

Calendar No. 422

119TH CONGRESS }
2d Session }

SENATE

{ REPORT
119-122 }

FOREIGN ROBOCALL ELIMINATION ACT

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND
TRANSPORTATION

ON

S. 2666



JUNE 1, 2026.—Ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

69-010

WASHINGTON : 2026

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

ONE HUNDRED NINETEENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

TED CRUZ, Texas, *Chairman*

JOHN THUNE, South Dakota	MARIA CANTWELL, Washington
ROGER F. WICKER, Mississippi	AMY KLOBUCHAR, Minnesota
DEB FISCHER, Nebraska	BRIAN SCHATZ, Hawaii
JERRY MORAN, Kansas	EDWARD J. MARKEY, Massachusetts
DAN SULLIVAN, Alaska	GARY C. PETERS, Michigan
MARSHA BLACKBURN, Tennessee	TAMMY BALDWIN, Wisconsin
TODD YOUNG, Indiana	TAMMY DUCKWORTH, Illinois
TED BUDD, North Carolina	JACKY ROSEN, Nevada
ERIC SCHMITT, Missouri	BEN RAY LUJA AE1N, New Mexico
JOHN CURTIS, Utah	JOHN W. HICKENLOOPER, Colorado
BERNIE MORENO, Ohio	JOHN FETTERMAN, Pennsylvania
TIM SHEEHY, Montana	ANDY KIM, New Jersey
SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, West Virginia	LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER, Delaware
CYNTHIA M. LUMMIS, Wyoming	

BRAD GRANTZ, *Majority Staff Director*

LILA HARPER HELMS, *Democratic Staff Director*

Calendar No. 422

119TH CONGRESS }
2d Session }

SENATE

{ REPORT
119–122 }

FOREIGN ROBOCALL ELIMINATION ACT

JUNE 1, 2026.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. CRUZ, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and
Transportation, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany S. 2666]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, to which was referred the bill (S. 2666) to direct the Federal Communications Commission to establish a taskforce on unlawful robocalls, and for other purposes, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and recommends that the bill, as amended, do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of S. 2666 is to direct the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC or Commission), in consultation with heads of relevant Federal agencies, to establish a combined interagency and private sector taskforce to report on unlawful, foreign-initiated robocalls. The taskforce would submit a report to Congress with findings and recommendations on designated topics to combat foreign-initiated robocalls.

BACKGROUND AND NEEDS

Robocalls are a major annoyance for consumers and represent the top consumer complaint received by the FCC.¹ The Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991 (TCPA)² regulates robocalls;

¹Patricia Moloney Figliola, “Federal Communications Commission: Progress Protecting Consumers from Illegal Robocalls,” Congressional Research Service, R46311, 2020, <https://www.everycrsreport.com/reports/R46311.html>.

²Public Law 102 09243, 47 U.S.C. 201.

under this regime, some robocalls are legal, while others are prohibited.³ The Telephone Robocall Abuse Criminal Enforcement and Deterrence (TRACED) Act of 2019⁴ further established rules and requirements to combat illegal robocalls by providing the FCC with enhanced authority and additional tools to deter unwanted and unlawful robocalls.⁵

The TRACED Act requires the FCC to publish an annual robocall report and to oversee an ongoing annual registration process for a private-led consortium dedicated to tracing the origin of suspected illegal robocalls.⁶ With advances in technology, however, illegal robocalls can now be made from anywhere in the world more easily and at a cheaper cost than ever before.⁷ Congress and the FCC have previously noted that illegal robocalls originating from abroad are a significant part of the robocall problem.⁸

The Foreign Robocall Elimination Act would establish an inter-agency taskforce comprised of representatives from the FCC, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), and the Department of Justice (DOJ), as well as private industry representatives, to report on foreign-initiated robocalls. The taskforce would terminate 90 days after it submits its report to Congress. Additionally, the bill would revise the TRACED Act's annual robocall consortium registration requirement. The bill would also direct the FCC to issue rules that require certain providers registering in the Robocall Mitigation Database to post a bond not to exceed \$100,000.

