Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of	
Closed Captioning of Video Programming	CG Docket No. 05-231
Telecommunications for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Inc. Petition for Rulemaking	
Delete, Delete, Delete	GN Docket No. 25-133

REPORT AND ORDER

Adopted: August 21, 2026 **Released: August 26, 2026**

By the Commission: Chairman Carr issuing a statement.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Today, we remove a costly and unnecessary regulatory burden hanging over thousands of citizens and organizations that create locally owned and locally watched video programming for public, educational, and governmental access (PEG) channels.[1] Specifically, we exempt these PEG video programmers from the requirement to register with the Federal Communications Commission (Commission) and to certify captioning compliance if the PEG video programmers provide video programming exclusively to PEG channels that are exempt from closed captioning requirements. Additionally, providers of PEG programming are relieved of filing obligations if the administrators of non-exempt PEG channels certify compliance for programming carried on such channels. We similarly exempt providers of programming carried on nonbroadcast networks for distribution by a cable operator or other multichannel video programming distributor (MVPD) from certifying when the nonbroadcast network itself certifies that it is exempt or that all programming comprising the network's linear line-up is either exempt from or compliant with the closed captioning rules. Once these amended rules become effective, cable operators and other video programming distributors will also be relieved of the obligation to use "best efforts" to obtain caption quality certifications from video programmers.[2]

II. BACKGROUND

2. Section 713 of the Communications Act (the Act) directs the Commission to ensure that video programming is fully accessible through the provision of closed captioning.[3] All new, non-exempt English- and Spanish-language video programming, and 75 percent of non-exempt pre-rule video

[1] 47 U.S.C. § 613(b).

[2] *See* 47 CFR § 79.1(j)(1).

[3] 47 U.S.C. § 613(b). The Act defines "video programming" to mean "programming by, or generally considered comparable to programming provided by a television broadcast station, but not including consumer-generated media [as defined at 47 U.S.C. § 153(14)]." *Id.* § 613(h)(2). The Commission's rules define "video programming" as "[p]rogramming provided by, or generally considered comparable to programming provided by, a television broadcast station that is distributed and exhibited for residential use," including advertisements of more than five minutes in duration but not advertisements of five minutes' duration or less. 47 CFR § 79.1(a)(10).

programming, must be captioned.[4] Video programming or a video programming provider is exempt from the Commission's captioning rules if it (1) falls into one of twelve categorical, i.e., self-implementing, exemptions,[5] or (2) the provider has been granted an individual exemption from the closed captioning obligations after showing that providing captions would be economically burdensome.[6] Captioning exemptions may apply on a channel-wide or program-by-program basis.[7]

3. The Commission initially assigned primary responsibility for the provision of closed captioning on television programming to video programming distributors (VPDs).[8] In 2014, the Commission amended its television captioning rules to add requirements governing the quality of captions.[9] The Commission allows a VPD to satisfy in part its obligations under the captioning quality rules by ensuring that each video programmer whose programming it carries has certified its compliance with the Commission's closed captioning rules.[10] Pending the implementation of caption quality certifications by video programmers, VPDs are required to use "best efforts" to obtain certifications of caption quality compliance from their programming suppliers.[11]

4. In the February 2016 *Closed Captioning Responsibilities Order*,[12] the Commission took further steps of: (1) placing captioning obligations on video programmers,[13] as well as VPDs; and (2)

---

[4] 47 CFR § 79.1(b). "Pre-rule video programming" is defined as analog video programming first shown before January 1, 1998, and digital video programming first shown before July 1, 2002. *Id.* § 79.1(a)(8).

[5] *Id.* § 79.1(d) (listing exemptions adopted pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 613(d)(1)). A provider relying on a categorical exemption must be prepared to document the basis for the exemption in response to a complaint. *See* 47 CFR § 79.1(g)(6).

[6] *See* 47 U.S.C. § 613(d)(3); 47 CFR § 79.1(f). The Commission's rules define a video programming provider as any "video programming distributor and any other entity that provides video programming that is intended for distribution to residential households including, but not limited to broadcast or nonbroadcast television network and the owners of such programming." *Id.* § 79.1(a)(13).

[7] *See, e.g.*, *Closed Captioning and Video Description of Video Programming*; *Implementation of Section 305 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*; *Video Programming Accessibility*, MM Docket No. 95-176, Report and Order, 13 FCC Rcd 3272, 3364, para. 200 (1997) (*1997 Closed Captioning Report and Order*), *recon. granted in part*, 13 FCC Rcd 19973 (1998); *see also* 47 CFR § 79.1(f)(1) (noting that exemption petitions may be filed by video programming providers, producers, or owners and "[e]xemptions may be granted, in whole or in part, for a channel of video programming").

[8] *1997 Closed Captioning Report and Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 3286-87, paras. 27-29. A VPD is "[a]ny television broadcast station licensed by the Commission and any multichannel video programming distributor . . . and any other distributor of video programming for residential reception that delivers such programming directly to the home and is subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission." 47 CFR § 79.1(a)(11). *See also Closed Captioning of Video Programming*; *Telecommunications for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Inc., Petition for Rulemaking*, CG Docket No. 05-231, Second Report and Order, 31 FCC Rcd 1469, 1484-86, paras. 28-31 (2016) (*Closed Captioning Responsibilities Order*).

[9] *Closed Captioning of Video Programming*; *Telecommunications for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Inc., Petition for Rulemaking*, CG Docket No. 05-231, Report and Order, Declaratory Ruling, and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 29 FCC Rcd 2221 (2014) (*Closed Captioning Quality Order*).

[10] 47 CFR § 79.1(j)(1).

[11] *Id.*

[12] *Closed Captioning Responsibilities Order*, 31 FCC Rcd at 1492-93, para. 42.

