

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of Rules and Regulations)	CG Docket No. 02-278
Implementing the Telephone Consumer)	
Protection Act of 1991)	
)	
Improving Customer Service and)	CG Docket No. 26-52
Protecting Consumers through Onshoring)	
)	
In the Matter of Advanced Methods)	CG Docket No. 17-59
to Target and Eliminate Unlawful Robocalls)	
)	
Empowering Broadband Consumers)	CG Docket No. 22-2
Through Transparency)	

REPLY COMMENTS OF R.E.A.C.H.

Responsible Enterprises Against Consumer Harassment, Mutual Benefit Corporation (R.E.A.C.H.), on behalf of its direct-to-consumer marketing, lead generation, and performance marketing members, thanks the Commission for the opportunity to further comment on the important issue of TCPA Reform¹. After careful review of comments submitted, and for the reasons set forth below, R.E.A.C.H. urges the Commission to:

- I. Clarify, in the context of the NPRM, who the regulated “providers” of telecommunication services would be;
- II. Not presume that all offshore call center interactions result in inferior consumer experiences;

¹ Commission's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CG Docket No. 26-52, Tenth Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CG Docket No. 17-59; Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CG Docket No. 02-278; and Third Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CG Docket No. 22-2 (*NPRM*); FCC 26-16 (rel. March 27, 2026) (“Notice”).

- III. Focus on identifying and penalizing specific foreign call centers that knowingly utilize unlawful practices, rather than adopting a broad approach, or alternatively focus any broader approach on the jurisdictions from which those calls originate;
- IV. Recognize that offshore call centers often provide businesses with a more stable, better trained, and longer tenured workforce than many domestic call centers;
- V. Do not broadly restrict or ban offshore call centers as doing so would likely accelerate the replacement of human customer service with AI systems that humans neither prefer nor trust;
- VI. If disclosure requirements are imposed, they should be clear, specific, and designed to provide consumers with meaningful information;
- VII. Provide a compliance period of at least 18 months;
- VIII. Keep reporting requirements minimal and automated; and
- IX. Use foreign P.O.E. designations to combat illegal scam traffic, but avoid overbroad restrictions that treat lawful communications as illegal or permit carriers to improperly block or mislabel legitimate calls.

I. R.E.A.C.H. Urges The Commission to Clarify Who Regulated “Providers” of Telecommunications Services Would Be in the Context of the NPRM.

Most critically the Commission needs to clarify the scope of businesses and activities it seeks to regulate.

At paragraph 3 of the NPRM the Commission states “[w]e propose to apply these requirements to providers of telecommunications services, CMRS, interconnected VoIP service, cable television service, and DBS services, or affiliates of such providers. Where we seek comment on applying the proposed rules to providers of other services, the term ‘providers’ includes providers of those services as well. We also propose to apply these requirements to the use of

foreign call centers for consumer communications relating to Internet access service offered by any of the foregoing providers or their affiliates.”

As written, this paragraph suggests the entirety of the NPRM is focused solely on such “providers” of Commission-regulated services and not all American businesses. Yet read alternatively, the provision may apply indirectly to all American businesses because the services provided by an offshore call center will include telecommunication services or interconnected VoIP service.

In other words, the Commission should clearly articulate whether its intended or final rule applies to all American businesses using offshore call centers—since the “providers” are the call centers used by American businesses who must, in turn, comply with the rule— or only American telecommunications “providers” who elect to use offshore call centers. The NPRM at times appears to imply the latter but can be read to apply to either. R.E.A.C.H. submits American consumers and businesses alike need to know which one the Commission intended.

Notably paragraphs 64 and 65 of the NPRM suggest comment on whether the NPRM should be applied to a broader array of calls. However, the calls at issue in those paragraphs are not defined other than in circular reference to “not just calls on behalf of the types of providers already discussed.” Since the scope of “providers” cannot be identified, the scope of calls at issue in paragraphs 64 and 65 also cannot be identified.

II. SOME OFFSHORE CALL CENTERS ARE ACTUALLY GREAT!: R.E.A.C.H. Takes Issue with the Idea that All Offshore Call Centers Result in Poor Customer Experience.

The Commission suggests on a thin record that consumers universally disdain their experiences with offshore call centers. Nothing can be further from the truth.

In the experience of R.E.A.C.H. members, offshore call centers often employ extremely well trained and knowledgeable agents who are perfectly fluent in American standard English. Survey results from consumers often show superior results and experiences achieved by offshore as opposed to domestic call centers. This is particularly true in English-native countries like the Philippines².

