Federal Communications Commission

the use of caller identification manipulation.

(c) A person or entity that blocks or seeks to block a caller identification service from transmitting or displaying that person or entity's own caller identification information pursuant to §64.1601(b) of this part shall not be liable for violating the prohibition in paragraph (a) of this section. This paragraph (c) does not relieve any person or entity that engages in telemarketing, as defined in §64.1200(f)(10) of this part, of the obligation to transmit caller identification information under §64.1601(e).

[76 FR 43205, July 20, 2011]

§ 64.1605 Effective date.

The provisions of §§ 64.1600 and 64.1602 are effective April 12, 1995. The provisions of §§ 64.1601 and 64.1603 are effective December 1, 1995, except §§ 64.1601 and 64.1603 do not apply to public payphones and partylines until January 1, 1997.

[60 FR 29491, June 5, 1995; 60 FR 54449, Oct. 24, 1995. Redesignated at 76 FR 43205, July 20, 20111

Subpart Q—Implementation of Section 273(d)(5) of the Communications Act: Dispute Resolution Regarding Equipment Standards

Source: 61 FR 24903, May 17, 1996, unless otherwise noted.

§64.1700 Purpose and scope.

The purpose of this subpart is to implement the Telecommunications Act of 1996 which amended the Communications Act by creating section 273(d)(5), 47 U.S.C. 273(d)(5). Section 273(d) sets forth procedures to be followed by nonaccredited standards development organizations when these organizations set industry-wide standards and generic requirements for telecommunications equipment or customer premises equipment. The statutory procedures allow outside parties to fund and participate in setting the organization's standards and require the organization and the parties to develop a process for resolving any technical disputes. In cases where all parties cannot agree to a mutually satisfactory dispute resolution process, section 273(d)(5) requires the Commission to prescribe a dispute resolution process.

§64.1701 Definitions.

For purposes of this subpart, the terms accredited standards development organization, funding party, generic requirement, and industry-wide have the same meaning as found in 47 U.S.C. 273.

§64.1702 Procedures.

If a non-accredited standards development organization (NASDO) and the funding parties are unable to agree unanimously on a dispute resolution process prior to publishing a text for comment pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 273(d)(4)(A)(v), a funding party may use the default dispute resolution process set forth in section 64.1703.

§64.1703 Dispute resolution default process.

- (a) Tri-Partite Panel. Technical disputes governed by this section shall be resolved in accordance with the recommendation of a three-person panel, subject to a vote of the funding parties in accordance with paragraph (b) of this section. Persons who participated in the generic requirements or standards development process are eligible to serve on the panel. The panel shall be selected and operate as follows:
- (1) Within two (2) days of the filing of a dispute with the NASDO invoking the dispute resolution default process, both the funding party seeking dispute resolution and the NASDO shall select a representative to sit on the panel;
- (2) Within four (4) days of their selection, the two panelists shall select a neutral third panel member to create a tri-partite panel;
- (3) The tri-partite panel shall, at a minimum, review the proposed text of the NASDO and any explanatory material provided to the funding parties by the NASDO, the comments and any alternative text provided by the funding party seeking dispute resolution, any relevant standards which have been established or which are under development by an accredited-standards development organization, and any comments submitted by other funding parties;