

101. If adopted, the new framework proposed in the *FNPRM* could lessen the economic and administrative burdens of the licensing process and the operational requirements for space and earth station operators. Specifically, the *FNPRM* proposes to create “operational envelopes” that would allow applicants to request broader authority and change operations within that envelope without further permission from the Commission. This proposal is intended to significantly reduce repetitive paperwork, decrease the need for STA and waiver requests, and allow for future automation. In addition, this proposal is designed to continue the Commission’s efforts to simplify the overall application process for small and other space and earth station operator entities. The *FNPRM* seeks comment on each proposed rule, as well as on the operational envelope framework in general, as to whether the Commission’s proposed revisions would provide the intended increased speed, predictability, and clarity for applicants. The proposed revisions, if adopted, would ultimately provide benefits for space and earth station operators, of all sizes, in the long term.

102. Small entities also stand to realize economic benefits from efficiencies arising from other licensing simplification and liberalization proposals in the *FNPRM*. These include allowing NGSO call sign merging, allowing space station licensees to change or add RF sensing capabilities through a minor modification notification process, extending the framework for U.S.-licensed hosted space stations to non-U.S.-licensed space stations, creating a process for certification of ephemeris tracking systems, creating a framework for licensing communications via inter-satellite service links between U.S.-licensed and non-U.S.-licensed space stations, permitting licensees or market access holders to exchange processing round status via secondary markets, reforming the process for transfers of control and assignments of licenses, allowing for use of the Nationwide, Non-Site license process if certain waivers are present, and proposing revisions to streamline many earth station definitions. In addition, our proposed rule on GSO orbital slot reassignment may benefit small, newer businesses that will be able to apply for and use orbital resources that another operator has abandoned.

103. The *FNPRM* also contains several proposals to modernize the regulatory environment in ways that stand to benefit the entire space industry, including small entities, by ensuring

safety and stability of all operations licensed by the Commission. These include proposals to require full frequency reuse for all FSS and BSS operations in bands allocated to FSS and BSS, to mitigate orbital debris, to update two-degree GSO spacing requirements, and to require that all satellites, spacecraft, or space stations licensed by the Commission have a U.S.-based control point.

104. In determining its proposals in the *FNPRM*, the Commission considered alternative proposals that could minimize significant economic impact on small entities. For example, our proposed rules tentatively conclude that satellites, spacecraft, or space stations licensed by the Commission have a U.S. based control point. Alternatively, we considered potential burdens of this proposal’s requirements on operators and whether those burdens could be relieved by third-party control points that have agreements with operators. In addition, as discussed above, we propose the creation of a framework for licensing communications via inter-satellite service links between U.S.-licensed and non-U.S.-licensed space stations. We considered alternative proposals such as requiring a modification application that outlines the ownership and operations of the non-U.S.-licensed system or whether the U.S.-licensed system should simply file a notification prior to beginning operations that identifies the foreign satellite system. Small entities are encouraged to bring to the Commission’s attention any specific concerns that they may have with the proposals outlined in the *FNPRM*.

105. In addition, small entities are encouraged to bring to the Commission’s attention any alternative proposals they may have on the topics for which the *FNPRM* contains no specific proposals so that the Commission may benefit from their insight into the impact on small entities as this proceeding progresses. These include such areas as revising the licensing process for earth stations and whether, and how, the Commission should adopt more structured renewal and replacement expectancy frameworks for satellite and earth station authorizations. The Commission expects to consider more fully the economic impact on small entities following its review of comments filed in response to the *FNPRM*, including costs and benefits information. Alternative proposals and approaches from commenters could also help the Commission further minimize the economic impact on small entities.

106. The Commission’s evaluation of the comments filed in this proceeding will shape the final conclusions it reaches, the final alternatives it considers, and the actions it ultimately takes in this proceeding to minimize any significant economic impact that may occur on small entities from the final rules that are ultimately adopted.

