

TSR Prerecorded Call Prohibition & Call Abandonment Standard Modification,  
Project No. R411001

1. Yes, the Commission should include an elicited prohibition of prerecorded telemarketing calls in the TSR
2. Yes, as a consumer, I think prerecorded sales pitches & charitable solicitations are abusive to my privacy. I pay for the privilege of having phone service and do not appreciate having my line tied up or my time wasted with unsolicited requests for my money
3. The consumer's choice not to list his or her phone number on the Do Not Call Registry does not indicate that he or she is willing to receive telemarketing calls, live & prerecorded. Most likely, it is due to a consumer's ignorance that the option is available and how to go about getting on the list.
4. Yes, the rule should specify disclosures that must be made when obtaining a consumer's express written consent to receiving any kind of telemarketing calls. The disclosure should not be in small print or mixed in with a large amount of text. It should be on the front of a document, at the top, and in at least the largest font used for other text contained therein. Disguising the consent form amongst an entry form for a contest fools people into thinking that the purpose of their consent is for winning a prize, not getting telemarketing solicitations. The disclosure should be visible and the purpose for the signature should be obvious
5. By not applying the safe harbor requirements to calls left on answering machines, a consumer's privacy is compromised. Recordings can fill up a voice mail system pretty fast, especially during election times, and by monopolizing the phone's functionality with unsolicited information, telemarketers are effectively depriving consumers of the use of their phone.
6. Prerecorded messages left on answering machines are more intrusive than those answered by a person. A person can hang up on a recording. The answering machine keeps recording and ties up the line even longer, often cutting off the first portion of the recording, and the call takes up space which could be used for more pertinent calls.
7. Consumers are unlikely to see any benefits from allowing telemarketers to leave prerecorded as opposed to live messages on their answering machines. Both are bothersome. But often the recording does not know when to begin playing because it just starts in after a second or two and the answering machine greeting is still playing. So the result is often incomprehensible gibberish.
8. Companies who do not have to apply the safe harbor limit to answering machines will presumably target more voice mail systems. It would be cheaper and easier, but the negative effects on consumers would increase. It would have an effect of penalizing consumers who do not answer the phone when telemarketers call. This would be a lose-lose situation for consumers.
9. The 30-day standard, if adopted, should apply to each campaign separately. If the campaign is less than 30 days, it should conform to the 3% by average.

10. If the telemarketer only has to meet the 30-day standard averaged over all of its campaigns, the standard would be easier for larger companies with more campaigns and larger campaigns. It would also allow some campaigns to have a much higher rate of call abandonment. This would negatively affect uniformity in the industry.

11-15 refer to telemarketer technology and small business effects, of which I have no knowledge.