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To deter criminal robocall violations and improve enforcement of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
JANUARY 16, 2019

Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. MARKEY) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

A BILL

To deter criminal robocall violations and improve enforcement of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Telephone Robocall Abuse Criminal Enforcement and Deterrence Act” or the “TRACED Act”.

SEC. 2. FORFEITURE.

(a) In General.—Section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227) is amended—
(1) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following:

“(4) CIVIL FORFEITURE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Any person that is determined by the Commission, in accordance with paragraph (3) or (4) of section 503(b), to have violated any provision of this subsection shall be liable to the United States for a forfeiture penalty pursuant to section 503(b)(1). The amount of the forfeiture penalty determined under this subparagraph shall be determined in accordance with subparagraphs (A) through (F) of section 503(b)(2).

“(B) VIOLATION WITH INTENT.—Any person that is determined by the Commission, in accordance with paragraph (3) or (4) of section 503(b), to have violated this subsection with the intent to cause such violation shall be liable to the United States for a forfeiture penalty. The amount of the forfeiture penalty determined under this subparagraph shall be equal to an amount determined in accordance with subparagraphs (A) through (F) of section 503(b)(2) plus an additional penalty not to exceed $10,000.
“(C) RECOVERY.—Any forfeiture penalty determined under subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be recoverable under section 504(a).

“(D) PROCEDURE.—No forfeiture liability shall be determined under subparagraph (A) or (B) against any person unless such person receives the notice required by paragraph (3) or (4) of section 503(b).

“(E) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—No forfeiture penalty shall be determined or imposed against any person—

“(i) under subparagraph (A) if the violation charged occurred more than 1 year prior to the date of issuance of the required notice or notice of apparent liability; and

“(ii) under subparagraph (B) if the violation charged occurred more than 3 years prior to the date of issuance of the required notice or notice of apparent liability.

“(F) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Notwithstanding any law to the contrary, the Commission may not determine or impose a forfeiture
penalty on a person under both subparagraphs
(A) and (B) based on the same conduct.’’; and
(2) by striking subsection (h).
(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this
section shall not affect any action or proceeding com-
menced before and pending on the date of enactment of
this Act.
(c) DEADLINE FOR REGULATIONS.—The Federal
Communications Commission shall prescribe regulations
to implement the amendments made by this section not
later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this
Act.
SEC. 3. CALL AUTHENTICATION.
(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:
(1) STIR/SHAKEN AUTHENTICATION FRAME-
WORK.—The term ‘‘STIR/SHAKEN authentication
framework’’ means the secure telephone identity re-
visited and signature-based handling of asserted in-
formation using tokens standards proposed by the
information and communications technology industry
to attach a certificate of authenticity to each phone
to verify the source of each call.
(2) VOICE SERVICE.—The term ‘‘voice serv-
ice’’—
(A) means any service that is interconnected with the public switched telephone network and that furnishes voice communications to an end user using resources from the North American Numbering Plan or any successor to the North American Numbering Plan adopted by the Commission under section 251(e)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 251(e)(1)); and

(B) includes—

(i) transmissions from a telephone facsimile machine, computer, or other device to a telephone facsimile machine; and

(ii) without limitation, any service that enables real-time, two-way voice communications, including any service that requires internet protocol-compatible customer premises equipment (commonly known as “CPE”) and permits out-bound calling, whether or not the service is one-way or two-way voice over internet protocol.

(b) AUTHENTICATION FRAMEWORK.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), not later than 18 months after the date of
enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall require a provider of voice service to implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication framework in the internet protocol networks of voice service providers.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Federal Communications Commission shall not take the action described in paragraph (1) if the Commission determines that a provider of voice service, not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act—

(A) has adopted the STIR/SHAKEN authentication framework for calls on the internet protocol networks of voice service providers;

(B) has agreed voluntarily to participate with other providers of voice service in the STIR/SHAKEN authentication framework;

(C) has begun to implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication framework; and

(D) will be capable of fully implementing the STIR/SHAKEN authentication framework not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall sub-
mit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representa-
tives a report on the determination required under paragraph (2), which shall include—

(A) an analysis of the extent to which pro-
viders of a voice service have implemented the
STIR/SHAKEN authentication framework; and

(B) an assessment of the efficacy of the
STIR/SHAKEN authentication framework, as
being implemented under this section, in ad-
dressing all aspects of call authentication.

(4) REVIEW AND REVISION OR REPLACE-
MENT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of en-
actment of this Act, and every 3 years thereafter,
the Federal Communications Commission, after pub-
lic notice and an opportunity for comment, shall—

(A) assess the efficacy of the call authen-
tication framework implemented under this sec-
tion;

(B) based on the assessment under sub-
paragraph (A), revise or replace the call au-
thentication framework under this section if the
Commission determines it is in the public inter-
est to do so; and
(C) submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report on the findings of the assessment under subparagraph (A) and on any actions to revise or replace the call authentication framework under subparagraph (B).

(5) Extension of implementation deadline.—The Federal Communications Commission may extend any deadline for the implementation of a call authentication framework required under this section by 12 months or such further amount of time as the Commission determines necessary if the Commission determines that purchasing or upgrading equipment to support call authentication would constitute a substantial hardship for a provider or category of providers.

