

Both.

Yes.

I mean, we need -- it's a double issue here.

Guys, let's try not to talk over each other.

I saw that Bob had his hand up first and then we'll go to David.

We're still waiting for tape.

Rather than -- rather than hold you up we'll hold them up.

I want to wait for Bob really quickly because he has a comment to make.

Which ones we can consolidate?

Yeah.

You hold that one.

You hold this.

You can see them all at the same time.

I don't think that people would be able

to understand my handwriting.

I just want --

The number three, it should be honest appraisal of Section 255.

So I wanted to ask Bob, do you want to still make a comment?

Let's hear from Bob first.

I want to reinforce what Brenda said about the pay phones disappearing because it is also difficult for people with speech disabilities or other disabilities sometimes to hold a cell phone and it's easier for them to hold a pay phone handle.

Thank you.

And David, did you still have a comment?

Basically reinforce the telephone issue.

The reason the pay phone issue came up is because there are two problems with the reduction of the number of pay phones as they disappear.

One is that, you know, there are other people with disabilities that have problems with them --

have problems with cell phones and the other is that a

pay phone may be the only means of someone having access

either at all or in situations where they really need

access.

OK.

Thank you.

We're going to go on with reading this.

Would you rewrite Number 9?

It should say -- identify the providers

technology versus the needs of the consumers.

OK.

What I understood from that was

matching -- making sure you match what's coming out.

What's available respecting the

confidentiality issue and not even getting into future

technology but just dealing with what we know now.

Taking what's available from such an

expert group and matching them to the needs of the

consumer group.

OK.

Good first place to start.

Taking what's available now and matching it as best we can and with the kind of good input that we can get from this many -- with the different types of disabilities.

OK.

I think we really need to, in the interest of time, move on to reading through these.

I guess what I'll do is Maricela, do you want to read it since you wrote it?

If you will grab a microphone, I think that one will reach, and read them out for us.

What I'm going to do is read them all.

And then we're going to go and do the multi- --

I think what we want to do is read them all and then as you read them, if people have suggestions about how a few of them can be combined if possible, that would be great.

And then we're going to vote.

Judith, do you --

Could you add a word for number one?

Functionally equivalent, unquote, to number one.

Say that one more time?

Add the word define, quote, functionally equivalent.

Unquote.

OK.

With quotation marks.

In quotes.

Thank you.

So the first one is define functionality equivalent functionally equivalent.

The second one is T.R.S. national advertisements -- advertising.

The third one is honest appraisal to Section 255.

The fourth one is better understanding of 255.

The fifth one is better access to basic network functionality.

The sixth one is quality assurance.

Clear definition and measurements of all definitions.

Does that make sense?

Number four was actually the complaint educating consumers about filing complaints for 255.

Better understanding of the complaint mechanism.

Better understanding of the --

Complaint mechanism.

Basically there haven't been many complaints and we just know that everybody out there is not satisfied.

It just doesn't add up.

I propose that under -- I think it was Number 5, the definition standards, is it Number 5?

Number 5 is better access to basic network functionality.

The one that Pam brought up with definitions, definitions and standards, I propose that

that be combined with number one, if Judith agrees that

number one is a definition issue and basically we need

better definitions all around.

       I think if we use the -- the one that you

had and just make sure that we include better

definitions and --

       I think they're separate issues.

       Yeah.

       What Judy was referring to is the word

functionally equivalent.

       What Paul was referring to was basic

service.

       I'm on the wrong one?

       I'm not talking about Paul's

suggestion.

       I'm talking about I think it was Pam's.

       Oh, OK.

       Said that there needed to be better

definitions in general and so I was recommending that

Judith in that one category.

       So I think if we copy yours, in fact you

may not even need to rewrite it, that we just put

Judith's under yours, Pam.

We're going to rewrite them.

Why don't we just say clear definitions for our vocabulary and measurements.

Is that OK?

I can tell you what I meant.

You have to decide that the term functionally equivalent -- I take it to mean that I would be able to use a telephone and be able to deal with it the same thing I would if I could speak.

But in some parts of the FCC rules it's taken to just mean that I can use relay service and that's not what I mean by functionally equivalent.

I want to have tone of voice because I can hear it, I will know what the person's feelings are behind the words and so forth.

I have a definition that I would be glad to share with anyone.

So you're specifically concerned about that definition.

Yes.

I think it has broad application.

