

This submission is being made pursuant to 44 U.S.C. § 3507 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 to revise this collection.

SUPPORTING STATEMENT

A. Justification:

1. Sections 201, 202, 203, 204 and 205 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 and 205, require that common carriers establish just and reasonable charges, practices and regulations that must be filed with the Commission, which is authorized to determine whether such schedules are just, reasonable and not unduly discriminatory. Section 251(b)(5) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 251(b)(5), requires local exchange carriers to establish reciprocal compensation arrangements for the transport and termination of telecommunications.

Part 61 of the Commission's rules establishes the procedures for filing interstate tariffs which contain the charges, practices and regulations of the common carriers, supporting economic data and other related documents. The supporting data must also conform to other parts of the rules such as Parts 36 and 69. Part 61 prescribes the framework for the initial establishment of and subsequent revisions to tariffs. Any issuing carrier that is an incumbent local exchange carrier, and chooses to establish an Internet web site, must make its tariffs available on that web site, in addition to the Commission's web site. See 47 C.F.R. § 61.72(c).

Part 51 of the Commission's rules requires certain local exchange carriers to file interstate and/or intrastate tariffs to transition certain interstate and intrastate switched access and reciprocal compensation rates to bill-and-keep. This subpart uses the tariffing procedures of Part 61 to govern the interstate tariff filings required by Part 51. Tariffs that are required by Part 51 to be filed with state commissions are to use the relevant state procedures.

On April 27, 2001, the Commission released the *CLEC Access Order*,¹ which limited the application of the Commission's tariff rules to interstate access services provided by nondominant local exchange carriers (*i.e.*, competitive LECs). Pursuant to this order, competitive LEC access rates that are at or below a benchmark set by the Commission will be presumed to be just and reasonable and may be imposed by tariff. Above the benchmark, competitive LEC access services were mandatorily detariffed.

¹ *Access Charge Reform, Reform of Access Charges Imposed by Competitive Local Exchange Carriers*, CC Docket No. 96-262, Order, 16 FCC Rcd 3832 (2001) (*CLEC Access Order*).

On September 23, 2005, the Commission released the *Wireline Broadband Internet Access Services Order*, which permits facilities-based providers to offer broadband Internet access transmission arrangements for wireline broadband Internet access services on a common carrier basis or a non-common carrier basis.² If the provider decides to offer broadband Internet access transmission service on a common carrier basis, the Commission allows them to do so on a permissive detariffed basis.

On August 31, 2007, the Commission released the *Section 272 Sunset Order*, which found the Bell Operating Companies (BOCs) to be nondominant in the provision of in-region, interstate and international, long distance services, whether they provide these services directly or through affiliates that are neither section 272 nor rule 64.1903 affiliates.³ Under that Order, AT&T, the legacy Qwest portions of CenturyLink, Verizon, Hawaiian Telcom, and the legacy Verizon portions of FairPoint and Frontier are barred from filing tariffs for in-region, interstate and international, long distance services pursuant to section 203 of the Act and sections 61.31-61.38 and 61.43 of the Commission's rules.

On November 18, 2011, the Commission released the *USF/ICC Transformation Order*,⁴ which requires or permits incumbent and competitive local exchange carriers as part of transitioning regulation of interstate and intrastate switched access rates and reciprocal compensation rates to bill-and-keep under section 251(b)(5) to file tariffs with state commissions and the FCC. This transition affects different switched access rates at specified timeframes and establishes an Access Recovery Charge by which carriers will be able to assess end users a monthly charge to recover some or all of the revenues they are permitted to recover resulting from reductions in intercarrier compensation rates.

On March 23, 2016, the Commission adopted the *Rate-of-Return Order*,⁵ which reformed universal service for rate-of-return LECs. The Commission allowed carriers to elect the new Alternative Connect America Model (A-CAM), which provides a set amount of monthly support over 10 years, or remain with a reformed version of legacy support mechanisms with Connect America Fund Broadband Support (CAF-BLS) and High Cost Loop Support (HCLS).