F. Federal Rules That May Duplicate, Overlap, or Conflict With the Proposed Rules

107. None.

V. Ordering Clauses

108. *It is ordered*, pursuant to sections 4(i), 4(j), 7(a), 301, 303, 307, 308, 309, 310, 312, 316, 332 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 154(i), 154(j), 157(a), 301, 303, 307, 308, 309, 310, 312, 316, 332, that the *FNPRM* is adopted.

109. *It is further ordered* that the Office of the Secretary, *shall send* a copy of the *FNPRM*, including the Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration, in accordance with section 603(a) of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene Dortch,

Secretary, Office of the Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2026–21818 Filed 10–23–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 64

[CG Docket No. 02–278; FCC 26–67; FRS 373557]

Modernizing the Ability of Consumers To Control Robocalls

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Commission seeks comment on measures to ensure that the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA) rules that govern robocalls continue to evolve with changes in technology and industry practices. Specifically, we seek comment on reducing the timeframe callers must honor revocation requests, requirements for two-way texting functionality, requiring a revoke all method, and the treatment of affiliates.

DATES: Comments are due on or before November 25, 2026, and reply comments are due on or before December 28, 2026.

ADDRESSES: Pursuant to §§ 1.415 and 1.419 of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR 1.415, 1.419, interested parties may file comments and reply comments on or before the dates indicated in the **DATES** section of this document. Submit comments identified by CG Docket No. 02–278, by any of the following methods:

- *Electronic Filers:* Comments may be filed electronically using the internet by accessing the Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS): <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs>. See *Electronic Filing of Documents in Rulemaking Proceedings*, 63 FR 24121 (1998).

- *Paper Filers:* Parties who choose to file by paper must file an original and one copy of each filing.

- Filings can be sent by hand or messenger delivery, by commercial courier, or by the U.S. Postal Service. All filings must be addressed to the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission.

- Hand-delivered or messenger-delivered paper filings for the Commission's Secretary are accepted between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. by the FCC's mailing contractor at 9050 Junction Drive, Annapolis Junction, MD 20701. All hand deliveries must be held together with rubber bands or fasteners. Any envelopes and boxes must be disposed of before entering the building.

- Commercial courier deliveries (any deliveries not by the U.S. Postal Service) must be sent to 9050 Junction Drive, Annapolis Junction, MD 20701.

- Filings sent by U.S. Postal Service First-Class Mail, Priority Mail, and Priority Mail Express must be sent to 45 L Street NE, Washington, DC 20554.

- *Accessible Formats:* To request materials in accessible formats for people with disabilities (Braille, large print, electronic files, audio format) or to request reasonable accommodations (e.g. accessible format documents, sign language interpreters, CART), send an email to fcc504@fcc.gov or call the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at (202) 418–0530 (voice).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Contact Richard D. Smith
Richard.Smith@fcc.gov, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, (717) 338–2797.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (FNPRM), in CG Docket No. 02–278, FCC 26–67, adopted September 30, 2026 and released on October 1, 2026. The full text of this document is available for public inspection during

regular business hours at Commission's headquarters 45 L Street NE, Washington, DC 20554 or at the following internet address: <https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/FCC-26-67A1.pdf>.

Synopsis

I. Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

We seek further comment on additional revisions to our TCPA rules that can ensure these rules continue to evolve with changes in technology and industry practices.

A. Joint Letter

On June 30, 2026, American Bankers Association, National Consumer Law Center, and ACA International filed a joint letter expressing concerns with the Commission's TCPA Consent Order, published at 89 FR 82518 on October 11, 2024, and proposing additional revisions to our TCPA rules. As discussed in greater detail below, we seek comment on these proposals including reducing the timeframe to honor revocation requests, requiring two-way texting to facilitate revocation requests made in response to text messages, requiring a “revoke all” method, and how revocation requests should apply to affiliates, separate lines of business, or divisions of entities of which such businesses are a part.