The truth is call center agents in many nations are highly motivated and happy to be there. They are honest, hardworking individuals that truly want to deliver an excellent customer experience to American consumers. They are well trained and well supervised by highly-scrutinized managers who are in continuous contact with American call center operators and managers to assure compliance and alignment with American quality standards.

Stated simply—not all foreign call centers deliver poor results. There are truly “elite” foreign call centers that afford experiences that are just flat out superior to those currently being offered domestically.

III. AVOID THE BROAD-BRUSH APPROACH: R.E.A.C.H. Invites the Commission to Further Scrutinize the Nations Where Complaints (And Scams) Are Arising From.

To be sure, however, not all call centers are great—that is true with foreign call centers as well as with domestic centers.

² The Commission makes note of the high number of call center jobs in the Philippines. Call center jobs are also on the rise in “near shore” locations like Mexico and Belize where English fluency is remarkably high.

We know, for instance, certain American call centers have acted with endless disregard for the law and the needs of American consumers.³ But enforcement actions are pursued based on individual actors—not based on collective punishment.

To the extent some foreign call centers are acting inappropriately—either by delivering poor results or misusing consumer data— R.E.A.C.H. submits the Commission should focus its efforts on determining how to identify, punish, and evaluate taking offline those call centers—and perhaps punishing the American businesses utilizing them—rather than adopting a rule that punishes all providers (the just and the unjust alike).

Further, to the extent a broader prophylactic approach is to be adopted, the Commission should look deeper to determine the locations where the bad actors are operating. Anecdotally, for instance, R.E.A.C.H. has concerns with call centers operating out of Pakistan as major drivers of scam and spam traffic. Superior data around the locations that are driving the most fraud and scam traffic would enable consumer education and choice—it will help consumers to understand whether the call center handling their call is more, or less, likely to be problematic than a domestic call center.

³ *In the Matter of John C. Spiller; Jakob A. Mears; Rising Eagle Cap. Grp. LLC; Jsquared Telecom LLC; Only Web Leads LLC; Rising Phoenix Group; Rising Phoenix Holdings; Rpg Leads; & Rising Eagle Cap. Grp. - Cayman*, 38 F.C.C. Rcd. 5581 (F.C.C. June 7, 2023) (Rising Eagle, a Texas-Based telemarketing company, "willfully and repeatedly violated the Truth in Caller ID Act by knowingly causing the display of inaccurate caller ID information with the intent to defraud, cause harm, and wrongfully obtain something of value" and was ordered to forfeit \$225,000,000 by the FCC); *see also In re Sumco Panama SA, Sumco Panama USA, Virtual Telecom kft, Virtual Telecom Inc., Davis Telecom Inc., Geist Telecom LLC, Fugle Telecom LLC, Tech Direct LLC, Mobi Telecom LLC, & Posting Express Inc.*, FCC 23-64, File No. EB-TCD-21-00031913 (F.C.C. Aug. 3, 2023) (The FCC imposed a penalty of \$299,997,000 on several US based companies for placing "over five billion auto warranty robocalls to consumers...in violation of the [TCPA] and Truth in Caller ID Act.").

Domestic call centers are often staffed with unsavory characters—even individuals recently released from prison as famously discussed by former inmate (and jewel thief) Larry Lawton who worked in a call center immediately after being released from prison.⁴

Once the Commission has needed data in terms of the geographic sources of scam and fraudulent traffic originating overseas a more targeted strategy can be adopted—perhaps even a “no go” list of nations where American businesses are simply restricted from doing business for national security reasons.

IV. American Call Centers Are Tough to Staff, Have High Turn Over, and May Also Result in Negative Customer Experience.

R.E.A.C.H. loves American businesses—big and small. But we have to be honest. American call centers are sometimes the worst.

Domestic call centers often struggle to hire and maintain quality employees given the general stigma around call center work in the United States and the high cost of training and employing call center employees in this nation. Plus, let’s face it, no American kid says “I want to work in a call center when I grow up.” By and large the folks that staff American call centers are short timers who are doing it just long enough—and just well enough—to avoid getting fired on their path to something else.

It is well documented that turn over in American call centers ranges between 40-60% annually⁵—that means approximately half of individuals employed today, won’t be in that call

⁴ See “What I Did to Get Sent BACK To Prison Ep 18” https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_aMaEH2qSrM&t=7s, at 18:58 “I was a customer service rep for Verizon telephone....Most probably getting an inmate. Who just got out of prison. And you’re giving me your name, your address, your last four of your social security number.”