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS

S. 2666 would do the following:

- Require the FCC Chairman to establish a taskforce, in consultation with heads of the FTC and DOJ, comprised of representatives from the FCC, FTC, DOJ, the consortium established in the TRACED Act, and seven representatives from private sector entities.
- Establish a process for appointing taskforce members if the FCC, FTC, and DOJ are unable to reach agreement.
- Require the taskforce to prepare a report analyzing specific matters related to unlawful robocalls originating outside the United States and recommend strategies to combat them.
- Terminate the taskforce 90 days after it submits its report to Congress.
- Modify the TRACED Act to require a private-led consortium reauthorization every 3 years instead of annually.
- Modify the TRACED Act to immunize the TRACED Act consortium from liability for receiving or sharing covered information, and authorize the consortium, jointly with the FCC, or the FCC unilaterally to publish a list identifying voice service

³Ibid at 1.

⁴Public Law 116 09105, 133 Stat. 3274 (2019).

⁵"TRACED Act Implementation," Federal Communications Commission, <https://www.fcc.gov/TRACEDAct>.

⁶47 U.S.C. 227(h).

⁷"Stop Unwanted Robocalls and Texts," Federal Communications Commission, <https://www.fcc.gov/consumers/guides/stop-unwanted-robocalls-and-texts>.

⁸Federal Communications Commission, "Advanced Methods to Target and Eliminate Unlawful Robocalls," CG Docket No. 17 0959; "Call Authentication Trust Anchor," WC Docket No. 17 0997; Report and Order, Order on Reconsideration, Order, and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, *FCC Record*, vol. 37 (2022), no. 8, p. 6869, <https://www.fcc.gov/document/fcc-acts-stop-international-robocall-scams>.

providers found to cause substantial amounts of unlawful robocalls or which refuse to trace back calls.

- Direct the FCC to issue rules that require providers certifying in the Robocall Mitigation Database to post a bond not to exceed \$100,000 unless the FCC determines—considering enumerated factors—that requiring the bond is not necessary to deter unlawful robocall activity for a particular provider.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

S. 2666 was introduced on August 1, 2025, by Senator Budd (for himself and Senator Welch) and was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate. On October 21, 2025, the Committee met in open Executive Session and, by voice vote, ordered S. 2666 reported favorably with an amendment (in the nature of a substitute with amendments). Senators Husted and Warnock were later added as cosponsors.

117TH CONGRESS

H.R. 5207, the Foreign Robocall Elimination Act, was introduced on September 10, 2021, by then-Representative Budd (for himself and Representatives Gottheimer, Bishop, and Webster) and was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives. Seven Representatives were later added as cosponsors.

116TH CONGRESS

H.R. 5985, the Foreign Robocall Elimination Act, was introduced on February 27, 2020, by then-Representative Budd (for himself and Representatives Bishop and Clay) and was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

ESTIMATED COSTS

In accordance with paragraph 11(a) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate and section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Committee provides the following cost estimate, prepared by the Congressional Budget Office:

S. 2666, Foreign Robocall Elimination Act			
As ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation on October 21, 2025			
By Fiscal Year, Millions of Dollars	2026	2026-2031	2026-2036
Direct Spending (Outlays)	0	0	0
Revenues	*	*	*
Increase or Decrease (-) in the Deficit	*	*	*
Spending Subject to Appropriation (Outlays)	*	*	not estimated
Increases <i>net direct spending</i> in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2037?	No	Statutory pay-as-you-go procedures apply? Yes	
		Mandate Effects	
Increases <i>on-budget deficits</i> in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2037?	No	Contains intergovernmental mandate?	No
		Contains private-sector mandate?	Yes, Cannot Determine Costs
* = between -\$500,000 and \$500,000.			

S. 2666 would require the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), in coordination with the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) and Department of Justice (DOJ), to establish a taskforce on unlawful robocalls. That taskforce would report to the Congress on the most effective ways to combat unlawful robocalls. The bill also would direct the FCC to issue rules requiring certain voice service providers to post a bond—of up to \$100,000, as determined by the commission—before those providers certify to the Robocall Mitigation Database that they are implementing measures to mitigate unlawful robocalls. Under current law, providers must provide such certifications annually.