² *Appropriate Framework for Broadband Access to the Internet Over Wireline Facilities; Universal Service Obligations of Broadband Providers; Review of Regulatory Requirements for Incumbent LEC Broadband Telecommunications Services, Computer III Further Remand Proceedings: Bell Operating Company Provision of Enhanced Services; 1998 Biennial Regulatory Review – Review of Computer III and ONA Safeguards and Requirements; Conditional Petition of the Verizon Telephone Companies for Forbearance Under 47 U.S.C. § 160(c) with Regard to Broadband Services Provided Via Fiber to the Premises; Petition of the Verizon Telephone Companies for Declaratory Ruling or, Alternatively, for Interim Waiver with Regard to Broadband Services Provided Via Fiber to the Premises; Consumer Protection in the Broadband Era*, CC Docket Nos. 02-33, 01-337, 95-20, 98-10, WC Docket Nos. 04-242, 05-271, Report and Order and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 20 FCC Rcd 14853 (2005) (*Wireline Broadband Internet Access Services Order*).

³ *Section 272(f)(1) Sunset of the BOC Separate Affiliate and Related Requirements; 2000 Biennial Regulatory Review Separate Affiliate Requirements of Section 64.1903 of the Commission's Rules; Petition of AT&T Inc. for Forbearance Under 47 U.S.C. § 160(c) with Regard to Certain Dominant Carrier Regulations for In-Region, Interexchange Services*, WC Docket Nos. 02-112 and 06-120, CC Docket No. 00-175, Report and Order and Memorandum Opinion and Order, 22 FCC Rcd 16440 (2007) (*Section 272 Sunset Order*).

⁴ *Connect America Fund et al.*, WC Docket Nos. 10-90, 07-135, 05-337, 03-109, CC Docket Nos. 01-92, 96-45, GN Docket No. 09-51, WT Docket No. 10-208, Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 26 FCC Rcd 17663 (2011) (*USF/ICC Transformation Order*).

⁵ *Connect America Fund et al.*, WC Docket Nos. 10-90 and 14-58, CC Docket No. 01-92, Report and Order, Order and Order on Reconsideration, and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 16-33 (adopted May 23, 2016) (*Rate-of-Return Order*).

On April 28, 2017, the Commission released the *Business Data Services Order*,⁶ which establishes a new regulatory framework for business data services. Under this framework, price cap incumbent LECs are no longer subject to price cap regulation of their: (a) packet-based business data services; (b) time division multiplexing (TDM) transport business data services; (c) TDM business data services with bandwidth in excess of a DS3; and (d) DS1 and DS3 end user channel terminations, and other lower bandwidth TDM business data services, to the extent a price cap incumbent LEC provides them in counties deemed competitive under the Commission's competitive market test or in counties for which the price cap incumbent LEC had obtained Phase II pricing flexibility under the Commission's prior regulatory regime. The *Business Data Services Order* required that, within 36 months of its effective date (*i.e.*, by August 1, 2020), price cap incumbent LECs must remove all business data services that are no longer subject to price cap regulation from their interstate tariffs. The Order also required that, by that same deadline, competitive LECs must remove all business data services from their interstate tariffs.

On October 24, 2018, the Commission released the *Rate-of-Return Business Data Services Report and Order*,⁷ allowing rate-of-return carriers currently receiving model-based or other forms of fixed high-cost universal service support to voluntarily elect to transition their business data service offerings from rate-of-return to incentive regulation.

On September 27, 2019, the Commission released the *Access Arbitrage Order*,⁸ making access-stimulating local exchange carriers (LECs) financially responsible for the terminating tandem switching and transport service access charges associated with the delivery of traffic from an interexchange carrier (IXC) to the access-stimulating LEC end office or its functional equivalent. The *Access Arbitrage Order* required that, within 45 days of its effective date, access-stimulating LECs remove any existing tariff provisions for terminating tandem switching or terminating tandem switched transport access charges. Affected intermediate access providers have the same time period to prepare any tariff revisions which they may see fit to file. The *Access Arbitrage Order* also required that access-stimulating LECs provide notice of their assumption of that financial responsibility to the Commission by filing a record of their access-stimulating status and acceptance of financial responsibility in the Commission's *Access Arbitrage* docket, and to provide notice to any affected IXCs and intermediate access providers of the same, within 45 days of approval by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). If, after approval of this requirement by OMB, access-stimulating LECs no longer engage in access stimulation they must also file notice of that change in status with the Commission and with any affected IXCs and intermediate access providers.