(c) Safe Harbor and other regulations.—

(1) In general.—The Federal Communications Commission shall promulgate rules—

(A) establishing when a provider of voice service may block a voice call based, in whole or in part, on information provided by the call authentication framework under subsection (b);
(B) establishing a safe harbor for a pro-
vider of voice service from liability for unin-
tended or inadvertent blocking of calls or for
the unintended or inadvertent misidentification
of the level of trust for individual calls based,
in whole or in part, on information provided by
the call authentication framework under sub-
section (b); and

(C) establishing a process to permit a call-
ing party adversely affected by the information
provided by the call authentication framework
under subsection (b) to verify the authenticity
of the calling party’s calls.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In establishing the safe
harbor under paragraph (1), the Federal Commu-
ications Commission shall consider limiting the li-
ability of a provider based on the extent to which the
provider—

(A) blocks or identifies calls based, in
whole or in part, on the information provided
by the call authentication framework under sub-
section (b);

(B) implemented procedures based, in
whole or in part, on the information provided
by the call authentication framework under sub-
section (b); and

(C) used reasonable care.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this sec-
tion shall preclude the Federal Communications Commis-
sion from initiating a rulemaking pursuant to its existing
statutory authority.

SEC. 4. PROTECTIONS FROM SPOOFED CALLS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the
date of enactment of this Act, and consistent with the call
authentication framework under section 3, the Federal
Communications Commission shall initiate a rulemaking
to help protect a subscriber from receiving unwanted calls
or text messages from a caller using an unauthenticated
number.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In promulgating rules under
subsection (a), the Federal Communications Commission
shall consider—

(1) the Government Accountability Office report
on combating the fraudulent provision of misleading
or inaccurate caller identification required by section
503(c) of division P of the Consolidated Appropri-
tions Act 2018 (Public Law 115–141);

(2) the best means of ensuring that a sub-
scriber or provider has the ability to block calls from
a caller using an unauthenticated North American Numbering Plan number;

(3) the impact on the privacy of a subscriber from unauthenticated calls;

(4) the effectiveness in verifying the accuracy of caller identification information; and

(5) the availability and cost of providing protection from the unwanted calls or text messages described in subsection (a).

SEC. 5. INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, shall convene an interagency working group to study Government prosecution of violations of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)).

(b) DUTIES.—In carrying out the study under subsection (a), the interagency working group shall—

(1) determine whether, and if so how, any Federal laws, including regulations, policies, and practices, or budgetary or jurisdictional constraints inhibit the prosecution of such violations;

(2) identify existing and potential Federal policies and programs that encourage and improve coordination among Federal departments and agencies
and States, and between States, in the prevention and prosecution of such violations;

(3) identify existing and potential international policies and programs that encourage and improve coordination between countries in the prevention and prosecution of such violations; and

(4) consider—

(A) the benefit and potential sources of additional resources for the Federal prevention and prosecution of criminal violations of that section;

(B) whether to establish memoranda of understanding regarding the prevention and prosecution of such violations between—

(i) the States;

(ii) the States and the Federal Government; and

(iii) the Federal Government and a foreign government;

(C) whether to establish a process to allow States to request Federal subpoenas from the Federal Communications Commission;

(D) whether extending civil enforcement authority to the States would assist in the suc-
cessful prevention and prosecution of such viola-

(E) whether increased forfeiture and imprison- 
ment penalties are appropriate, such as 

(F) whether regulation of any entity that 
enters into a business arrangement with a com-
mon carrier regulated under title II of the Com- 
 munications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 201 et 
seq.) for the specific purpose of carrying, rout-
ing, or transmitting a call that constitutes such 
a violation would assist in the successful pre-
vention and prosecution of such violations; and 

(G) the extent to which, if any, Depart-
ment of Justice policies to pursue the prosecu-
tion of violations causing economic harm, phys-
ical danger, or erosion of an inhabitant’s peace 
of mind and sense of security inhibits the pre-
vention or prosecution of such violations. 

(c) MEMBERS.—The interagency working group shall 
be composed of such representatives of Federal depart-
ments and agencies as the Attorney General considers ap-
propriate, such as— 

(1) the Department of Commerce;
(2) the Department of State;

(3) the Department of Homeland Security;

(4) the Federal Communications Commission;

(5) the Federal Trade Commission; and

(6) the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

(d) NON-FEDERAL STAKEHOLDERS.—In carrying out the study under subsection (a), the interagency working group shall consult with such non-Federal stakeholders as the Attorney General determines have the relevant expertise, including the National Association of Attorneys General.

(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the interagency working group shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report on the findings of the study under subsection (a), including—

(1) any recommendations regarding the prevention and prosecution of such violations; and

(2) a description of what progress, if any, relevant Federal departments and agencies have made in implementing the recommendations under paragraph (1).
SEC. 6. ACCESS TO NUMBER RESOURCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) EXAMINATION OF FCC POLICIES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall commence a proceeding to determine whether Federal Communications Commission policies regarding access to number resources, including number resources for toll free and non-toll free telephone numbers, could be modified, including by establishing registration and compliance obligations, to help reduce access to numbers by potential perpetrators of violations of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)).

(2) REGULATIONS.—If the Federal Communications Commission determines under paragraph (1) that modifying the policies described in that paragraph could help achieve the goal described in that paragraph, the Commission shall prescribe regulations to implement those policy modifications.

(b) AUTHORITY.—Any person who knowingly, through an employee, agent, officer, or otherwise, directly or indirectly, by or through any means or device whatsoever, is a party to obtaining number resources, including number resources for toll free and non-toll free telephone numbers, from a common carrier regulated under title II
of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 201 et seq.), in violation of a regulation prescribed under subsection (a) of this section, shall, notwithstanding section 503(b)(5) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 503(b)(5)), be subject to a forfeiture penalty under section 503 of that Act. A forfeiture penalty under this subsection shall be in addition to any other penalty provided for by law.