B. Timeframe for Honoring Revocation Requests

We seek comment on whether to reduce the timeframe for callers to honor revocation requests. Consumers are understandably frustrated when they continue to receive robocalls after revoking consent. Such delays also undermine a consumer's right to determine which robocalls that they wish to receive under the privacy protections afforded by the TCPA. Our rules currently provide that callers must honor revocation of consent requests within a reasonable time from the date that the request is made, not to exceed ten business days after receipt of the request. In adopting this timeframe, the Commission noted that advances in technology over time, including the use of automated and interactive technologies, makes the processing of revocation requests more efficient and timely and reserved the right to adjust this timeframe as necessary.

Because callers may now designate an exclusive, automated means by which consumers must revoke consent, we seek comment on whether they can now process revocation requests more quickly and efficiently. As a result, we seek comment on whether to reduce the

maximum timeframe for honoring revocation requests. For example, the Joint Letter suggests reducing the deadline to seven business days unless the caller demonstrates that processing a revocation beyond seven business days is reasonable. Is that a reasonable timeframe for callers to process revocation requests? Should the timeframe vary between those callers that designate an exclusive means to revoke consent and those that do not? Would varying timeframes result in consumer confusion? We seek comment on the cost and benefits to reduce the maximum timeframe for honoring revocation requests including ways to minimize any burdens on smaller entities subject to this obligation. We seek comment on these and any other issues relevant to this issue.

C. Two-Way Texting

We seek comment on whether to eliminate the provision from § 64.1200(a)(10) of the Commission's rules that allows text senders to use a texting protocol that does not allow consumers to revoke consent by reply text. Our rules currently permit text senders to utilize a texting protocol that does not allow for reply texts when the text sender: (1) provides a clear and conspicuous disclosure in each text to the consumer that two-way texting is not available due to technical limitations of the texting protocol; and (2) clearly and conspicuously provides in each text a reasonable alternative method for a consumer to revoke consent, such as a telephone number or website.

In the 2024 TCPA Consent Order, the Commission concluded that while there is no mandate that texting parties transmitting an autodialed text message must provide consumers with any specific means to revoke consent, such as through reply texts, that two-way texting is a reasonable and widely recognized means for text recipients to revoke prior express consent. In the Joint Letter, ABA, NCLC, and ACA International propose a rule amendment that would remove the provision from our rules that allows text senders to use one-way texting protocols by providing an alternative means in each text to revoke consent.

We seek comment on whether to require senders of text messages subject to § 64.1200(a)(10) to provide recipients with the ability to use reply texts to revoke consent. In that regard, we seek comment on the extent to which text senders currently use texting protocols that do not allow for reply texts. Are one-way texting protocols used primarily for informational and

notification purposes or are they also used for telemarketing and advertising? Should we consider allowing one-way texting for informational messages and require two-way texting only on text messages that include an advertisement or telemarketing? To what extent would requiring the use of two-way texting protocols enhance the ability of text recipients to more easily revoke consent to unwanted text messages by replying to the text? Conversely, to what extent would eliminating the ability of text senders to use one-way texting protocols increase compliance burdens or interfere with the ability to communicate with consumers? We seek comment on these and any other related issues including how we might minimize any compliance burdens for small entities as well as public institutions, such as schools that currently use one-way texting services.

D. Revoke All Method

We seek comment on whether callers should be allowed to treat a revocation request as applying to the type of call that prompted the revocation only if the caller provides a “method to revoke consent for all types of messages for which consent is required.” We also seek comment on whether we should require any such “revoke all” mechanism to be automated, and, if so, what specific forms such an automated mechanism should take. In light of our rule change allowing callers to interpret a revocation request as applying only to the specific category of informational robocalls to which the revocation was directed, we seek comment on whether consumers would benefit from a one-step option to stop all future robocalls. If so, we seek comment on what methods should be mandated and how such requirements could be designed to minimize compliance burdens, including on small entities. We also seek comment on EEI’s request for clarification that revocation requests apply only to the telephone number for which consent has been revoked rather than extend to all telephone numbers associated with a customer’s account. In that regard, we seek comment on whether this request is consistent with the TCPA’s reference to obtaining consent of the “called party” and Commission precedent.

