## § 76.1001

(m) Terrestrial cable programming vendor. The term "terrestrial cable programming vendor" means a person engaged in the production, creation, or wholesale distribution for sale of terrestrial cable programming, but does not include a satellite broadcast programming vendor or a satellite cable programming vendor.

[58 FR 27670, May 11, 1993, as amended at 61 FR 28708, June 5, 1996; 64 FR 67197, Dec. 1, 1999; 69 FR 72046, Dec. 10, 2004; 75 FR 9723, Mar. 3, 2010]

## § 76.1001 Unfair practices generally.

- (a) Unfair practices generally. No cable operator, satellite cable programming vendor in which a cable operator has an attributable interest, or satellite broadcast programming vendor shall engage in unfair methods of competition or unfair or deceptive acts or practices, the purpose or effect of which is to hinder significantly or prevent any multichannel video programming distributor from providing satellite cable programming or satellite broadcast programming to subscribers or consumers.
- (b) Unfair practices involving terrestrial cable programming and terrestrial cable programming vendors. (1) The phrase "unfair methods of competition or unfair or deceptive acts or practices" as used in paragraph (a) of this section includes, but is not limited to, the following:
- (i) Any effort or action by a cable operator that has an attributable interest in a terrestrial cable programming vendor to unduly or improperly influence the decision of such vendor to sell, or unduly or improperly influence such vendor's prices, terms, and conditions for the sale of, terrestrial cable programming to any unaffiliated multichannel video programming distributor
- (ii) Discrimination in the prices, terms, or conditions of sale or delivery of terrestrial cable programming among or between competing cable systems, competing cable operators, or any competing multichannel video programming distributors, or their agents or buying groups, by a terrestrial cable programming vendor that is wholly owned by, controlled by, or under common control with a cable operator or

cable operators, satellite cable programming vendor or vendors in which a cable operator has an attributable interest, or satellite broadcast programming vendor or vendors; except that the phrase does not include the practices set forth in §76.1002(b)(1) through (3). The cable operator or cable operators, satellite cable programming vendor or vendors in which a cable operator has an attributable interest, or satellite broadcast programming vendor or vendors that wholly own or control, or are under common control with, such terrestrial cable programming vendor shall be deemed responsible for such discrimination and any complaint based on such discrimination shall be filed against such cable operator, satellite cable programming vendor, or satellite broadcast programming vendor.

- (iii) Exclusive contracts, or any practice, activity, or arrangement tantamount to an exclusive contract, for terrestrial cable programming between a cable operator and a terrestrial cable programming vendor in which a cable operator has an attributable interest.
- (2) Any multichannel video programming distributor aggrieved by conduct described in paragraph (b)(1) of this section that it believes constitutes a violation of paragraph (a) of this section may commence an adjudicatory proceeding at the Commission to obtain enforcement of the rules through the filing of a complaint. The complaint shall be filed and responded to in accordance with the procedures specified in §76.7, as modified by §76.1003, with the following additions or changes:
- (i) The defendant shall answer the complaint within forty-five (45) days of service of the complaint, unless otherwise directed by the Commission.
- (ii) The complainant shall have the burden of proof that the defendant's alleged conduct described in paragraph (b)(1) of this section has the purpose or effect of hindering significantly or preventing the complainant from providing satellite cable programming or satellite broadcast programming to subscribers or consumers. An answer to such a complaint shall set forth the defendant's reasons to support a finding

## **Federal Communications Commission**

that the complainant has not carried this burden.

(iii) A complainant alleging that a terrestrial cable programming vendor has engaged in conduct described in paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section shall have the burden of proof that the terrestrial cable programming vendor is wholly owned by, controlled by, or under common control with a cable operator or cable operators, satellite cable programming vendor or vendors in which a cable operator has an attributable interest, or satellite broadcast programming vendor or vendors. An answer to such a complaint shall set forth the defendant's reasons to support a finding that the complainant has not carried this burden.

[75 FR 9723, Mar. 3, 2010]

## § 76.1002 Specific unfair practices prohibited.

- (a) Undue or improper influence. No cable operator that has an attributable interest in a satellite cable programming vendor or in a satellite broadcast programming vendor shall unduly or improperly influence the decision of such vendor to sell, or unduly or improperly influence such vendor's prices, terms and conditions for the sale of, satellite cable programming or satellite broadcast programming to any unaffiliated multichannel video programming distributor.
- (b) Discrimination in prices, terms or conditions. No satellite cable programming vendor in which a cable operator has an attributable interest, or satellite broadcast programming vendor, shall discriminate in the prices, terms, and conditions of sale or delivery of satellite cable programming or satellite broadcast programming among or between competing cable systems, competing cable operators, or any competing multichannel video programming distributors. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall preclude:
- (1) The imposition of reasonable requirements for creditworthiness, offering of service, and financial stability and standards regarding character and technical quality;

NOTE 1: Vendors are permitted to create a distinct class or classes of service in pricing based on credit considerations or financial stability, although any such distinctions

must be applied for reasons for other than a multichannel video programming distributor's technology. Vendors are not permitted to manifest factors such as creditworthiness or financial stability in price differentials if such factors are already taken into account through different terms or conditions such as special credit requirements or payment guarantees.

NOTE 2: Vendors may establish price differentials based on factors related to offering of service, or difference related to the actual service exchanged between the vendor and the distributor, as manifested in standardly applied contract terms based on a distributor's particular characteristics or willingness to provide secondary services that are reflected as a discount or surcharge in the programming service's price. Such factors include, but are not limited to, penetration of programming to subscribers or to particular systems; retail price of programming to the consumer for pay services; amount and type of promotional or advertising services by a distributor; a distributor's purchase of programming in a package or a la carte: channel position; importance of location for non-volume reasons; prepayment discounts; contract duration; date of purchase, especially purchase of service at launch; meeting competition at the distributor level; and other legitimate factors as standardly applied in a technology neutral fashion.

(2) The establishment of different prices, terms, and conditions to take into account actual and reasonable differences in the cost of creation, sale, delivery, or transmission of satellite cable programming, satellite broadcast programming, or terrestrial cable programming:

NOTE: Vendors may base price differentials, in whole or in part, on differences in the cost of delivering a programming service to particular distributors, such as differences in costs, or additional costs, incurred for advertising expenses, copyright fees, customer service, and signal security. Vendors may base price differentials on cost differences that occur within a given technology as well as between technologies. A price differential for a program service may not be based on a distributor's retail costs in delivering service to subscribers unless the program vendor can demonstrate that subscribers do not or will not benefit from the distributor's cost savings that result from a lower programming price.

(3) The establishment of different prices, terms, and conditions which take into account economies of scale,