[13] A video programmer is "[a]ny entity that provides video programming that is intended for distribution to residential households including, but not limited to, broadcast or nonbroadcast television networks and the owners of such programming." 47 CFR § 79.1(a)(9).

apportioning responsibility for caption quality between VPDs and video programmers.[14] In addition, to ensure that video programmers can be held accountable for satisfying their captioning obligations, the Commission adopted requirements for each video programmer to register with the Commission[15] and certify compliance with the captioning rules.[16] Video programmers are required to register and submit certifications of compliance to the Commission once a compliance date is published in the Federal Register.[17]

5. In a petition filed in August 2016, the Alliance for Community Media (ACM) requested that the closed captioning registration and certification requirements be waived for program producers that provide programs exclusively to PEG channels.[18] PEG channels are authorized by section 611 of the Act, which permits cable franchising authorities to "establish requirements in a franchise with respect to designation or use of channel capacity for public, educational, or governmental use."[19] According to ACM, PEG programming is provided by more than 1.2 million volunteers and more than 250,000 community groups across the United States, including "ordinary citizens and organizations—Cub Scouts, gospel choirs, political candidates, and community groups of every possible type,"[20] and the vast majority of PEG channels are exempt from the Commission's captioning rules.[21]

6. In comments on the ACM Petition, NCTA raised related concerns as to the need for owners of programs included in linear program networks distributed by MVPDs to register and certify compliance with the captioning rules.[22] NCTA reasoned that the programmer certification requirement was intended to address a potential gap in captioning responsibility in cases where owners of video

---

[14] *Closed Captioning Responsibilities Order*, 31 FCC Rcd at 1478-84, paras. 17-26; 47 CFR § 79.1(j)(1), (3).

[15] 47 CFR § 79.1(i)(3) (requiring video programmers to file contact information, including the name, title or office, telephone number, fax number (if applicable), postal mailing address, and email address of a person with primary responsibility for addressing captioning issues and ensuring compliance with the Commission's rules); *Closed Captioning Responsibilities Order*, 31 FCC Rcd at 1510-14, paras. 79-84 ("[W]e require video programmers to file their contact information through a web form located on the Commission's web site for the handling of written closed captioning complaints by the Commission and by VPDs, and as required for VPDs, to update such information within ten business days of any changes.").

[16] 47 CFR § 79.1(m); *Closed Captioning Responsibilities Order*, 31 FCC Rcd at 1488-91, paras. 36-40 (stating that each video programmer shall submit to the Commission a certification that its programming (1) provides closed captioning in compliance with the Commission's rules *and* (2) either complies with the caption quality standards of 47 CFR § 79.1(j)(2) or adheres to the Best Practices for video programmers set forth in 47 CFR § 79.1(k)(1)).

[17] *See* 47 CFR § 79.1(m)(5) (providing that the Commission will publish a notice in the Federal Register announcing the compliance date for the video programmer certification requirements); *id.* § 79.1(i)(3)(ii) (providing that the compliance date for section 79.1(m) also will apply to the video programmer registration requirements).

[18] *See* ACM Petition for Waiver of Registration and Certification Requirement, CG Docket No. 05-231, at 1 (filed Aug. 26, 2016), https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/10825083956243/1 (ACM Petition).

[19] 47 U.S.C. § 531(a). *Public* access channels are available for the general public's use and typically are administered either by a cable operator or by a third party designated by the franchising authority. Programming time on *educational* access channels is typically allocated among local schools, colleges, and universities by the franchising authority or the cable operator. *Governmental* access channels generally are controlled by local governments, which use these channels for governmental programming in their jurisdictions. FCC, *Public, Educational, and Governmental Access Channels*, https://www.fcc.gov/media/public-educational-and-governmental-access-channels-peg-channels (last visited June 8, 2026).

[20] *See PEG Further Notice*, 39 FCC Rcd at 8350-51, para. 8 (citing ACM Petition at 1-2).

[21] *See* ACM Petition at 2 & n.3.

[22] NCTA Comments at 1, 3 (rec. Feb. 9, 2017).

programming may distribute programming to third parties; and no such gap arises when the non-broadcast network itself certifies compliance with the captioning rules.[23]

7. In July 2024, the Commission released a Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (*PEG Further Notice*),[24] proposing that the filing requirements under the closed captioning and certification rules would not apply to video programmers that provide video programming exclusively to a PEG channel for which the channel administrator certifies that the channel is exempt from the closed captioning requirements.[25] In addition, the Commission proposed that captioning registration and certifications shall not apply to programming carried on nonbroadcast networks for distribution by a cable operator or other MVPD, if the network itself certifies that it is exempt or that all programming comprising the network's linear line-up is either exempt from or compliant with the closed caption rules.[26] A number of comments and replies were filed in response to the *PEG Further Notice*.[27]

8. In the 2025 *Delete, Delete, Delete* proceeding, several industry stakeholders urged the Commission to complete implementation of the rules adopted in 2016,[28] emphasizing that it will relieve cable operators and other video programming distributors from the regulatory burden of having to make best efforts to obtain compliance certifications from video programmers.

[23] NCTA Comments at 3 (further maintaining that "to require in addition certification from each program licensed for airing on that network would impose needless paperwork obligations on the numerous suppliers that contribute to the thousands of hours of programming shown daily on hundreds of non-broadcast networks").

[24] *Closed Captioning of Video Programming*; *Telecommunications for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Inc. Petition for Rulemaking*, CG Docket No. 05-231, Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 39 FCC Rcd 8348 (2024) (*PEG Further Notice*). The impetus for the *PEG Further Notice* was the ACM Petition, https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/10825083956243/1. The Commission deferred ruling on the petition until the completion of this rulemaking. *PEG Further Notice*, 39 FCC Rcd at 8352-3, para. 11. Because the changes being adopted in this Report and Order resolves ACM's petition, we are dismissing ACM's petition as moot.

[25] The term "administrator" refers to any entity that is competent to file a certification regarding all the programming on a PEG channel. *PEG Further Notice*, 39 FCC Rcd at 8352-53, para. 11. Such an entity, for example, might be a cable operator, a public access channel administrator designated by the franchising authority, an educational institution, or a local government body. *Id.*

[26] *PEG Further Notice*, 39 FCC Rcd at 8355, para. 16.

[27] NCTA – The Internet & Television Association (NCTA) Comments; Wisconsin Department of Health Services, Office for Promotion of Independent Living (OPIL) Comments; One Ministries, Inc. (OMI) Comments; National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors (NATOA) Reply Comments; Alliance for Community Media (ACM) Reply Comments; City of Boston, Massachusetts, City of Worcester, Massachusetts, Texas Coalition of Cities for Utility Issues, Howard County, Maryland, City of Bowie, Maryland (Local Governments) Reply Comments.