Alternatively, we seek comment on whether the potential compliance burdens and risk of inadvertent revocation of consent to calls that they may wish to receive outweigh any such benefits and therefore should counsel against adopting such a requirement. To what extent does our clarification that revocation requests made in response to

robocalls with an advertisement or that constitute telemarketing revoke consent to all similar robocalls from that caller address concerns that consumers will be burdened with multiple revocation requests? We seek comment on whether limiting this situation to informational calls adequately mitigates those concerns. In addition, we note that one commenter opposes any requirement to provide a method to revoke consent to all calls arguing that such a requirement is not required by the TCPA and would impose significant burdens on callers. To the extent that the Joint Letter proposes revocation methods that effectively treat a customer’s failure to respond to communications intended to clarify a revocation request as a revocation of consent for all future robocalls, we seek comment on concerns that this is an overly broad approach that may not reflect customer intent. We seek comment on these and any other related issues in this context.

E. Affiliates and Separate Lines of Businesses or Divisions

We seek comment on whether further specificity is useful to clarify the application of the TCPA’s consent and revocation requirements where an entity operates through separate affiliates, lines of business, or divisions. We note that our current rules for exempted calls to residential telephone lines and telemarketing calls provide that “[i]n the absence of a specific request by the subscriber to the contrary, a residential subscriber’s do-not-call request shall apply to the particular entity making the call (or on whose behalf a call is made), and will not apply to affiliated entities unless the consumer reasonably would expect them to be included given the identification of the caller and (for telemarketing calls) the product being advertised.”

We seek comment on whether we should modify this existing standard or provide more specific guidance. If so, we seek comment on the form of such guidance. We also seek comment on whether this rule or a modified rule should be expanded to encompass all robocalls rather than limited to exempted and telemarketing calls. In that regard, we note that financial and consumer groups have suggested that we adopt a new rule governing affiliates and separate lines of businesses or divisions. We seek comment on these and any other issues related to this matter.

F. Other

We seek comment on whether there are any additional changes that we should consider to our rules that govern

revocation of consent in light of changes in technology and industry practices including any proposals contained in the Joint Letter or EEI Ex Parte not referenced above. For example, we note that the Joint Letter proposes to reduce the list of standardized words that can be used to revoke consent, eliminates the rebuttable presumption analysis contained in the current § 64.1200(a)(11) of the Commission’s rules to determine whether a reasonable revocation method has been used when a caller has not designated an exclusive means to revoke consent, and allow callers to make a confirmation call or text in response to a revocation request. In addition, Vibes requests that text senders be allowed to request clarification of the category of message from which the consumer intended to revoke consent in a confirmation text message. We seek comment on these and any other issues relevant to this matter.

II. Procedural Matters

G. Paperwork Reduction Act Analysis

The FNPRM may contain proposed new or modified information collection requirements. The Commission, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burdens, invites the general public and OMB to comment on these information collection requirements, as required by the PRA. In addition, pursuant to the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2002, 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(4), we seek specific comment on how we might further reduce the information collection burden for small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees.

H. Ex Parte Rules

This matter shall be treated as a “permit-but-disclose” proceeding in accordance with the Commission’s *ex parte* rules. 47 CFR 1.1200 through 1.1216. Persons making oral *ex parte* presentations are reminded that memoranda summarizing the presentations must contain summaries of the substances of the presentations and not merely a listing of the subjects discussed. More than a one or two sentence description of the views and arguments presented is generally required. See 47 CFR 1.1206(b). Other rules pertaining to oral and written *ex parte* presentations in permit-but-disclose proceedings are set forth in § 1.1206(b) of the Commission’s rules, 47 CFR 1.1206(b).

I. Providing Accountability Through Transparency Act

Consistent with the Providing Accountability Through Transparency

Act, Public Law 118–9, a summary of this document will be available on <https://www.fcc.gov/proposed-rulemakings>.

Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

As required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, as amended (RFA), the Federal Communications Commission (Commission) has prepared this Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA) of the policies and rules proposed in the Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (FNPRM) assessing the possible significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The Commission requests written public comments on this IRFA. Comments must be identified as responses to the IRFA and must be filed by the deadlines for comments specified in the **DATES** section of this document. The Commission will send a copy of the FNPRM, including this IRFA, to the Chief Counsel for the Small Business Administration (SBA) Office of Advocacy. In addition, the FNPRM and IRFA (or summaries thereof) will be published in the **Federal Register**.

A. Need for, and Objectives of, the Proposed Rules

In the FNPRM, the Commission seeks to update various TCPA rules that govern consumer's revocation of consent to receive robocalls. This FNPRM seeks comment on reducing the maximum timeframe for honoring revocation requests, requiring the use of two-way texting protocols that allow consumers to revoke consent via reply text message, offering a means to revoke

consent to all robocalls, and providing greater specificity to affiliates. Our objective is to ensure that our rules reflect advances in technology and regulatory changes that permit callers to process revocation requests in a timely and cost efficient manner to ensure that consumers can exercise their right to control which robocalls they wish to receive.

B. Legal Basis

The proposed action is authorized pursuant to sections 1–5, and 227 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 151–155, and 227.

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

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 rules, if adopted. The RFA generally defines the term “small entity” as having the same meaning as the terms “small business,” “small organization,” and “small governmental jurisdiction.” In addition, the term “small business” has the same meaning as the term “small business concern” under the Small Business Act. 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. 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.

Our actions, over time, may 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. In general, a small business is an independent business having fewer than 500 employees. These types of small businesses represent 99.9% of all businesses in the United States, which translates to 34.75 million businesses. Next, “small organizations” are not-for-profit enterprises that are independently owned and operated and not dominant in their field. 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. Finally, “small governmental jurisdictions” are defined as cities, counties, towns, townships, villages, school districts, or special districts with populations of less than fifty thousand. Based on the 2022 U.S. Census of Governments data, we estimate that at least 48,724 out of 90,835 local government jurisdictions have a population of less than 50,000.

The rules proposed in the FNPRM will apply to small entities in the industries identified in the chart below by their six-digit North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) codes and corresponding SBA size standard. Where available, we also provide additional information regarding the number of potentially affected entities in the industries identified 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	Total small firms	Percentage small firms
Wired Telecommunications Carriers	517111	1,500 employees	3,403	3,027	88.95
Wireless Telecommunications Carriers (except Satellite)	517112	1,500 employees	1,184	1,081	91.30
Commercial Banks	522110	\$850 million in assets ..	3,917	2,897	73.96
Credit Unions	522130	\$850 million in assets ..	4,411	3,671	83.22
Savings Institutions and Other Depository Credit Intermediation	522180	\$850 million in assets ..	569	375	65.91
Sales Financing	522220	\$47 million	2,180	1,690	77.52
Consumer Lending	522291	\$47 million	2,918	2,292	78.55
Mortgage and Nonmortgage Loan Brokers	522310	\$15 million	4,603	3,966	86.16
Offices of Real Estate Agents and Brokers	531210	\$15 million	150,558	100,559	66.79
Marketing Consulting Services	541613	\$19 million	50,507	34,127	67.57
Other Services Related to Advertising	541890	\$19 million	7,067	4,850	68.63
Facilities Support Service	561210	\$47 million	2,941	2,402	81.67
Telemarketing Bureaus and Other Contact Centers	561422	\$25.5 million	2,380	1,798	75.55
Collection Agencies	561440	\$19.5 million	2,549	1,827	71.68
Schools	611110	\$20 million	14,088	14,087	99.99
Offices of Physicians Except Mental Health Specialists	621111	\$16 million	138,120	104,486	75.65
Offices of All Other Miscellaneous Health Practitioners	621399	\$10 million	29,775	18,206	61.15
General Medical and Surgical Hospitals	622110	\$47 million	2,280	501	21.97
Business Associations	813910	\$15.5 million	14,599	13,134	89.97

