

Connect America Fund- Alternative Connect America Cost Model (A-CAM) Voluntary Location Adjustment Process and Rural Digital Opportunity Fund (RDOF) Unreasonable Locations Process

**3060-1279
March 2026**

SUPPORTING STATEMENT

The Federal Communications Commission (“FCC or the Commission”) is seeking approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) to revise this information collection to eliminate the requirements associated with the Connect America Phase II Auction Eligible Locations Adjustment Process (ELAP) now that this process has concluded.

Additionally, the Commission is seeking approval for new information collection requirements implemented in the *High-Cost Fabric Order*. Specifically, the Commission seeks approval for information collection requirements related to a voluntary location adjustment process for Revised Alternative Connect America Cost Model (A-CAM) I and A-CAM II carriers that will give carriers an opportunity to seek a downward adjustment in the number of locations they are required to serve if there are fewer locations in their service area than originally estimated, along with an associated support reduction. The Commission also seeks approval for information collection requirements related to a process for Rural Digital Opportunity Fund (RDOF) carriers that have more actual locations in their service areas than originally estimated to demonstrate that locations in their service areas are unreasonable to serve. Finally, the proposed revisions include retitling this collection from “Connect America Fund – Eligible Locations Adjustment Process” to “Connect America Fund- Alternative Connect America Cost Model (A-CAM) Voluntary Location Adjustment Process and Rural Digital Opportunity Fund (RDOF) Unreasonable Locations Process.”

A. Justification

1. *Circumstances that make the collection necessary:*

The Communications Act of 1934, as amended (Act), requires the “preservation and advancement of universal service.” 47 U.S.C. § 254(b). The information collection requirements reported under this information collection are the result of FCC actions to promote the Act’s universal service goals.

Eligible Locations Adjustment Process

This information collection addresses the requirements of ELAP that the Commission used to facilitate the post-auction review of certain CAF (Connect America Fund) Phase II Auction support recipients’ defined deployment obligations (and associated support), on a state-by-state basis, in situations where the number of eligible locations within a state is less than the number of funded locations. *Connect America Fund*, WC Docket No. 10-90, Order, 38 FCC Rcd 1135 (WCB 2023); *Connect America Fund*, WC Docket Nos. 10-90 et al., Order on Reconsideration, 33 FCC Rcd 1380, 1390-92, paras. 23-28 (2018) (*Phase II Auction Reconsideration Order*); *Connect America Fund*, WC Docket

No. 10-90, Order, 34 FCC Rcd 10395 (WCB 2019) (adopting rules and requirements necessary to implement this process, consistent with the parameters set forth in the *Phase II Auction Reconsideration Order* and prior Commission guidance for adjusting defined deployment obligations) (*ELAP Order*). CAF Phase II Auction support recipients' participation in this process was voluntary. On February 9, 2023, the Wireline Competition Bureau (WCB) released an order determining that each ELAP participant had met its burden of proof and modifying the obligations and support of each of these participants, on a state-by-state basis. *Connect America Fund*, WC Docket No. 10-90, Order, 38 FCC Rcd 1135 (WCB 2023) (*ELAP Resolution Order*).

Revised A-CAM I and A-CAM II Locations Adjustment Process

This information collection also addresses the requirements of a location adjustment process that the Commission adopted for Revised A-CAM I and A-CAM II carriers. Specifically, the Commission decided that A-CAM support recipients that discover there is a widely divergent number of locations in their funded census blocks as compared to the model-estimated number of locations should have the opportunity to seek an adjustment to modify their deployment obligations. The Commission delegated to the WCB the authority to adjust the number of funded locations downward and reduce associated funding levels. *Connect America Fund et al.*, WC Docket No. 10-90 et al., Report and Order, Order and Order on Reconsideration, and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 31 FCC Rcd 3087 (2016) (*2016 Rate-of-Return Reform Order*).