⁵ See *Call Center Turnover Rates*, Insignia Resource, <https://www.insigniaresource.com/research/call-center-turnover-rates/> (last visited May 26, 2026).

center a year from now. Turnover rates in offshore call centers are consistently only half as high—meaning agents in foreign call centers are likely to stay two or even three times longer than the average American⁶.

Further, call center jobs are hard. By and large these are not jobs that deliver high marks for mental health. Micromanagement, extreme metric fatigue and burnout are commonly reported⁷. Finding ways to compensate American employees to take on these high-stress jobs has proven impracticable for a large number of American businesses who have found working with offshore call centers a more cost-effective way to engage with more-committed workers who stay for the long term.

What this means is agents in foreign call centers are often better trained and more committed than American agents. They often view call center jobs as a stable and alluring profession where they get to interact with Americans (often viewed as an opportunity in these nations) and make money that is considered extremely generous. The socioeconomics around call center work is exactly the opposite in many nations than in America—these are highly sought after positions that educated locals are eager to pursue.

V. Pick Your Poison— Limiting or Banning Offshore Call Centers Will Result in Even Less Attractive AI Options.

The unfortunate reality is that barring a complete and revolutionary change in the call center market in the United States, there is simply no way to “onshore” all of the call center operations taking place in foreign nations today. America just does not have a ready work force of

⁶ *Offshore Call Center Attrition Rates*, Afrishore BPO, <https://afrishorebpo.com/offshore-call-center-attrition-rates/> (last visited May 26, 2026).

⁷ *Why Call Center Jobs Are Hard*, Bright Pattern, <https://www.brightpattern.com/why-call-center-jobs-are-hard/> (last visited May 26, 2026).

millions of individuals eager to crash into a high-stress, metrics-driven and mundane call center environment—even if the economic incentives to drive high wages were present (and they are not).

So that will leave American consumers interacting with bots to an even greater degree than they do already.

Nobody likes the self-checkout line. Nobody likes ordering from a tablet at McDonalds. And people who call a business hope to be helped by a live human being and not a bot.

Yet, the primary response to be expected from American businesses—limited as they are by an uneager American workforce—to a rule banning the use of foreign call centers will be to flock to AI agents to handle consumer inquiries.

As R.E.A.C.H. has said previously—AI holds much promise. But the technology isn't where it needs to be yet to assure quality consumer experiences sufficient to displace millions of foreign call center workers. Indeed, two-thirds of consumers report preferring to speak to live human beings and nearly half of consumers distrust companies that rely on AI for customer service⁸.

Pushing American businesses to ban offshore call centers will simply lead to a higher reliance on unreliable (for now) AI solutions, which will hasten consumer distrust of the phone system and erode confidence in the communications network the Commission is tasked to preserve and protect.

⁸ *Consumers Prefer Human-Led Customer Service*, Customer Experience Dive, <https://www.customerexperiencedive.com/news/consumers-prefer-human-led-customer-service/814226/> (last visited May 26, 2026).

VI. R.E.A.C.H. Agrees Consumers Should Be Empowered to Know Whether a Call is Being Handled or Originating Offshore—But Should Also Understand Choosing to be Contacted by a Domestic Agent May Take More Time.

The Commission states: “We believe it is essential for consumers to know when calls from a provider originate overseas and when calls they make to a provider are answered at a foreign call center. If consumers know they are speaking with a foreign call center, they can take any precautions they believe necessary to address privacy risks—e.g., by refusing to disclose sensitive personal information, demanding satisfactory assurance that such information will be protected effectively, or requesting that the call be transferred to the United States, as discussed below. This also might help consumers identify companies that support American jobs.”⁹

As noted above, R.E.A.C.H. is neutral on the use of foreign call centers by American businesses—there are benefits and there are drawbacks. Foreign call centers are not per se evil. American call centers are not per se superior. But some consumers might prefer one or the other given the advantages and drawbacks of each.

One of the most obvious advantages to consumers in need of immediate assistance is that foreign call center staff will very likely be more available and easier to reach than a domestic agent. As set forth above, this follows naturally from the fact that call center jobs are more desirable in other areas of the world than they are in America. In many countries working in a call center assisting Americans is viewed as a dream come true—a job that can provide for their families and provide a better life. That is simply not the way call center jobs are viewed in America—and the business economics have traditionally not made it feasible for American businesses to invest heavily in call center personnel.

⁹ See *Improving Customer Service and Protecting Consumers Through Onshoring*, 91 Fed. Reg. 21761, 21764 (proposed Apr. 23, 2026) (to be codified at 47 CFR Parts 8, 25, 64 and 76).