This information collection does not affect individuals or households; thus, there are no impacts under the Privacy Act.

Statutory authority for this information collection is contained in sections 1-5, 201-205, 208, 251-271, 403, 502, and 503 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151-155, 201-205, 208, 251-271, 403, 502, and 503.

⁶ *Business Data Services in an Internet Protocol Environment*, WC Docket 16-143 et al., Report and Order, 32 FCC Rcd 3459 (2017) (*Business Data Services Order*).

⁷ *Business Data Services for Rate-of-Return Local Exchange Carriers*, WC Docket No. 16-143 et al., Report and Order, 33 FCC Rcd 10403 (2018) (*Rate-of-Return Business Data Services Order*).

⁸ *Updating the Intercarrier Compensation Regime to Eliminate Access Arbitrage*, WC Docket No. 18-155, Report and Order and Modification of Section 214 Authorizations (rel. Sept. 27, 2019) (*Access Arbitrage Order*).

2. The information collected through a carrier's tariff is used by the Commission and State Commissions to determine whether services offered are just and reasonable as the Act requires. The tariffs and any supporting documentation are examined in order to determine if the services are offered in a just and reasonable manner.

3. Beginning January 18, 2012, all carriers, both domestic and international, were required to file interstate and international tariffs (where still mandated or permitted) electronically using the Commission's Electronic Tariff Filing System.⁹ We are unable to estimate the number of filings with state commissions that can be made electronically, or how many will need to be filed by paper.

4. No similar information is available elsewhere.

5. As discussed in prior OMB filings, small incumbent local exchange carriers are not considered by the Commission to constitute small entities within the meaning of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, since they are dominant in the provision of local exchange and access services. The Commission, nevertheless, is committed to reducing the regulatory burdens on small incumbent local exchange carriers whenever possible consistent with the Commission's other public interest responsibilities. Nondominant local exchange carriers are permitted, but not required, to file tariffs for services that are not mandatorily detariffed. Some nondominant local exchange carriers may qualify as small businesses under the Regulatory Flexibility Act. See *CLEC Access Order*, paras. 115-116.

6. The tariff reporting requirements are necessary to allow the Commission and state commissions to become aware of unjust or unreasonable charges to the public in a timely manner. Without these reporting requirements, the Commission would not be able to minimize any adverse effects on the public.

7. Sections 51.907 and 51.909 of the Commission's rules, among other things, require incumbent local exchange carriers to file tariffs with State Commissions. We do not know the extent to which any state commission may require that more than an original and two copies of a tariff filing be filed. If that is the case, we believe that state commissions have determined that multiple copies are needed for it to perform its functions.

8. The Commission published a 60-day notice in the Federal Register seeking public comment on Nov. 27, 2019 (84 FR 65392). The Commission received one comment in response, filed by AT&T Services, Inc. A&T supported the notice provisions, and agreed that the provisions impose minimal burdens on access stimulating LECs. AT&T also agreed that the provisions will increase transparency into access stimulation and will assist in the orderly transition of financial responsibility.

9. The Commission does not anticipate providing any payment or gift to respondents.

10. The information is not of a confidential nature. Respondents who believe certain information to be of a proprietary nature may solicit confidential treatment in accordance with the procedures described in 47 C.F.R. § 0.459.

11. There are no questions of a sensitive nature with respect to this information collection.

12. The following represents the estimated number of burden hours for this information collection. We note that the hourly burden imposed by the requirement is very difficult to quantify. The following represents our best estimate.

⁹ *Electronic Tariff Filing System (EFTS)*, WC Docket No. 10-141, Report and Order, 26 FCC Rcd 8884 (2011).