In the *High-Cost Fabric Order*, WCB adopted procedures to implement this process, including permitting Revised A-CAM I and A-CAM II carriers that have fewer locations in eligible 2010 census blocks than the carrier has supported locations pursuant to its A-CAM authorization to seek a voluntary downward adjustment in their location totals by using the Broadband Serviceable Location Fabric (Fabric) to demonstrate the actual number of locations in their service areas. The adjustment will be based on the version of the Fabric used for the Broadband Data Collection (BDC) collection as of June 30, 2026, which is expected to be released to licensees around June 2026, and carriers will have a one-time window to request such an adjustment shortly after this version of the Fabric is made available to licensees. Revised A-CAM I and A-CAM II carriers must request a downward adjustment in WC Docket No. 10-90 and can incorporate Fabric by reference when requesting this adjustment by certifying that they have reviewed the Fabric and there are fewer locations identified in the relevant version of the Fabric in the carriers' service area than the carrier's model-estimated locations total. A carrier can demonstrate that it has met the preponderance of the evidence standard by referencing the Fabric data and WCB will use the A-CAM to determine the adjusted location obligations and support amounts for such carriers. *Connect America Fund et al.*, WC Docket No. 10-90 et al., DA 25-32 (WCB Jan. 10, 2025) (*High-Cost Fabric Order*).

Process for Removing Unreasonable Locations for Carriers with More RDOF Locations

To account for disparities between locations on the ground and those estimated by the Connect America Cost Model and to acknowledge its confidence that the Commission would have access to more accurate location data in the next few years, the Commission directed WCB to seek comment on updated location data and publish revised location counts no later than the end of service milestone year six for RDOF carriers. The Commission also adopted a framework for how service milestones would be revised in various circumstances after WCB had published more accurate location counts. In areas where there are more locations than locations estimated by the CAM, a RDOF carrier has until the end of the eighth calendar year to offer service to the additional locations. Such a RDOF carrier may seek to have its new location count adjusted to exclude additional locations, beyond the number identified by the CAM, that are ineligible, unreasonable to deploy to, or are part of a development that is newly built after the sixth year of support for which the cost and/or time to deploy before the end of the support term would be unreasonable. *Connect America Fund et al.*, WC Docket No. 19-126 et al., Report and Order, 35 FCC Rcd 686 (2020).

In the *High-Cost Fabric Order*, WCB adopted procedures to implement this process. Specifically, once WCB has announced revised location totals for RDOF carriers in 2027, carriers will have six months to submit any requests to remove locations from their revised locations lists. WCB will set up a data collection system in which carriers should submit a request identifying the locations they claim are unreasonable to serve (i.e., Fabric Location ID), the specific reasons why each location is unreasonable to serve, and evidence to support their claims. WCB may request additional information from the carrier and other stakeholders to verify and assess the carrier's claims. Also, WCB may request additional information to assess a carrier's claim that a location is unreasonable to serve, and a failure to submit this additional information would result in finding that the carrier has not demonstrated that it would be unreasonable to serve the location.

New requirements for which we are seeking OMB approval:

The Commission proposes to add the following information collection requirements for which WCB adopted procedures in the *High-Cost Fabric Order*:

(1) Revised A-CAM I and A-CAM II Location Adjustment Process (See 12.a):

WCB will open a one-time window for Revised A-CAM I and A-CAM II carriers to request a downward adjustment when there are fewer locations in eligible 2010 census blocks than the carrier has supported locations pursuant to its A-CAM authorization. Carriers that want to participate in this process must request a downward adjustment in WC Docket No. 10-90 by a deadline that WCB will announce in a public release. Carriers are permitted to incorporate Fabric data by reference when requesting this adjustment by certifying that they have reviewed the Fabric and there are fewer locations in the version of the Fabric used for the BDC as of June 30, 2026 than the carrier's model-estimated locations total. Carriers are on notice that any outstanding or pending

challenges that were filed but not incorporated in the release of this Fabric version will not be considered for determining the final deployment obligation.

A carrier can demonstrate that it has met the preponderance of the evidence standard by referencing the Fabric data. The A-CAM will be used to determine the adjusted location obligations and support amounts. Support will be capped at existing levels.

(2) Process for Removing Unreasonable Locations for Carriers with More RDOF Locations (See 12.b):

RDOF carriers for which there are more locations than estimated by the CAM can seek to exclude additional locations, beyond the number identified by the CAM, to which they determine it is unreasonable to deploy. Such a RDOF carrier must submit a request using the data collection system that the Universal Service Administrative Company (USAC) will have set up at the direction of WCB.

Specifically, a RDOF carrier must submit the following information:

- a) Carrier name
- b) Service Provider Identification Number (SPIN/498 ID)
- c) Study area code
- d) State
- e) Fabric Location ID
- f) Reason why location is unreasonable to serve
- g) Evidence to demonstrate location is unreasonable to serve
- h) Whether the carrier is requesting confidential treatment of the submitted evidence
- i) Certification that carrier has or will have served at a minimum the number of locations estimated by the CAM by the end of the deployment period
- j) Contact information

WCB does not expect to routinely grant requests to exclude locations from a RDOF carrier's location total and will conduct a rigorous, thorough, and searching review of the information submitted that (1) will include, but not be limited to, the consideration of all factors discussed in the High-Cost Fabric Order, and 2) will be comparable to a total company earnings review in which WCB will take into account not only all revenues derived from network facilities that are supported by universal service but also revenues derived from unregulated and unsupported services as well in determining whether it would be unreasonable for a company to serve a location. WCB may request additional information to assess a carrier's claim that a location is unreasonable to serve, and a failure to submit this additional information will result in the Bureau finding that the carrier has not demonstrated that it would be unreasonable to serve the location.

RDOF carriers will be required to submit their requests within six months after the date that WCB announces new location totals for RDOF carriers. However, if WCB makes the data collection available sooner, RDOF carriers can submit requests, but must certify that they have

or will have served at a minimum the number of locations estimated by the CAM by the end of the deployment period.

Currently approved requirements in this information collection that are being eliminated:

The Commission proposes to eliminate the following information collection requirements related to ELAP now that the ELAP has ended:

(3) Collection of Location Information from Participants (See 12.c):

For each state in which a participant is seeking an adjustment to its defined deployment obligation, the participant must submit location information for all qualifying locations and may submit information for prospective locations. The total number of eligible locations (qualifying and prospective locations) in a state cannot exceed the participant's defined deployment obligation for that state.

To initiate the ELAP process, a participant must identify itself and the state in which it is seeking adjustment to its defined deployment obligation. There are 198 participant/state combinations. We estimate that 75 percent of the participant/state combinations, or 148 respondents, will submit location information pursuant to the ELAP. In some instances, a participant will seek to adjust its defined deployment obligation in more than one state. In these instances, each participant/state combination is treated as a separate respondent and information submitted for each state are treated as separate filings.

Participants must submit eligible location information in a tabular format (e.g., a .csv file) into a module within the HUBB. Separate .csv files must be prepared for each qualifying location and prospective location. For each location entry, participants must submit the following information:

- (a) Study Area Code(s)
- (b) Address of location
- (c) Latitude of the location (to 6 decimal places)
- (d) Longitude of Location (to 6 decimal places)
- (e) Number of units at the location
- (f) Method information, e.g., GPS methods and/or source used and the "as-of" date of such method or source
- (g) Location Type, i.e., qualifying location, prospective location, ineligible location
- (h) Ineligible Reason Code from Drop-Down List
- (i) Ineligible Reason Comment if Ineligible Reason Code is "Other"

In addition, the participant may submit the above location information in the same .csv file for any location that it has affirmatively determined to be ineligible, together with a description of the reason why such location should not be counted, e.g., derelict, industrial facility, or temporary or mobile unit.

The participant also must provide the following information: contact information for the person who prepared and submitted the data; an officer certification that the information is true and correct; and the certifying officer's official contact information. A participant may revise and recertify its filing until the filing deadline.

(4) Collection of Methods Description from Participants (See 12.d):

For each state in which it is seeking adjustment, each participant must submit its methods description (e.g., as a .pdf file) into the ELAP module. The description must describe the participant's method(s) for identifying every qualifying location within eligible areas within a state. Participants must also justify their methodological choices and make clear that they systematically and reasonably gathered location data for all eligible areas.

In their methods description, participants relying on databases or software to identify locations must demonstrate that the database or geolocation software has an evidentiary basis, such as customer records. Participants must also establish the source's accuracy and reliability in the relevant geographic areas, which may be accomplished through, for example, proof of statistical sampling and verification of sampled locations in eligible areas. Participants relying on publicly available databases/information must describe how they accounted for any differences between such databases/information and the Commission's requirements (such as how buildings and other structures are defined as locations) when compiling their location data.

The participant also must provide the following information: contact information for the person who prepared and submitted the data; an officer certification that the information is true and correct; and the certifying officer's official contact information. A participant may revise and recertify its filing until the filing deadline.

(5) Collection of Supporting Evidence from Participants (See 12.e):

For each state in which a participant is seeking adjustment to its defined deployment obligation, it must file in the ELAP module evidence supporting their descriptions of methods and location information in a commonly supported format, e.g., pdf., jpeg., etc. This evidence will assist the Bureau's evaluation of the completeness of participants' location lists.

Participants have flexibility in determining what and how much evidence to submit. For example, participants may submit publicly available information supporting their determination that certain locations are ineligible, such as copies from county assessor websites. Similar public records information may be submitted to demonstrate the reliability and validity of database or geolocation software.

The participant also must provide the following information: contact information for the person who prepared and submitted the data; an officer certification that the

information is true and correct; and the certifying officer's official contact information. A participant may revise and recertify its filing until the filing deadline.

(6) Collection of Information Verifying Stakeholder Eligibility (See 12.f)

In order to participate as stakeholders in the ELAP process, non-governmental entities and individuals must submit certain information to USAC for the purposes of verifying their identity and eligibility to participate as a stakeholder and must certify that this information is true and correct. USAC will submit some of this information to a commercial verifier selected by USAC. In addition, stakeholders must certify that they do not hold a controlling interest in a direct competitor of the participant. Individuals must acknowledge receipt of a Privacy Act Notice.

The Bureau anticipates that a variety of stakeholders will file challenges and estimates that there will be at least one unique stakeholder for every participant/state combination, or 148 stakeholders. The Bureau anticipates that 50 percent (74) of all stakeholders will be non-governmental entities and individuals. As noted below, pursuant to the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, 5 U.S.C. § 552a, the Commission will create a system of records notice (SORN) to cover any personal identifiable information.

Once the stakeholder's eligibility is verified, the third-party verifier will submit information to USAC (e.g., name, e-mail address, and confirmation) on the stakeholder's eligibility to participate in ELAP. In situations where the prospective stakeholder's identity and/or eligibility cannot be verified through the commercial verifier, the stakeholder may submit to USAC alternative evidence, such as copies of public records or government-issued documentation.

(7) Collection of Location Information from Stakeholders (See 12.g):

For each state where the stakeholder is challenging a participant's filings, stakeholders may submit location information for eligible locations that they have identified as omitted from the relevant participant's location information. The Bureau anticipates that a variety of stakeholders will file challenges and estimates that there will be 148 stakeholders.

Stakeholders must submit eligible location information in a tabular format (e.g., a .csv file) into the HUBB ELAP module. Separate .csv files must be prepared for each qualifying location and prospective location. For each location entry, the stakeholder must submit the following information:

- (a) Study Area Code(s)
- (b) State(s) for which the carrier is making the filing
- (c) Latitude of the location (to 6 decimal places)
- (d) Longitude of Location (to 6 decimal places)
- (e) Address of location
- (f) Number of units at the location

- (g) Method information, e.g., GPS methods and/or source used and the “as-of” date of such method or source
- (h) Location Type, i.e., qualifying location, prospective location, ineligible location
- (i) Ineligible Reason Code from Drop-Down List
- (j) Ineligible Reason Comment if Ineligible Reason Code is “Other”

In addition, stakeholders also must provide the following information: contact information for the person who prepared and submitted the data and a certification that the information is true and correct. If the stakeholder is an individual, the individual must submit the certification. If the stakeholder is a non-commercial entity or a governmental entity, the certification may be submitted by any representative authorized to act on behalf of the entity. A stakeholder may revise and recertify its filing until the filing deadline.

(8) Collection of Methods Description and Supporting Evidence from Stakeholders (See 12.h):

For each state where the stakeholder is challenging a participant’s filings, stakeholders must submit a description of how they identified eligible locations, including any limitations to their methods used, and must submit proof that the location data describes an eligible location.

We expect that there will be a variety of stakeholders responding to participants’ submissions. Accordingly, the description of methodology may range from a simple explanation, such as might occur if a homeowner reports that his/her home has been omitted from the participant’s list of eligible locations, or a more in-depth explanation, such as might occur if a local government entity claims that several locations have been omitted from the participant’s list.

Generally, the Bureau has determined that sets of geocoordinates 36 feet or more from another describe separate structures. Accordingly, when a stakeholder-reported location falls within 36 feet of the geocoordinates reported by the participant (generally, an overlap in the first three decimal places of geocoordinates), the stakeholder must also explain why the location should be considered a separate and unique location from the location reported by the participant (e.g., the stakeholder’s location data describes a separate business or residential location or unit within the same property/parcel).

If a stakeholder reports one or more prospective locations as location(s) omitted from the relevant participant’s location information, it must explain why such location(s) should be considered when determining participant’s defined deployment obligations and submit some supporting evidence that the location(s) will become a qualifying location(s) within the participant’s build-out period. Stakeholders may include factual arguments demonstrating why their methodology produces location information more complete or accurate than that of the participant but are not required to do so.