To the extent a disclosure is mandated, the Commission should provide very clear guidance in terms of what a caller or call center must disclose. To better empower consumers and inform consumer choice, the consumer should be informed as to the precise country the call is being made from or to and the length of time before the call center agent may be available to help them and also the length of time a domestic agent may be able to help them. The call center should also be free to provide additional accurate information to help inform consumer preference—for instance accurately describing the foreign call center agents as “well trained” “vetted” or “English-fluent” should be permitted, so long as true.

VII. R.E.A.C.H. Contends Any Rule Should Include an 18 Month Adoption Window.

As explained in section I, above, there is significant confusion as to whether the intended scope of the NPRM covers only “providers” that use offshore call centers or whether any offshore call center is included as a “provider,” thereby extending the scope of the NPRM to all American businesses using offshore “providers.”

Either way the NPRM may usher in a massive change to how American businesses interact with consumers, and there is no apparent easy way to comply. Lacking any eager American workforce available to handle those calls R.E.A.C.H. members will either need to opt for AI solutions or cease handling some portion of the calls they would otherwise field in favor of alternative communications channels¹⁰.

R.E.A.C.H. requests at least 18 months for businesses to adapt and develop a response to any limitation on—or required disclosure of—foreign call center usage. That time is the *minimal* conceivable window by which operational compliance appears feasible.

¹⁰ Depriving American consumers who desire to communicate by phone with a live human being of the ability to do so seems to be the most likely outcome of this NPRM.

VIII. R.E.A.C.H. Submits Reporting Requirements Should Be Kept Minimal and Automated.

The expense to be imposed by the NPRM is incredibly high. Adding complicated and expensive reporting requirements on American businesses in addition to complicated new rules is simply not justifiable. Whatever reporting rules the Commission adopts should be as minimal and automated as possible.

IX. The Commission Should Use Foreign P.O.E. Designations to Mandate Bond Posting and Tolling—But Should Not Credit Every Consumer Complaint.

R.E.A.C.H. heavily supports hammering scam callers originating offshore. It stands behind all efforts the Commission makes to throttle, limit, upend, and punish domestic gateway point-of-entry providers permitting scam traffic onto the network.

The ITG has long identified points of entry of illegal scam traffic. R.E.A.C.H. supports the continued and heightened use of the ITG program to eliminate U.S. based sources of illegal foreign traffic.

R.E.A.C.H. cautions a distinction should be made between illegal and scam traffic—i.e. dangerous and fraudulent calls aimed at stealing money from American consumers—and calls that might be otherwise legal but simply undesirable to consumers (e.g. marketing calls originating with consent the consumer does not desire). It is common for consumers to receive perfectly legal marketing calls they consented to but no longer desire to receive. The TCPA's DNC rules operate to protect consumers from further calls. And the standards adopted by R.E.A.C.H. members help to ensure consumers are not bombarded by unwanted calls even in the absence of a revocation

effort. But the Commission should not impose arbitrary restrictions or blocks on otherwise legal calls—and should ban carriers from mislabeling or blocking such calls¹¹.

X. Conclusion.

For the reasons described above, R.E.A.C.H. respectfully urges the Commission to:

- (I) provide clarity on who the "providers" of telecommunication services are;
- (II) not assume that offshore call centers inherently provide a lower-quality consumer experience;
- (III) aim its efforts at taking enforcement action against particular offshore call centers that knowingly utilize unlawful practices and further scrutinizing the nations where complaints and scams are arising from instead of adopting a broad approach;
- (IV) acknowledge that unlike their domestic counterparts, many offshore call centers maintain experienced, tenured employees that deliver efficient and professional service;
- (V) recognize that overly aggressive limitations on offshore call centers may have the unintended effect of encouraging companies to replace live representatives altogether with AI systems that humans neither prefer nor trust;
- (VI) provide consumers with disclosures that are clear, specific, and designed to provide meaningful information;
- (VII) limit the period of compliance to at least 18 months;
- (VIII) minimize reporting requirements and use automated reporting; and

¹¹ For these reasons R.E.A.C.H. continues to request a ruling on its outstanding petition. *See Reply Comments of R.E.A.C.H.*, CG Docket No. 02-278 et al. (F.C.C. Feb. 3, 2026).

(IX) take care not to create standards that inadvertently categorize legitimate offshore calls as suspicious or enable carriers to block, flag, or mischaracterize lawful calls in the use of foreign P.O.E. designations.

Respectfully submitted,

R.E.A.C.H

By:

[Signature Block]

Dated: June 2, 2026