TABLE 2—TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE PROVIDER DATA

2025 Universal Service Monitoring Report telecommunications service provider data (data as of December 2024)	SBA size standard (1,500 employees)		
	Total number FCC Form 499A filers	Small firms	Percentage small entities
Affected entity			
Competitive Local Exchange Carriers (CLECs)	4,049	3,853	95.16
Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers (Incumbent LECs)	1,175	920	78.30
Interexchange Carriers (IXCs)	112	92	82.14
Local Exchange Carriers (LECs)	5,224	4,773	91.37
Operator Service Providers (OSPs)	26	24	92.31
Other Toll Carriers	72	69	95.83
Paging & Messaging	56	56	100.00
Payphone Service Providers	25	24	96.00
Prepaid Card Providers	47	45	95.74
Telecommunications Resellers	655	630	96.18
Wired Telecommunications Carriers	4,971	4,531	91.15
Wireless Telecommunications Carriers (except Satellite)	608	522	85.86
Wireless Telephony	336	262	77.98

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

The RFA directs agencies to describe the economic impact of proposed 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 requirements and the type of professional skills necessary for preparation of the report or record.

In this FNPRM, we seek comment on whether to reduce the maximum timeframe for callers to honor revocation requests. This may require callers to take compliance measures to ensure that revocation requests are processed within a shorter timeframe than under our current rules. We have also sought comment on eliminating the existing rule provision that allows text senders to utilize one-way texting protocols that do not allow for reply text messages by disclosing this limitation and providing a reasonable alternative way for a consumer to revoke consent. Eliminating this provision may require some text senders to change their current texting protocol to a two-way texting protocol that allows for reply text messages. We also seek comment on whether to require callers to offer a means to revoke consent to all robocalls including whether the compliance burdens outweigh benefits. These may entail some compliance burdens and costs on small entities if adopted such as requiring callers to alter existing communications systems to accommodate these requirements. In this FNPRM, we specifically seek comment on these compliance burdens that may impact small entities.

E. Discussion of Significant Alternatives Considered That Minimize the Significant Economic Impact on Small Entities

The RFA directs agencies to provide a description of any significant alternatives to the proposed rules that would accomplish the stated objectives of applicable statutes, and minimize any significant economic impact on small entities. The discussion is required to include alternatives such as: “(1) the establishment of differing compliance or reporting requirements or timetables that take into account the resources available to small entities; (2) the clarification, consolidation, or simplification of compliance and reporting requirements under the rule for such small entities; (3) the use of performance rather than design standards; and (4) an exemption from coverage of the rule, or any part thereof, for such small entities.”

In this FNPRM, we seek comment on alternatives that minimize the economic impact of any rule medication on small entities. For example, we seek comment regarding whether the timeframe for honoring revocation requests should vary between those callers that designate a method to revoke consents and those that do not. This may lessen the compliance burdens on smaller entities by reducing the timeframe only in those instances in which the caller has designated the method to revoke consent and thereby avoid the necessity to process all reasonable revocation requests. We have also sought comment on whether only those text senders that send messages containing telemarketing should be required to utilize two-way texting protocols. This would allow interested parties, including smaller entities, that use one-way text

messaging for informational and notification purposes to continue doing so without the necessity to change to a two-way texting protocol. Finally, we seek comment on the compliance burdens associated with requiring callers to provide a means for consumers to revoke consent to all robocalls including ways to minimize the burdens on smaller entities.

F. Federal Rules That May Duplicate, Overlap, or Conflict With the Proposed Rules

None.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 64

Communications common carriers, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Telecommunications, Telephone.

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene Dortch,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2026-21820 Filed 10-23-26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 571

[Docket No. NHTSA-2026-1519]

RIN 2127-AM70

Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Modernization of FMVSS No. 108 To Accommodate ADS-Equipped Vehicles

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT).