The Telecommunications Industry Association (“TIA”)\(^1\) hereby submits brief reply comments in response to the Federal Communications Commission’s (“Commission”) Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (“NPRM”),\(^2\) which seeks comment on proposed rules that aim to make emergency information be accessible to individuals who are blind or visually impaired and that certain equipment be capable of delivering video description and emergency information to those individuals.

\(^{1}\) TIA is the leading trade association for the information and communications technology (“ICT”) industry, representing companies that manufacture or supply the products and services used in global communications across all technology platforms. TIA represents its members on the full range of policy issues affecting the ICT industry and forges consensus on industry standards. Among their numerous lines of business, TIA member companies design, produce, and deploy a wide variety of devices with the goal of making technology accessible to all Americans.

individuals pursuant to the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010.\(^3\)

Consistent with our comments submitted already in this matter,\(^4\) we submit this brief reply comment to supplement our first round of comments, related to the definition of the term “apparatus” in its previous Internet protocol (“IP”) closed captioning Order,\(^5\) though the Commission notes that there is a pending Petition for Reconsideration pending from the Consumer Electronics Association (“CEA”).\(^6\) We note our agreement that the definition adopted in the IP Captioning Order should not be applied in this instance, as well as our support for CEA’s assertion that the IP Captioning Order’s reading of Section 203 was overbroad.\(^7\)

We agree that if the Commission concludes that any device that is “built with a video player” and is able to receive or play back “video” is “designed to receive or play back video programming transmitted simultaneously with sound”\(^8\) under Section 203, this would not reflect actual design intent of manufacturers. We also agree that altering proposed Sections 79.105(a) and 79.106(a) and the accompanying notes to paragraph (a) in each section by replacing “video


\(^7\) See Comments of CEA, MB Docket No. 12-107 (filed Dec. 18, 2012) at 7-8 (“CEA Comments”).

\(^8\) See NPRM at ¶ 33; see also IP Closed Captioning Order at 842 ¶ 95 (2012).
player” with “video programming player” would correctly define the scope of apparatus
designed to receive or play back video programming.
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