I mean, like captioned television provides the same benefits that being able to hear the television that using pay phones or other technology that's

governed by FCC rules and regulations allows a person with disability to have the same benefits than people without disability.

So I think for time let's just keep it instead of rewriting it --

Judy --

Why don't you write especially functionally equivalent.

Especially functionally equivalent.

Instead of especially, can you say examples, i.e.?

There are others two.

I asked for better definition of telecommunication services.

We can make a little list at the top.

And products.

I think we can also continue the list

of the definitions that may need better -- or may need

clarification when we get on the list and I think the

number one right now could be Judy's suggestion of

functional equivalent.

Is that OK?

You need an "N" in functional.

I need a spell checker.

I don't have my computer here.

I'd like to recognize Ann Marie.

I'm sorry, I don't have a name tag.

I want -- I'm sorry too about the mike.

Breaking all the rules.

To tie things together and help you focus,

I think the whole question of definitions is related to

the review and the assessment of Section 255 of the

Telecom act.

A lot of these terms have first showed up

in the new telecommunications law.

And that is what we are doing.

We're going back to the law, back to the

work that has been done already and taking it a step

further.

We're looking at it and saying is the language in the telecommunications act clear and if it -- if it is clear, is it in fact working.

So the assessment of 255 and all of this list of definitions, that can all be tied together, I think, under one whole issue.

Just a suggestion.

OK.

Thank you.

But functional equivalence comes from --

Would someone turn on Brenda's mike?

We're talking about a definition from Title 4 of the A.D.A.

We're not talking about a definition from Section 255 here.

Functional equivalence is a definition in Title 4 of the A.D.A. here.

We're talking about a different law here.

It would not fall under Section 255.

And I think -- I'm sorry, but I agree with Judy, functional equivalence is if you like basically what would determine really what relay is all about.

I think what we need, we need a consumer input into the definition.

And we need to have clear expectations about what functional equivalent means to consumers because there's a mismatch right now about what a consumer means by functional equivalent when they use the relay and what the FCC at the moment definition basically says.

And I think it goes at the core of relays.

I think it should be set separately.

I agree with Judith on that.

Pam.

For the sake -- is this on?

For the sake of time I think that what we need to do -- I mean, we realize that and I agree strongly with you but I think we just need to agree to make a subcommittee that deals just with that type of

thing.

All the different wordings in the rulings
that we use and are they clear, why aren't they clear
and how do we need -- what do we have to do to make them
clear.

I think at this point, because we have
10 minutes to come up with all of our priorities and get
through the list, that we need to -- that when we get
hot issues like I think this is an extremely hot issue
for us, that we need to take note of them and perhaps
create an additional subcommittee that works with this
issue specifically and that we need to agree that this
issue needs to be further discussed on our list serve.

Pam.

I have another thing that I can
summarize a couple of these points.

When we talked about teaching people how
to do complaints and there was some things that Julie
talked about.

In addition to advertising we need to have
a group focused on outreach and education and that takes

care of all the customer training, letting them know

what they can complain about, how to complain,

everything.

Are there any disagreements with that?

I think that -- that we can keep the

specific comments but I think that accurately collects

the concerns about not getting enough complaints, people

not knowing, for instance, what telecommunication is and

is not.

I think it also gets also telling people

what they can complain about.

Paul.

I think for the benefit of those who

can't see to read the list that we need to quickly read

through the list.

Let's do that without interruption.

One other consolidation.

One other consolidation might be the

accessibility of emerging technologies and the

accessibility of blue tooth receivers.

David?

Can we put blue tooth under emerging

technologies?

 To explain -- can we get a mike for

David?

 It should be on.

 They just need to turn it up.

 You're on.

 OK.

 The emerging technology one had to do with

the development of -- or the resolution of

infrastructure issues.

 The blue tooth one had to do with

communication using blue tooth.

 It's kind of two different things

actually.

 So maybe we just need to reword the -- put

infrastructure issue resolution instead of emerging

technology.

 Up there.

 OK.

 Why don't I do this, why don't I read

them and whoever's issue it was will interpret then we

can rewrite it.

At least we know that where you wanted to say is on paper.

Let's go ahead and do that.

I'm going to go -- the we're done with the first page so we're going to go to the second page.

Internet relations for phone and media.

Is that OK?

Whoever -- who was the person that -- is that -- OK.

Number 9 is identify providers of technology versus the needs of the consumers.

Is that -- OK, that was OK.

Number 10, technical assistance for consumers.

Is that what -- who said that?

Is that Julie, is that OK?

OK.

Number 11, more technical assistance and guidance.

I think that was yours also, Julie.

Is that OK?

I was thinking we might as well combine them.

Less combine them.

Thank you.

Number 13, creation of standards that allows equipment manufacturers for common ground.

I guess a subset is do we fix the old or just rely -- go forward and rely on the new?

That's an issue facing manufacturers.

Do we fix the old trying to fix what's in place or do we just go forward and try to do -- emerging technologies as the solutions.

Can we maybe just put a parentheses bracket that says old versus new technology, will that -- OK.

We will do that.

Number 14, FCC to consider reimbursements to other kind of telecommunication.

OK.

Number 15, FCC to consider

reimbursements to companies other means of

communication.

So those two should be combined?

Right.

OK.

Those two can be combined.

Number 14 and 15.

OK.

Number 16, to reimburse companies who want

to provide video relay if the company is not a -- is not

a common carrier.

So those three should be combined.

OK.

So 14, 15, and 16 should be combined.

Reimbursing companies that provide

communication services that are not common carriers.

Number 17, better voice access.

Yes, I think you can consolidate

everything under -- just put everything under voice

accessibility.

I think what she's saying is you've got better voice, what you mentioned about all the emerging voice technology, and universal access and the web with voice.

Can you consolidate all that into one?

So consolidate 17 and 18.

Everything with voice.

You could probably consolidate 17, 18, and 19 under universal information access, improving and encouraging it.

Maybe that would cover -- bring all of those together.

Universal access to information and dot, you could maybe put in parentheses, Internet, voice, I'm sure there are a couple of others.

Data.

You have to be careful to use universal access.

It means different things with the FCC

It's a very different concept.

OK.

Then encouraging access to information services?

Encouraging consumer access to information --

Help me out.

How about -- I know that most important to Shelley was voice access.

How about multiple -- or alternative modes of access.

Alternative access.

Alternative access.

How can we indicate -- the voice and the Internet are different manifestations of the same problem.

So how could we indicate those?

Or simply just list them under the same --

Encourage multi-modal access to information.

How does that sound?

And then maybe we can list as examples basic voice as well as Internet, OK?

Can I ask -- can I enlarge for Shelley

here?

Yes.

Part of the problem with voice is a lot
of the things that are coming out to recognize voice and
telecommunications do not recognize imperfect speech and
that is a huge issue.

It's not just universal access of the web
design but it's coming up with things that can recognize
imperfect speech.

So however that can be in there, that's
what she's trying to say.

We could put in parenthesis voice
recognition of -- and then web access.

I mean, they are separate and they do
combine in some ways.

Does that indicate what you were saying?

Speech recognition.

The quality of speech recognition
technologies, would that be under emerging technologies?

It's not a quality issue.

It's a --

Capability.

An availability issue.

OK.

Which is part of web access, that's why
I'm confused.

Yeah.

Improve and encourage multi-modal
access to information, I know you've got voice
recognition, web access, so I think we've got that.

We now have less than a minute.

So I think what we're going to do is
finish reading through this and then we're going --
Larry has suggested we vote on-line.

Will that serve everyone in terms of
prioritizing?

I think it might also help if people
can then clear up what they meant by writing back and
forth to each other.

OK.

Because we're struggling with that

right now.

Maricela, you want to finish?

Let me finish reading.

Number 20, address removing pay phones
because of assumptions everyone is using cell phones.

Number 21, permanent FM frequency
allocation assist tiff living devices and area
description.

Number 22, focus the voice services of
access -- focus to voice services of access -- excuse
me, focus to voice services, investigate and improve

progress of access to enhance services.

Paul, were you the one that was saying
that one?

Yeah.

Investigate the progress and hopefully
improve access to services.

Maybe you can rewrite it.

We got the gist of it.

Number three, the use -- investigating the

use of signaling handicap indicators.

24, exploring access issues with blue tooth technology.

Number 25, accessibility of emerging technology.

Number 26, formal recognition programs from the FCC

And Number 27, research from named companies.

I think what we have, we have the gist of it.

We will send it over the Internet and have you guys, if it's not what you meant, rewrite it.

So thank you all and we will get this on the Internet and we can vote on the priorities.

Thank you.

I think at this point we need to reconvene with the rest of the group.