A. Reporting Requirement of Interstate Tariffs

- (1) Number of respondents: 740.
- (2) Frequency of response: One-time, on occasion, annual, and biennial reporting requirements.
- (3) Total number of responses annually: Approximately 1,480.
- (4) Estimated time per response: 50 hours.
- (5) Total annual burden: **74,000 hours**.

The Commission estimates that approximately 740 respondents will require 50 hours of reporting time per filing.

740 respondents x 50 hours per response x 2 responses per year per respondent = 74,000 hours.

- (6) Total estimate of “in-house” cost to respondents: **\$3,469,120**.

- (7) Explanation of calculation:

The Commission estimates that respondents will use personnel comparable in pay to a GS 12/Step 5 employee earning \$46.88 per hour. Thus:

74,000 hours x \$46.88 per hour = \$3,469,120.

B. Reporting Requirement of Intrastate Tariffs

- (1) Number of respondents: Approximately 2,840.
- (2) Frequency of response: One-time, on occasion and annual reporting requirements.
- (3) Total number of responses annually: Approximately 2,840.
- (4) Estimated time per response: 30 hours.
- (5) Total annual burden: **85,200 hours**.

The Commission estimates that approximately 2,840 respondents will require 30 hours of reporting time per filing.

2,840 respondents x 30 hours per response x 1 response per year per respondent = 85,200 hours.

- (6) Total estimate of “in-house” cost to respondents: **\$3,994,176**.

- (7) Explanation of calculation:

The Commission estimates that respondents will use personnel comparable in pay to a GS 12/Step 5 employee earning \$46.88 per hour. Thus:

85,200 hours x \$46.88 per hour = \$3,994,176.

C. Reporting Requirement: Detariffing of Price Cap Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers

- (1) Number of respondents: 13.
- (2) Frequency of response: On occasion reporting requirement as needed by filer.
- (3) Total number of responses annually: Approximately 13.
- (4) Estimated time per response: Approximately 30 hours per filing.
- (5) Total annual burden: **390 hours.**

The Commission estimates that approximately 13 entities will require approximately 30 hours of reporting time per filing.

13 respondents x 30 hours per response x 1 response per year per respondent = 390 hours.

- (6) Total estimate of “in-house” cost to respondents: **\$18,283.20.**
- (7) Explanation of calculation:

The Commission estimates that respondents will use personnel comparable in pay to a GS 12/Step 5 employee earning \$46.88 per hour. Thus:

390 hours x \$46.88 per hour = \$18,283.20.

D. Reporting Requirement: Detariffing of Competitive Local Exchange Carriers

- (1) Number of respondents: 1,210.
- (2) Frequency of response: On occasion reporting requirement as needed by filer.
- (3) Total number of responses annually: 1,210.
- (4) Estimated time per response: 30 hours.
- (5) Total annual burden: **36,300 hours.**

The Commission estimates that approximately 1,210 entities will require approximately 30 hours of reporting time per filing.

1,210 respondents x 30 hours per response x 1 response per year per respondent = 36,300 hours.

(6) Total estimate of “in-house” cost to respondents: **\$1,701,744.**

(7) Explanation of calculation:

The Commission estimates that respondents will use personnel comparable in pay to a GS 12/Step 5 employee earning \$46.88 per hour. Thus:

$36,300 \text{ hours} \times \$46.88 \text{ hour} = \$1,701,744.$

E. Reporting Requirement: Detariffing of Access-Stimulating Local Exchange Carriers

(1) Number of respondents: Approximately 25.

(2) Frequency of response: One-time reporting requirement.

(3) Total number of responses annually: Approximately 25.

(4) Estimated time per response: Approximately 30 hours.

(5) Total annual burden: **750 hours.**

The Commission estimates that approximately 25 entities will require approximately 30 hours of reporting time per filing.