Based on information from the FCC, CBO expects that the commission would establish the specific conditions under which a bond would be required and that providers failing to meet those conditions could forfeit the bond. Any forfeited payments would be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury and recorded as increases in revenues. CBO expects the number of affected providers would be small and the likelihood of forfeiture would be low; thus, we estimate that any increase in revenues would be insignificant over the 2026–2036 period.

Using information from the agencies, CBO estimates that the costs for the FCC, FTC, and DOJ to implement S. 2666 would be insignificant over the 2026–2031 period. Because the FCC is authorized to collect fees each year sufficient to offset the appropriated costs of its regulatory activities, CBO estimates that the net cost to the FCC would be negligible, assuming appropriation actions consistent with that authority. Any related spending for the FTC and DOJ would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

S. 2666 contains private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA). CBO cannot determine whether the aggregate costs of those mandates would exceed the threshold established in UMRA (\$214 million in 2026, adjusted annually for inflation).

Under current law, a consortium of private-sector entities is registered with the FCC to conduct efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls. S. 2666 would grant the consortium immunity from prosecution for publishing information on suspected fraudulent, abusive, or unlawful robocalls. The bill would impose a private-sector mandate by limiting a right of action of a private entity that could otherwise seek redress or recover damages for the sharing or publishing of such information. CBO has no basis to estimate the number of possible lawsuits or related awards that would be precluded by the bill and cannot predict the amount of potential foregone damages. Therefore, CBO cannot determine whether the cost of the mandate would exceed the annual threshold established in UMRA for private-sector mandates.

S. 2666 also would impose a private-sector mandate on certain communication providers by requiring them to post a bond up to \$100,000 before filing certifications to the Robocall Mitigation Database. Because the FCC has yet to establish the exemptions, conditions, and terms of the new bond, CBO cannot determine whether the cost of the mandate would exceed the annual threshold established in UMRA for private-sector mandates.

Finally, the bill would increase the cost of an existing private-sector mandate if the FCC increases annual fee collections to offset the costs of implementing provisions in S. 2666. CBO estimates that the incremental cost of the mandate would be small and would fall well below the annual threshold established in UMRA for private-sector mandates.

S. 2666 contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in UMRA.

The CBO staff contacts for this estimate are David Hughes (for federal costs) and Rachel Austin (for mandates). The estimate was reviewed by H. Samuel Papenfuss, Deputy Director of Budget Analysis.

PHILLIP L. SWAGEL,
Director, Congressional Budget Office.

REGULATORY IMPACT STATEMENT

In accordance with paragraph 11(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee provides the following evaluation of the regulatory impact of the legislation, as reported:

NUMBER OF PERSONS COVERED

S. 2666 would require the FCC, in consultation with the FTC and DOJ, to establish an interagency taskforce comprised of representatives from those agencies, as well as private industry representatives, to report on foreign-initiated robocalls. While there are no new reporting requirements, the collection of some information from private companies relevant to foreign-initiated robocalls, including those already regulated under the TCPA and the Communications Act of 1934, may be necessary in order to complete the required report. S. 2666 would require providers certifying in the Robocall Mitigation Database to post a bond if the provider does not meet FCC-established criteria. Additionally, S. 2666 would extend liability immunity to the TRACED Act consortium for the receipt, sharing, or publication of covered information and allow for

the publication of a list identifying voice service providers deemed potentially problematic in deterring unlawful robocalls.

ECONOMIC IMPACT

S. 2666 is not expected to have an adverse impact on the Nation's economy. The legislation would promote government and commercial efforts to reduce one of the largest sources of consumer complaints.

PRIVACY

S. 2666 would not impact the personal privacy of individuals.

PAPERWORK

The Committee does not anticipate a major increase in paper-work burdens for private individuals or businesses resulting from the passage of this legislation. S. 2666 would require a report to Congress on particular aspects of foreign-initiated robocalls, which may necessitate the collection of limited information from entities involved in such activities.

S. 2666 would also allow the publication of a list of voice service providers deemed problematic in combating unlawful robocalls and require certain providers to post a bond before certifying in the Robocall Mitigation Database.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING

In compliance with paragraph 4(b) of rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee provides that no provisions contained in the bill, as reported, meet the definition of congressionally directed spending items under the rule.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1. Short title.