[28] Comments of ACA Connects, GN Docket No. 23-133, at 18 (filed Apr. 11, 2025), https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/10411614902430/1; Comments of U.S. Chamber of Commerce, GN Docket No. 23-133, at 9 (filed Apr. 11, 2025), https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/10411184024497/1. Although accessibility organizations did not file comments on the *PEG Further Notice*, they supported the 2016 ACM Petition and stated they did not object to the requirement that video programmers register and submit certifications of compliance to the Commission once a compliance date is published in the Federal Register. Comments of Telecommunications for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Inc. (TDI) et al. at 3 (filed Feb. 9, 2017) (Accessibility Organizations 2017 Comments), https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/102091327006936/1; TDIforAccess, Inc., Communication Service for the Deaf, Deaf Equality, the Hearing Loss Association of America, the American Foundation for the Blind, and the American Council of the Blind (Accessibility Organizations) Reply, GN Docket No. 25-133, at 16 (rec. Apr. 29, 2025), https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/1042814359780/1. We hereby incorporate all relevant comments and *ex parte* presentations in GN Docket No. 25-133 into this docket. Commenters need not resubmit material previously filed in those proceedings.

III. DISCUSSION

A. Registration and Certification – PEG Channels

9. *Exempt PEG Channels*. We amend our rules to provide that video programmers providing programming exclusively to PEG channels are not required to register with the Commission and file certifications of compliance if the PEG channel administrators certify that the entire channels are exempt (e.g., because they yield less than $3 million annually or fall within another categorical exemption).[29] Requiring each of thousands of individual video programmers to certify to the same exemptions claimed by their channel administrators imposes duplicative and needlessly burdensome paperwork.[30] Where the PEG channel administrator files the required contact information and a certification attesting to the channel's exemption from the captioning rules, consumers will have access to the information intended by the certification requirement,[31] and the Commission will have sufficient documentation to ensure accountability for compliance with its rules.

10. The record indicates that it is reasonable to expect that the administrators of most exempt PEG channels can certify that the channel is exempt.[32] In instances where a channel administrator does not register and certify, individual video programmers are obligated to comply with the registration and certification requirements.[33]

11. *Non-Exempt PEG Channels*. We further amend the captioning rule to provide that, if a PEG channel is not entirely exempt, video programmers on that channel are not required to register and certify compliance if the channel administrator certifies that all programming carried on the channel is either compliant or exempt. Although it seems that there are few, if any, non-exempt PEG channels,[34] we conclude that the same rationale for allowing administrators to certify for exempt PEG channels is applicable to non-exempt channels—i.e., to the extent that the administrator can certify on behalf of the entire channel, such certification will avoid imposing needless, duplicative paperwork on video programmers.[35] In instances where a channel administrator does not register and certify, individual video programmers retain their obligations to comply with the registration and certification requirements.[36]

12. *Effect on Caption Quality*. We sought comment about whether, and if so how, the proposed rule amendments would affect the quality of closed captioning on exempt and non-exempt PEG channels.[37] Commenters addressing this question generally agree that removing these paperwork burdens

---

[29] *See Appendix B*, Final Rules (adding 47 CFR § 79.1(i)(4), (m)(6)); *see also* 47 CFR § 79.1(d) (listing the closed captioning exemptions); *1997 Closed Captioning Report and Order*, 13 FCC Rcd 3272, 3364, para. 200 (1997) (explaining that exemptions may apply on a channel-wide or program-by-program basis). *See supra* note 5.

[30] *See* Local Governments Reply Comments at 10; ACM Reply Comments at 2-3.

[31] *See* 47 CFR § 79.1(i) (requiring the submission of specified contact information); *id*. § 79.1(m)(3) (requiring that certifications claiming exemption from captioning must specify each category of exemption claimed).

[32] *See*, *e.g.*, Local Governments Reply Comments at 11.

[33] 47 CFR § 79.1 (i)(3), (m).

[34] *See* ACM Petition at 2 & n.3; ACM Reply Comments at 3; Local Governments Reply Comments at 4-5; NATOA Reply at 2.

[35] *See* Local Governments Reply Comments at 3-4 ("Local Governments believe the justifications for allowing exempt PEG channel administrators to certify compliance on a channel-wide basis would apply equally to non-exempt channels").

[36] *See PEG Further Notice*, 39 FCC Rcd at 8354, para. 13.

[37] *PEG Further Notice*, 39 FCC Rcd at 8355, para. 15. In their prior comments on the 2016 ACM Petition, the Accessibility Organizations noted that exempting PEG channels "could risk unintended consequences for caption quality" and urged the Commission to "account carefully for this possibility in any educational efforts [the Commission] undertake[s] if an exemption is granted." Accessibility Organizations 2017 Comments at 2.

on programmers will not impact caption quality.[38] We concur. As explained in the *PEG Further Notice*, these rule changes do not alter any video programmer's substantive captioning obligations.[39] Programming that is exempt from captioning will continue to be exempt, and providers of non-exempt programming will continue to be required to provide captioning. The amended rules also do not change the requirement that certifications of compliance or exemption be filed for all programming carried on PEG channels. They merely minimize unnecessary and duplicative paperwork. By ensuring that neither PEG programmers nor agency staff are burdened with unnecessary paperwork, we make implementation of the rules more efficient, and thereby advance the Commission's overarching goal of ensuring that all non-exempt programming is captioned in compliance with the Commission's standards. Therefore, we find today's action to be fully consistent with the Commission's longstanding commitment to ensure the accessibility of video programming through the provision of closed captioning.[40]

B. Nonbroadcast Network Programming

13. Under FCC captioning rules, nonbroadcast networks are "video programmers"[41] and must register with the Commission and annually certify either that the network itself is exempt or that each of the programs comprising its channel line-up is compliant with (or exempt from) the captioning rules.[42] In light of these existing registration and certification requirements for nonbroadcast networks, we conclude that it would be unnecessarily duplicative for potentially thousands of program owners that supply programming exclusively to nonbroadcast networks to also register and file annual certifications with the Commission for the same programming addressed in the networks' filings.[43]

14. To alleviate this burden, we amend our rules to provide that closed captioning registration and certification requirements will not apply to video programmers that provide or license video programming exclusively to a nonbroadcast network[44] for distribution by a cable operator or other MVPD, if the network has registered and filed a certification with the Commission confirming that either (1) the network itself is exempt or (2) all programming comprising its linear line-up is compliant with or exempt from captioning obligations.[45] However, if a nonbroadcast network does not file a certification,

[38] *See* ACM Reply Comments at 2; Local Governments Reply Comments at 11.

[39] *PEG Further Notice*, 39 FCC Rcd at 8355, para. 15.

[40] *See* OPIL Comments at 1 (recommending that the FCC closely monitor the implementation of these exemptions to ensure that captioning quality remains high).

[41] *See* 47 CFR § 79.1(a)(9) (defining "video programmer" as "[a]ny entity that provides video programming that is intended for distribution to residential households including, but not limited to, broadcast or nonbroadcast television networks and the owners of such programming").

[42] *Id*. § 79.1(i)(3), (m); *Closed Captioning Responsibilities Order*, 31 FCC Rcd at 1488-91, 1510-13, paras. 36-40, 79-83.

[43] NCTA Comments at 1; ACM Reply Comments at 3; Local Governments Reply Comments at 7, 11; NATOA Reply Comments at 3.

[44] Nonbroadcast networks are those networks whose programming is delivered via MVPDs, such as cable systems or satellite services. The term "nonbroadcast networks" includes local and regional cable channels, such as local and regional cable news and sports channels. *See Annual Assessment of the Status of Competition in the Market for the Delivery of Video Programming, Eighteenth Report*, 32 FCC Rcd 568, Appendices C, D (MB 2017). PEG channels are not "nonbroadcast networks."

[45] Under the rules as amended, a food or sports network, for example, will continue to have an obligation to register with the Commission and certify the overall compliance of their programming with the captioning rules—or with applicable exemptions therefrom. 47 CFR § 79.1(i)(3), (m). However, the individual programmers that provide programs shown on these networks—such as baking shows and cooking contests in the case of a food network, and football and baseball games in the case of a sports network—are no longer obligated to make these filings so long as their networks meet their own filing requirements.

each video programmer that provides programming on such network will remain subject to the registration and certification requirements. NCTA explains that nonbroadcast networks "often employ contractual provisions or other mechanisms to hold their suppliers (i.e., program owners) accountable for working with the network to ensure captioning compliance."[46] As requested by NCTA, we clarify that the rules we adopt in this Order are not intended to disturb or interfere with any agreements between programming owners and nonbroadcast networks to ensure captioning compliance.[47]

15. *Multiple Program Networks.* NCTA states that "some companies control multiple program networks that must certify compliance with the captioning rules" and that requiring such companies "to separately register and submit certifications for each program network they own would be duplicative."[48] We direct the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau (CGB or Bureau), pursuant to its delegated authority to oversee the development of a certification and registration form and database,[49] to consider ways to minimize the burden for providers,[50] including providers that control multiple program networks, to submit their registration and certification information in accordance with its obligations under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA)[51] and the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2002.[52]

16. *Applicability to vMVPDs*. A commenter asks the Commission to declare that any procedural matters affecting MVPDs should equally apply to virtual MVPDs (vMVPDs).[53] This is beyond the scope of this proceeding, which concerns the Commission's registration and certification requirements related to closed captioning of televised video programming.[54] In the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act (CVAA), Congress established separate guidelines for traditional television distribution and IP-delivered video programming.[55] We therefore decline to consider this request here.

C. Costs and Benefits

17. Thousands of video programmers provide programming to PEG channels and nonbroadcast networks. Under current rules, once the Commission sets up its database to accept their filings,[56] these programmers must provide contact information and certify that their programming is compliant with the closed captioning rules or exempt from them each year. This Order amends the closed captioning rules so that such programmers need not file this information if the PEG channel administrator

---

[46] NCTA Comments at 2.

[47] *Id*. (requesting the Commission to "clarify that the exemption is not intended to disrupt or interfere with any obligations program owners may owe to program networks").

[48] *Id.* at 3.

[49] 47 CFR § 0.141(c).

[50] NCTA requests that the Commission allow companies that control multiple program networks to register and certify those networks as a group. NCTA Comments at 3.

[51] Pub. L. No. 104-13, 109 Stat 163 (1995) (codified at 44 U.S.C. §§ 3501-3521).

[52] 44 U.S.C. § 3506(c)(4).

[53] *See generally* 47 U.S.C. § 522(13); OMI Comments at 1.

[54] 47 CFR § 79.1. *See generally Promoting Innovation and Competition in the Provision of Multichannel Video Programming Distribution Services*, MB Docket No. 14-261, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 29 FCC Rcd 15995 (2014).

[55] Pub. L. No. 111-260, 124 Stat. 2751 (2010); 47 U.S.C. § 613 (codifying the video programming accessibility requirements).

[56] Currently, video programmers do not file such information because the Commission's website is not yet ready to accept filings. *PEG Further Notice*, 39 FCC Rcd at 8349, para. 6.

or nonbroadcast network itself registers its contact information and certifies channel-wide exemption from or compliance with the closed captioning rules.[57] Because nonbroadcast networks are already required to file this information and certification, we expect they will do so and individual nonbroadcast network programmers will not need to file with the Commission. Further, following this rule change, we expect that PEG channel administrators will provide the information and certification for the entire channel so that individual PEG video programmers will not need to file with the Commission. Making these assumptions, we estimate that about 290,000 programmers[58] would save about 30 minutes of time per year. Using a value of time of about $17 per hour,[59] we estimate that this would save $2.43 million annually. PEG channel administrators, however, would incur the cost of filing contact information and certifying compliance with, or exemption from, the closed captioning rules. We estimate that about 1,700 channel administrators would be required to file contact information and make a certification.[60] Because we expect nearly all PEG channels are exempt from the closed captioning requirements,[61] we expect this will take about 30 minutes annually and will therefore cost about $14,238.[62] Therefore, the net cost savings from this rule change are expected to be $2.41 million. This change is not expected to affect the quality of closed captioning because providers of non-exempt programming would be relieved only from filing requirements, not the underlying obligation to provide captioning in accordance with quality standards.

IV. PROCEDURAL MATTERS

18. *Regulatory Flexibility Act*. The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, as amended (RFA),[63] requires that an agency prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis for notice and comment rulemakings, unless the agency certifies that "the rule will not, if promulgated, have a significant economic impact on a

---

[57] Each PEG channel might have only one or many programmers (i.e., multiple entities contributing programming at different times). A PEG channel administrator (sometimes within the local franchising authority) might oversee a single PEG channel, or more than one, up to all the PEG channels across each cable provider within a given cable service area. Thus, the number of PEG channel administrators is vastly less than the number of PEG channel programmers.

[58] ACM estimates that more than 250,000 community groups create programming for PEG channels. ACM Petition at 1. We estimate that not more than 40,000 programmers provide programming to nonbroadcast networks. With approximately 230 nonbroadcast networks in the United States, if each network aired programming created by a different programmer each hour of the day every week, there would be 38,640 programmers. S&P Capital IQ, *TV Network Summary* (last accessed June 9, 2026).

[59] Based on the Department of Transportation's value of travel time, we estimate value of time as 50% of hourly median income. U.S. Department of Transportation, *Revised Guidance on Valuation of Travel Time in Economic Analysis* (Sept. 27, 2016), https://www.transportation.gov/sites/dot.gov/files/docs/2016%20Revised%20Value%20of%20Travel%20Time%20Guidance.pdf. Hourly median income is calculated as the median hourly wage ($23.11) multiplied by the ratio of mean total compensation to mean wage (1.45). U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, *May 2023 National Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates (Apr. 3, 2024)*, http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_nat.htm. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Employer Costs for Employee Compensation* (June 2023), https://www.bls.gov/web/ecec/ecec-civilian-dataset.xlsx. ($23.11*1.45 = $33.51; $33.51*0.5 = $16.75)

[60] ACM represents over 1,700 PEG access organizations. Alliance for Community Media, *About ACM*, https://www.allcommunitymedia.org/ACM/ACM/About/About_ACM.aspx?hkey=8b949448-ef7d-4d46-ad32-1469482c40f8 (last accessed May 14, 2026).

[61] ACM estimates that the vast majority of PEG channels are exempt from the closed captioning requirements because they do not meet the revenue threshold. ACM Petition at 3, note 3.

[62] 1,700*$16.75*0.5 = $14,237.50.

[63] 5 U.S.C. §§ 601 *et seq*., as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement and Fairness Act (SBREFA), Pub. L. No. 104-121, 110 Stat. 847 (1996).

substantial number of small entities."[64] Accordingly, the Commission has prepared a Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (FRFA) concerning the possible impact of the rule and policy changes contained in this *Report and Order* on small entities. The FRFA is set forth in Appendix C.

19. *Paperwork Reduction Act Analysis*. This document may contain substantively modified information collection requirements subject to the PRA.[65] All such modified information collections will be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review under section 3507(d) of the PRA.[66] OMB, the general public, and other Federal agencies will be invited to comment on the modified information collections contained in this proceeding. In addition, we note that pursuant to the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2002,[67] we previously sought specific comment on how the Commission might further reduce the information collection burden for small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees.[68]

20. *Congressional Review Act*. The Commission has determined, and the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, concurs, that the rule is "non-major" under the Congressional Review Act.[69] The Commission will send a copy of this *Report and Order* to Congress and the Government Accountability Office pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 801(a)(1)(A).

21. *People with Disabilities*. To request materials in accessible formats for people with disabilities (Braille, large print, electronic files, audio format), send an e-mail to fcc504@fcc.gov or call the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at 202-418-0530.

22. *Further Information*. For further information regarding the *Report and Order*, contact Joshua Mendelsohn, CGB, Disability Rights Office, at (202) 559-7304 or Joshua.Mendelsohn@fcc.gov.

V. ORDERING CLAUSES

23. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that, pursuant to sections 4(i), 303(r) and 713 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), 303(r), 613, this Report and Order IS ADOPTED.[70]

24. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the amendments to section 79.1(a) of the Commission's rules as set forth in Appendix B ARE ADOPTED and SHALL BE EFFECTIVE 30 days after publication of this *Report and Order* in the *Federal Register*, except for amendments to section 79.1(i)(4), and (m)(6) which may contain modified information collection requirements, and will not become effective until the Office of Management and Budget completes review of any information collections that the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau determines is required under the Paperwork Reduction Act. The Commission directs the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau to announce the effective date for sections 79.1(i)(4), and (m)(6) by notice in the Federal Register and by subsequent Public Notice.

25. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to sections 4(i), 303(r) and 713 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), 303(r), 613, the Petition for Waiver of

---

[64] *Id.* § 605(b).

[65] Pub. L. No. 104-13, 109 Stat 163 (1995) (codified at 44 U.S.C. §§ 3501-3521).

[66] 44 U.S.C. § 3507(d).

[67] Pub. L. No. 107-198, 116 Stat. 729 (2002); 44 U.S.C. § 3506(c)(4).

[68] *PEG Further Notice*, 39 FCC Rcd at 8361-67, Appx. C.

[69] 5 U.S.C. § 804(2).

[70] Pursuant to Executive Order 14215, 90 Fed. Reg. 10447 (Feb. 24, 2025), this regulatory action has been determined to be not significant under Executive Order 12866, 58 Fed. Reg. 51735 (Oct. 4, 1993).

Registration and Certification Requirement filed by ACM on August 26, 2016, in CG Docket No. 05-231 IS DISMISSED AS MOOT.

26. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Commission's Office of the Secretary, SHALL SEND a copy of this *Report and Order*, including the Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, to the Chief Counsel for the Small Business Administration (SBA) Office of Advocacy.

27. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Office of the Managing Director, Performance Program Management, SHALL SEND a copy of this Report and Order in a report to be sent to Congress and to the Government Accountability Office pursuant to the Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. § 801(a)(1)(A).

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary

APPENDIX A

List of Commenters PEG Further Notice

Initial Comments

NCTA – The Internet & Television Association (NCTA)

One Ministries, Inc. (ONI)

Wisconsin Department of Health Services, Office for Promotion of Independent Living (OPIL)

Reply Comments

Alliance for Community Media (ACM)

City of Boston, Massachusetts, City of Worcester, Massachusetts, Texas Coalition of Cities for Utility Issues, Howard County, Maryland, City of Bowie, Maryland (Coalition of Local Government)

National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors (NATOA)

APPENDIX B

Final Rules

For the reasons discussed in this document, the Federal Communications Commission amends 47 CFR part 79 as follows:

PART 79 – ACCESSIBILITY OF VIDEO PROGRAMMING

1. The authority citation for part 79 continues to read as follows:

AUTHORITY: 47 U.S.C. 151, 152(a), 154(i), 303, 307, 309, 310, 330, 544a, 613, 617.

2. Amend § 79.1 by:

a. Redesignating paragraphs (a)(6) through (a)(13) as paragraphs (a)(7) through (a)(14); and

b. Adding new paragraph (a)(6).

The addition reads as follows:

§ 79.1 Closed captioning of televised video programming.

(a) * * *

(6) *Nonbroadcast Network.* Networks whose programming is delivered via multichannel video programming distributors. Local and regional cable channels are included within the meaning of the term nonbroadcast networks.

* * * * *

3. Delayed indefinitely, amend § 79.1 by adding paragraphs (i)(4) and (m)(6) to read as follows:

§ 79.1 Closed captioning of televised video programming.

* * * * *

(i) * * *

(4) Video programmers shall not be required to file contact information with the Commission pursuant to paragraph (i)(3) of this section if they provide video programming exclusively to a public, educational, or governmental (PEG) access channel, as described in section 531 of title 47 of the United States Code, or a nonbroadcast network, for which the administrator of the PEG access channel or nonbroadcast network has on file with the Commission:

(i) The contact information required by paragraph (i)(3) of this section; and

(ii) A certification pursuant to paragraph (m) of this section attesting to:

(A) An exemption from the captioning rules for the nonbroadcast network or PEG channel itself;

or

(B) Compliance with, or exemption from, the captioning rules for the entire programming line-up of the nonbroadcast network or PEG channel itself.

* * * * *

(m) * * *

(6) Video programmers shall not be required to submit certifications to the Commission pursuant to this paragraph (m) if they provide video programming exclusively to a public, educational, or governmental (PEG) access channel, as described in section 531 of title 47 of the United States Code, or a nonbroadcast network, for which the administrator of the PEG access channel or nonbroadcast network has on file with the Commission:

(i) The contact information required by paragraph (i)(3) of this section; and

(ii) A certification pursuant to this paragraph (m) attesting to:

(A) An exemption from the captioning rules for the nonbroadcast network or PEG channel itself; or

(B) Compliance with, or exemption from, the captioning rules for the entire programming line-up of the nonbroadcast network or PEG channel itself.

APPENDIX C

Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

1. As required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, as amended (RFA),[1] the Federal Communications Commission (Commission) incorporated an Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA) in the *Closed Captioning of Video Programming et al., Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* (*PEG Further Notice*) released in July 2024.[2] The Commission sought written public comment on the proposals in the *PEG Further Notice*, including comment on the IRFA. No comments were filed addressing the IRFA. This Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (FRFA) conforms to the RFA and it (or summaries thereof) will be published in the Federal Register.[3]

A. Need for, and Objectives of, the Rules

2. In the *Report and Order*, the Commission modifies the video programmer registration and certification requirements adopted in the *Closed Captioning Responsibilities Order*, exempting video programmers that (1) provide video programming exclusively to public, educational, and governmental access channels (PEG channels) that are exempt from the provision of closed captioning pursuant to section 79.1(d) or (f) of the Commission's rules or certify compliance with, or exemption from, the closed captioning obligations for all programming shown over the PEG channel itself;[4] or (2) provide or license video programming to nonbroadcast networks for distribution by a cable operator or other MVPD, to the extent that such networks certify that the network itself is exempt or certify compliance with, or exemption from, the closed captioning obligations for all programming comprising the network's linear line-up. The *Report and Order* also ensures that captioning registration and certification requirements do not apply to video programmers with programs carried on non-exempt PEG channels to the extent the channel administrator has the ability to certify that all programming carried on the channel is either compliant or exempt. The revised rules will relieve providers of video programming to cable or other multichannel systems from the obligation to register with the Commission and to certify captioning compliance if the relevant certification has been filed by another competent entity.

B. Summary of Significant Issues Raised by Public Comments in Response to the IRFA

3. No comments were filed addressing the impact of the proposed rules on small entities.

C. Response to Comments by the Chief Counsel for the Small Business Administration Office of Advocacy

4. Pursuant to the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010, which amended the RFA,[5] the Commission is required to respond to any comments filed by the Chief Counsel for the Small Business Administration (SBA) Office of Advocacy, and also to provide a detailed statement of any change made to the proposed rules as a result of those comments.[6] The Chief Counsel did not file any comments in response to the proposed rules in this proceeding.

[1] 5 U.S.C. §§ 601 *et seq*., as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (SBREFA), Pub. L. No. 104-121, Title II, 110 Stat. 857 (1996).

[2] *Closed Captioning of Video Programming*; *Telecommunications for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Inc. Petition for Rulemaking*, CG Docket No. 05-231, Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 39 FCC Rcd 8348, 8361-67, Appx. C (July 18, 2024) (*PEG Further Notice*).

[3] 5 U.S.C. § 604.

[4] 47 CFR § 79.1(d), (f).

[5] Small Business Jobs Act of 2010, Pub. L. No. 111-240, 124 Stat. 2504 (2010).

[6] 5 U.S.C. § 604(a)(3).

D. Description and Estimate of the Number of Small Entities to Which the Rules Will Apply

5. The RFA directs agencies to provide a description of, and where feasible, an estimate of the number of small entities that may be affected by the proposed rule revisions, if adopted.[7] The RFA generally defines the term "small entity" as having the same meaning as the terms "small business," "small organization," and "small governmental jurisdiction."[8] In addition, the term "small business" has the same meaning as the term "small business concern" under the Small Business Act.[9] A "small business concern" is one which: (1) is independently owned and operated; (2) is not dominant in its field of operation; and (3) satisfies any additional criteria established by the SBA.[10] The SBA establishes small business size standards that agencies are required to use when promulgating regulations relating to small businesses; agencies may establish alternative size standards for use in such programs, but must consult and obtain approval from SBA before doing so.[11]

6. Our action may, over time, affect small entities that are not easily categorized at present. We therefore describe three broad groups of small entities that could be directly affected by our actions.[12] In general, a small business is an independent business having fewer than 500 employees.[13] These types of small businesses represent 99.9% of all businesses in the United States, which translates to 34.75 million businesses.[14] Next, "small organizations" are not-for-profit enterprises that are independently owned and operated and are not dominant in their field.[15] While we do not have data regarding the number of non-profits that meet that criteria, over 99 percent of nonprofits have fewer than 500 employees.[16] Finally, "small governmental jurisdictions" are defined as cities, counties, towns, townships, villages, school districts, or special districts with populations of less than fifty thousand.[17] Based on the 2022 U.S. Census of Governments data, we estimate that at least 48,724 out of 90,895 local government jurisdictions have a population of less than 50,000.[18]

[7] *Id.* § 604.

[8] *Id.* § 601(6).

[9] *Id.* § 601(3) (incorporating by reference the definition of "small-business concern" in the Small Business Act, 15 U.S.C. § 632). Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 601(3), the statutory definition of a small business applies "unless an agency, after consultation with the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration and after opportunity for public comment, establishes one or more definitions of such term which are appropriate to the activities of the agency and publishes such definition(s) in the Federal Register."

[10] 15 U.S.C. § 632.

[11] 13 CFR § 121.903.

[12] *See* 5 U.S.C. § 601(3)-(6).

[13] *See* SBA, Office of Advocacy, *Frequently Asked Questions About Small Business* (July 23, 2024), https://advocacy.sba.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/Frequently-Asked-Questions-About-Small-Business_2024-508.pdf.

[14] *Id.*

[15] 5 U.S.C. § 601(4).

[16] *See* SBA, Office of Advocacy, *Small Business Facts, Spotlight on Nonprofits* (July 2019), https://advocacy.sba.gov/2019/07/25/small-business-facts-spotlight-on-nonprofits/.

[17] 5 U.S.C. § 601(5).

[18] *See* U.S. Census Bureau, 2022 Census of Governments – Organization, https://www.census.gov/data/tables/2022/econ/gus/2022-governments.html, tables 1-11.

7. The rules adopted in the *Report and Order* will apply to small entities in the industries identified in the chart below by their six-digit North American Industry Classification System (NAICS)[19] codes and corresponding SBA size standard.[20] Where available, we also provide additional information regarding the number of potentially affected entities in the identified industries below.

Table 1. 2022 U.S. Census Bureau Data by NAICS Code

Regulated Industry (Footnotes specify potentially affected entities within a regulated industry where applicable)	NAICS Code	SBA Size Standard	Total Firms[21]	Total Small Firms[22]	% Small Firms
Motion Picture and Video Production	512110	$40 million	17,547	10,960	62.46%
Motion Picture and Video Distribution	512120	$39 million	474	336	70.89%
Closed Captioning Services - Court Reporting and Stenotype Services	512191	$39 million	3,102	1,540	49.65%
Wired Telecommunications Carriers[23]	517111	1,500 employees	3,403	3,027	88.95%
Closed Captioning Services - Teleproduction and Other Post Production Services	561492	$19 million	2,989	1,680	56.21%

E. Description of Economic Impact and Projected Reporting, Recordkeeping, and Other Compliance Requirements for Small Entities

8. The RFA directs agencies to describe the economic impact of adopted rules on small entities, as well as projected reporting, recordkeeping and other compliance requirements, including an estimate of the classes of small entities which will be subject to the requirement and the type of professional skills necessary for preparation of the report or record.[24]

[19] The North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) is the standard used by Federal statistical agencies in classifying business establishments for the purpose of collecting, analyzing, and publishing statistical data related to the U.S. business economy. *See* www.census.gov/NAICS for further details regarding the NAICS codes identified in this chart.

[20] The size standards in this chart are set forth in 13 CFR § 121.201, by six digit NAICS code.

[21] *U.S. Census Bureau*, "*Selected Sectors: Employment Size of Firms for the U.S.: 2022*." Economic Census, ECN Core Statistics Economic Census: Establishment and Firm Size Statistics for the U.S., Table EC2200SIZEEMPFIRM, 2025, *and* "*Selected Sectors: Sales, Value of Shipments, or Revenue Size of Firms for the U.S.: 2022*." Economic Census, ECN Core Statistics Economic Census: Establishment and Firm Size Statistics for the U.S., Table EC2200SIZEREVFIRM, 2025.

[22] *Id.*

[23] Affected Entities in this industry include Cable Television Distribution Services, Cable Companies and Systems (Rate Regulation), Cable System Operators (Telecom Act Standard), Direct Broadcast Satellite (DBS), Home Satellite Dish (HSD) Service, Open Video Systems, and Satellite Master Antenna Television (SMATV) Systems aka Private Cable Operators (PCOs).

[24] 5 U.S.C. § 604(a)(5).

9. As detailed in section A., the rule changes in the *Report and Order* will alleviate registration and certification administrative burdens for the likely thousands of operators of PEG channels run by small organizations that are exempt from the Commission's close captioning rules. We expect that small entities will experience cost-savings as a result of these changes. We estimate that about 290,000 programmers[25] will save about 30 minutes of time per year. Using a value of time of about $17 per hour,[26] we estimate that this would save $2.43 million annually. PEG channel administrators, however, would incur the cost of filing contact information and certifying compliance with or exemption from the closed captioning rules. We estimate that about 1,700 channel administrators would be required to file contact information and make a certification.[27] Because we expect nearly all PEG channels are exempt from the closed captioning requirements,[28] we expect this will take about 30 minutes annually and will therefore cost about $14,238.[29] Therefore, the net cost savings from this rule change are expected to be $2.41 million.