$25 \text{ respondents} \times 30 \text{ hours per response} \times 1 \text{ response per respondent} = 750 \text{ hours.}$

(6) Total estimate of “in-house” cost to respondents: **\$35,160.**

(7) Explanation of calculation:

The Commission estimates that respondents will use personnel comparable in pay to a GS 12/Step 5 employee earning \$46.88 per hour. Thus:

$750 \text{ hours} \times \$46.88 = \$35,160.$

F. Reporting Requirement: Notice Provided by Access-Stimulating Local Exchange Carriers

(1) Number of respondents: Approximately 25.

(2) Frequency of response: On occasion reporting requirement as needed by filer.

(3) Total number of responses annually: Approximately 25.

(4) Estimated time per response: 1 hour.

(5) Total annual burden: **25 hours.**

The Commission estimates that approximately 25 entities will require approximately 1 hour of reporting time per filing.

25 respondents x 1 hour per response x 1 response per year per respondent = 25 hours.

(6) Total estimate of “in-house” cost to respondents: **\$1,172.**

(7) Explanation of calculation:

The Commission estimates that respondents will use personnel comparable in pay to a GS 12/Step 5 employee earning \$46.88 per hour. Thus:

25 hours x \$46.88 hour = \$1,172.

G. Reporting Requirement: Notice Provided When Local Exchange Carrier is No Longer Engaged in Access Stimulation

(1) Number of respondents: Approximately 12.

(2) Frequency of response: On occasion reporting requirement as needed by filer.

(3) Total number of responses annually: Approximately 12.

(4) Estimated time per response: 1 hour.

(5) Total annual burden: **12 hours.**

The Commission estimates that approximately 12 entities will require approximately 1 hour of reporting time per filing.

12 respondents x 1 hour per response x 1 response per year per respondent = 12 hours.

(6) Total estimate of “in-house” cost to respondents: **\$562.56.**

(7) Explanation of calculation:

The Commission estimates that respondents will use personnel comparable in pay to a GS 12/Step 5 employee earning \$46.88 per hour. Thus:

12 hours x \$46.88/hour = \$562.56.

Total respondents: Approximately 2,840.

Total responses: 1,480 + 2,840 + 13 + 1,210 + 25 + 25 + 12 = 5,605.

Total annual burden: 74,000 + 85,200 + 390 + 36,300 + 750 + 25 + 12 = 196,677 hours.

Total In-House Costs to the Respondent:

- A. \$ 3,469,120
- B. \$ 3,994,176
- C. \$ 18,283.20
- D. \$ 1,701,744
- E. \$ 35,160
- F. \$ 1,172
- G. \$ 562.56

Total: \$9,220,217.76.

13. The following represents the Commission's estimate of the annual cost burden for respondents resulting from the information collection:

- (1) Total capital and start-up cost component (annualized over its expected useful life): \$0.
- (2) Total operations and maintenance and purchase of services: \$1,444,800.

Respondents are subject to a \$960 filing fee, for all interstate tariff submissions, not just the increase in filings addressed herein. We are unable to estimate what, if any, intrastate filing fees there may be. Thus:

$$1,505 \text{ filings} \times \$960 = \$1,444,800.$$

- (3) **Total annualized cost requested: \$1,444,800.**

14. Annualized cost to the Federal government to handle all tariffs has been estimated to be approximately \$987,206. Without conducting a survey, we are unable to estimate the cost to state commissions of reviewing the tariff filings that will be made with them.

15. The Commission is reporting program changes to this information collection as a result of the addition of reporting requirements to implement the *Access Arbitrage Order*. Therefore, the total number of responses increased from 5,543 to 5,605 (+62) and the total annual burden hours increased from 195,890 to 196,677 (+787). The total annualized cost has increased from \$1,369,000 to \$1,444,800 (+ \$75,800) due to an increase in the number of tariff filings (from 1,480 to 1,505) and an increase in the tariff filing fee (from \$925 to \$960).

16. The Commission does not anticipate that it will publish any of the information collected.

17. The Commission does not seek approval not to display the expiration date for OMB approval of the information collection.

18. There are no exceptions to the certification statement.

B. Collections of Information Employing Statistical Methods:

This information collection does not employ any statistical methods.