This section would provide that the bill may be cited as the "Foreign Robocall Elimination Act".

Section 2. Interagency taskforce on unlawful robocalls.

Subsection (a) would define the terms: "Commission", "Consortium", "Federal agency", "taskforce", "unlawful robocall".

Subsection (b) would require the FCC, in consultation with the FTC and DOJ, to establish a taskforce on unlawful robocalls within 270 days of enactment.

Subsection (c) would establish the taskforce's membership. Based on recommendations from each agency head, the FCC Chairman would appoint a representative of the FCC, FTC, and DOJ. Seven additional taskforce representatives would come from private sector entities with relevant expertise and be jointly appointed by the heads of the FCC, FTC, and DOJ. Of these, three representatives would come from voice service providers, analytics providers, technologists, and technology experts. One representative would be a member of the TRACED Act consortium. One representative would come from a marketing business that communicates with consumers by telephone in the normal course of business. One representative would come from a business or nonprofit organization

that regularly communicates with consumers by phone for non-marketing purposes. Finally, one representative would be from an organization that advocates on behalf of customers and has relevant expertise in combating illegal robocalls.

In the event the heads of the FCC, FTC, and DOJ cannot agree on the appointments of the private sector representatives, the FCC Chairman would make the appointment. In this case, the Chairman would need to notify the FCC Commissioners at least 48 hours prior to appointing the proposed taskforce member. Upon request by a Commissioner, the proposed appointment would be subject to a majority commission vote for approval.

Subsection (d) would require the taskforce to prepare and deliver to Congress within 360 days of its establishment a report with recommendations for relevant Federal agencies to combat unlawful robocalls originating from outside the United States. The taskforce would study matters regarding unlawful robocalls, such as comparing the estimated number of illegal robocalls originating within the United States to the estimated number originating outside the country. The report would study which foreign countries are originators of the most unlawful robocalls to the United States.

The report would also determine or examine the following:

- the magnitude of financial loss and the number of instances of stolen identity each year due to robocalls;
- methods for encouraging the adoption of caller identification authentication technology abroad;
- options for how countries can collaborate on solutions to authenticate and verify international calls, including relevant analytics;
- how better implementation of technical solutions abroad, e.g., traceback and caller identification authentication technology, would improve coordination between the United States and foreign countries;
- whether TRACED Act technical standards, i.e., STIR/SHAKEN, adequately provide call authentication from foreign providers to the United States;
- whether foreign countries should be encouraged to adopt such standards;
- ways to incentivize foreign countries to cooperate with U.S. law enforcement efforts;
- whether another relevant Federal agency or organization needs additional resources to combat foreign robocalls;
- whether an office within the DOJ would increase the ability of the Attorney General to conduct enforcement activities;
- how increased criminal penalties could help prevent foreign robocalls;
- how many enforcement activities the Attorney General has undertaken in the prior year (from the beginning of report preparation); and
- how the Attorney General has pursued forfeiture amounts for unlawful robocalls.

The report would seek input, as appropriate, from technologists and private sector innovators to find solutions and identify a list of voluntary best practices for providers to implement in identifying and blocking robocalls.

Finally, the report would evaluate whether requiring specific, periodic public disclosures, in whole or in part, of results of tracebacks conducted by the consortium will impact the integrity and effectiveness of the traceback process and examine mechanisms for improving compliance with TRACED Act requirements. Considerations in the evaluations of disclosures would include the following:

- revealing investigative methods;
- allowing consumers and businesses to avoid providers with a record of making unlawful robocalls;
- exposing proprietary, competitively sensitive, or confidential information of legitimate providers or entities;
- strengthening accountability and deterrence;
- enabling the initiators of unlawful robocalls to evade detection, adapt tactics, or exploit system vulnerabilities;
- improving the efforts of voice service providers to block calls that are determined to be unwanted based on reasonable analytics;
- impeding cooperation with future law enforcement investigations or future consumer protection efforts; or
- ensuring fairness in the reporting of traceback information.

The report would examine mechanisms for improving compliance with the requirements imposed pursuant to sections 6 and 7 of the TRACED Act.