F. Discussion of Steps Taken to Minimize the Significant Economic Impact on Small Entities, and Significant Alternatives Considered

10. The RFA requires an agency to provide, "a description of the steps the agency has taken to minimize the significant economic impact on small entities . . . including a statement of the factual, policy, and legal reasons for selecting the alternative adopted in the final rule and why each one of the other significant alternatives to the rule considered by the agency which affect the impact on small entities was rejected."[30]

11. In amending the Commission's closed captioning rules, the Commission believes that the rule changes associated with this *Report & Order* will not unduly burden, and will in fact reduce regulatory burdens for small entities. By amending the rules to not apply the registration and certification requirements to those video programmers that (1) provide video programming exclusively to PEG access channels that are exempt from the provision of closed captioning pursuant to section 79.1(d) or (f) of the Commission's rules or certify compliance with, or exemption from, the closed captioning obligations for all programming shown over the PEG channel itself; (2) provide video programming to non-exempt PEG access channels to the extent the channel administrator has the ability to certify that all programming

[25] ACM estimates that more than 250,000 community groups create programming for PEG channels. ACM Petition at 1. We estimate that not more than 40,000 programmers provide programming to nonbroadcast networks. With approximately 230 nonbroadcast networks in the United States, if each network aired programming created by a different programmer each hour of the day every week, there would be 38,640 programmers. S&P Capital IQ, *TV Network Summary* (last accessed Mar. 23, 2026).

[26] Based on the Department of Transportation's value of travel time, we estimate value of time as 50% of hourly median income. U.S. Department of Transportation, *Revised Guidance on Valuation of Travel Time in Economic Analysis* (Sept. 27, 2016), https://www.transportation.gov/sites/dot.gov/files/docs/2016%20Revised%20Value%20of%20Travel%20Time%20Guidance.pdf. Hourly median income is calculated as the median hourly wage ($23.11) multiplied by the ratio of mean total compensation to mean wage (1.45). U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, *May 2023 National Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates (Apr. 3, 2024)*, http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_nat.htm. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Employer Costs for Employee Compensation* (June 2023), https://www.bls.gov/web/ecec/ecec-civilian-dataset.xlsx. ($23.11*1.45 = $33.51; $33.51*0.5 = $16.75)

[27] ACM represents over 1,700 PEG access organizations. Alliance for Community Media, *About ACM*, https://www.allcommunitymedia.org/ACM/ACM/About/About_ACM.aspx?hkey=8b949448-ef7d-4d46-ad32-1469482c40f8 (last accessed May 14, 2026).

[28] ACM estimates that the vast majority of PEG channels are exempt from the closed captioning requirements because they do not meet the revenue threshold. ACM Petition at 3, note 3.

[29] 1,700*$16.75*0.5 = $14,237.50.

[30] 5 U.S.C. § 604(a)(6).

carried on the channel is either compliant or exempt; or (3) provide or license video programming to nonbroadcast networks for distribution by a cable operator or other MVPD, to the extent that such networks certify compliance with, or exemption from, the closed captioning obligations for all programming comprising the network's linear line-up, or certify that the network itself is exempt, the Commission relieves many entities, including small entities, from this reporting requirement.

12. *Captioning quality*. The Commission considered comments expressing concern that the certification and registration reforms may require more stringent oversight mechanisms, but sided with the majority of commenters in concluding that, so long as the PEG channel administrator files the required contact information and a certification attesting to the channel's exemption from the captioning rules, consumers will have access to the information intended by the certification requirement, and that the Commission will have sufficient documentation to ensure accountability for compliance with its rules, with no undue burdens imposed on small entities in the process.

13. *Non-exempt PEG channels*. The Commission sought comment on the feasibility of channel administrators for non-exempt PEG channels to certify that their channels programming is either compliant or exempt. While there was no directly apposite response in the record, the Commission concluded that it was appropriate to allow such channels to certify as described above, because, to the extent such scenarios do exist, allowing this option poses the prospect of reducing burdens on small entities, and does not in any other respect appear to impose burdens on small entities.

14. *Multiple network scenarios*. The Commission decided to delegate to the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau (CGB) the task of ensuring that companies offering multiple program networks can register once and then certify those networks as a group, provided the certification lists each program network to which the certification applies. While the record did not directly address this point, the Commission concluded that it would be more efficient and less administratively burdensome to create an avenue for such bulk processing in the registration and certification process, eliminating unnecessary paperwork in the process. To the extent that there are small non-profits that run multiple PEG program networks or related scenarios, this may stand to reduce burdens on small entities, and does not in any other respect appear to impose burdens on small entities.

G. Report to Congress

15. The Commission will send a copy of the *Report and Order*, including this Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, in a report to Congress pursuant to the Congressional Review Act.[31] In addition, the Commission will send a copy of the *Report and Order*, including this Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, to the Chief Counsel for the SBA Office of Advocacy and will publish a copy of the *Report and Order*, and this Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (or summaries thereof) in the Federal Register.[32]

[31] *Id.* § 801(a)(1)(A).

[32] *Id.* § 604(b).

STATEMENT OF
CHAIRMAN BRENDAN CARR

Re: *Closed Captioning of Video Programming, Telecommunications for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Inc. Petition for Rulemaking*; *Delete, Delete, Delete*, CG Docket No. 05-231; GN Docket No. 25-133.

Back in 2016, stakeholders asked the FCC to streamline closed captioning registration and certification requirements for producers that provide programs exclusively to public, educational, and governmental access or PEG channels. At the time, they raised concerns that requiring volunteers and community groups – such as Cub Scouts or gospel choirs – that were exempt from captioning rules to comply with those underlying obligations was both burdensome and needless. Stakeholders also asked the FCC to relieve program owners from compliance with captioning rules when their programs on linear networks were distributed by MVPDs, since the network themselves already certify compliance.

In the agency's *Delete, Delete, Delete* proceeding, commenters raised these concerns again. And today, 10 years later, we finally take action. We have voted to eliminate these unnecessarily duplicative requirements, saving hundreds of thousands of programmers a total of nearly $2.5 million annually in needless regulatory costs. We've concluded from the record that this action would have no negative impact on captioning availability or quality. This item continues the Commission's work to eliminate outdated rules and minimize duplicative obligations that provide no consumer benefit.

Thank you to staff for their hard work on this item, including Eduard Bartholme, Lisa Edwards, Robert Aldrich, Suzy Rosen Singleton, Michael Scott, Joshua Mendelsohn, and Ike Ofobike, as well as staff from the Offices of Communications Business Opportunities, Economics and Analytics, Enforcement Bureau, General Counsel, and Media Bureau.