Subsection (e) would allow the FCC, FTC, and DOJ to use funds for coordination, participation, or recommendations in the taskforce as required.

Subsection (f) would terminate the taskforce 90 days after it submits its report to Congress.

Section 3. FCC notice provision.

This section would require the FCC to register the TRACED Act consortium to conduct private-led efforts to trace back robocalls once every 3 years, rather than annually.

Section 4. Registered consortium conducting private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls.

This section would modify the TRACED Act to immunize the TRACED Act consortium against liability for receiving, sharing, or publishing covered information and allow the consortium with the FCC, or the FCC unilaterally, to publish (and FCC to take enforcement action on) a list of (1) voice service providers that refuse to participate in traceback efforts, and (2) other information collected about voice service providers found to originate or transmit substantial amounts of unlawful robocalls.

Section 5. Robocall mitigation database.

This section would require the Commission to issue rules that require providers to post a bond of not more than \$100,000 to certify in the Robocall Mitigation Database unless the provider meets certain criteria established by the Commission when considering certain specified factors that indicate the bond is not necessary to deter unlawful robocall activity.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 12 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new material is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

PALLONE-THUNE TRACED ACT

* * * * *

[Public Law 116–105; 133 Stat. 3287]

SEC. 13. ANNUAL ROBOCALL REPORT.

(a) * * *

(b) * * *

(c) * * *

(d) REGISTRATION OF CONSORTIUM OF PRIVATE-LED EFFORTS TO TRACE BACK THE ORIGIN OF SUSPECTED UNLAWFUL ROBOCALLS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue rules to establish a registration process for the registration of a single consortium that conducts private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls. The consortium shall meet the following requirements:

(A) Be a neutral third party competent to manage the private-led effort to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls in the judgement of the Commission.

(B) Maintain a set of written best practices about the management of such efforts and regarding providers of voice services’ participation in private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls.

(C) Consistent with section 222(d)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 222(d)(2)), any private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls conducted by the third party focus on “fraudulent, abusive, or unlawful” traffic.

(D) File a notice with the Commission that the consortium intends to conduct private-led efforts to trace back in advance of such registration.

(2) ANNUAL NOTICE BY THE COMMISSION SEEKING REGISTRATIONS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and **[annually]** *once every 3 years* thereafter, the Commission shall issue a notice to the public seeking the registration described in paragraph (1).

(3) IMMUNITY FOR RECEIVING, SHARING, AND PUBLISHING TRACE BACK INFORMATION.—

(A) DEFINITION.—*In this paragraph, the term “covered information”—*

(i) means information regarding suspected—

(I) fraudulent, abusive, or unlawful robocalls;

(II) illegally spoofed calls; and

(III) other illegal calls; and

(ii) includes—

(I) *call detail records of calls described in clause (i);*

(II) *the names of, and other identifying information concerning, the voice service providers that originated, carried, routed, and transmitted calls described in clause (i); and*

(III) *information about the entities that made calls described in clause (i), including any contact information of individuals that such an entity provided to the voice service provider that originated the call.*

(B) *TRACE BACK IMMUNITY.—No cause of action shall lie or be maintained in any court against the registered consortium for receiving, sharing, or publishing covered information or information derived from covered information.*

[(e) **LIST OF VOICE SERVICE PROVIDERS.**—The Commission may publish a list of voice service providers and take appropriate enforcement action based on information obtained from the consortium about voice service providers that refuse to participate in private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls, and other information the Commission may collect about voice service providers that are found to originate or transmit substantial amounts of unlawful robocalls.]

(e) *LIST OF VOICE SERVICE PROVIDERS.—*

(1) *PUBLICATION OF LIST.—The Commission, or the registered consortium in consultation with the Commission, may publish a list of voice service providers based on—*

(A) *information obtained by the consortium about voice service providers that refuse to participate in private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls; and*

(B) *other information the Commission or the consortium may collect about voice service providers that are found to originate or transmit substantial amounts of unlawful robocalls.*

(2) *ENFORCEMENT.—The Commission may take enforcement action based on the information described in paragraph (1).*

(f) * * *

* * * * *