The stakeholder must submit contact information for the person who prepared the information (if different from the contact information for the party submitting the location information). In addition, the stakeholder must submit a certification that the information is true and correct, a certification that the stakeholder is eligible to participate in the process, and the certifying individual's official title and/or contact information (if different from the stakeholder's contact information). A stakeholder may revise and recertify its filing until the filing deadline.

On behalf of the Commission, USAC will gather certain limited information verifying the identity of stakeholders (e.g., name and contact information) and their interests in ensuring service to the relevant area as well as certain information about locations that the stakeholder asserts are eligible locations which may include information linking an individual to certain property and commercial interests. The collection of such information is regulated by the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended (5 U.S.C. § 552a) and will be covered by a SORN.

(9) Collection of Reply Information from Participants (See 12.i):

Participants may submit a reply responding to relevant stakeholder challenge(s). This reply may include additional location information, methods description, and/or supporting evidence and may also include arguments challenging the methods or evidence of the stakeholder. The reply must be limited to information in stakeholder challenge(s).

A participant must submit contact information for the person who prepared and submitted the reply, certify that its submission is true and accurate, and may revise and recertify its filing until the filing deadline.

Statutory authority for this information collection is contained in 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), 155(c), 214, and 254.

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

2. *Use of Information.* For the information collection requirements for Revised A-CAM I and A-CAM II carriers, the Commission will use the information to identify which carriers have reviewed the relevant version of the Fabric, have determined there are fewer locations in their service area than originally estimated by the A-CAM, and that would like to participate in the location adjustment process.

For the information collection requirements for RDOF, the Commission will use the information to identify which carriers with more locations than estimated by the CAM would like to exclude locations from their location total because they are unreasonable to serve. The Commission will also use the certification that is collected as part of this process to require the carrier to certify that it will serve at a minimum the number of

locations estimate by the CAM given the Commission's direction that carriers can seek to exclude additional locations beyond the number identified by the CAM.

Additionally, the Commission will review the evidence submitted and make a determination regarding whether a location can be excluded from a carrier's location requirement because it is unreasonable to serve.

3. *Technology collection techniques.* Revised A-CAM I and A-CAM II carriers will submit their requests electronically for a downward adjustment in the Commission's ECFS in WC Docket No. 10-90. RDOF carriers will submit their requests to remove locations that are unreasonable to serve using a data collection system set up by USAC at the direction of WCB.
4. *Efforts to Identify Duplication.* There will be no duplication of information. The information sought is unique to each carrier or respondent and similar information is not already available.
5. *Impact on Small Entities.* The collection of information may affect small entities as well as large entities. The processes has been designed to limit the burden as much as possible on small entities.
6. *Consequences if information is not collected.* The Revised A-CAM I and A-CAM II location adjustment process is voluntary. However, if an entity does not participate and is not able to meet its defined deployment obligation at the end of its build-out term because it has been unable to identify the requisite number of required locations to serve, it will be held in default of its obligations and subject to the recovery of support and potential non-compliance measures. 47 CFR § 54.320(c) & (d). Similarly, the RDOF unreasonable location process is also voluntary. However, if a carrier does not participate or provide the required information to demonstrate a location is unreasonable to serve, the carrier will be subject to any non-compliance measures, including support recovery, for failing to serve these locations. 47 CFR §§ 54.320(d) & (c), 54.806(b) & (c).
7. *Special Circumstance.* We do not foresee any special circumstances with this information collection.
8. *Federal Register notice; efforts to consult with persons outside the Commission.* A 60-day notice was published in the Federal Register pursuant to 5 C.F.R. § 1320.8(d) on November 21, 2025. See 90 FR 52661. We received one comment in response to this notice. See Volt Broadband, LLC on Proposed Information Collection Requirements, OMB Control No. 3060-1279 (Connect America Fund- Alternative Connect America Cost Model (A-CAM) Voluntary Location Adjustment Process and Rural Digital Opportunity Fund (RDOF) Unreasonable Locations Process) (filed Jan. 20, 2026) (Volt Comments). Volt "seeks clarification on the criteria used in evaluating [F]abric challenges and permissible types of supporting documentation."

In the *RDOF Order*, the Commission held that RDOF carriers with more locations in their service area than originally estimated could seek to have their new location count adjusted to exclude additional locations beyond the original estimate that it determines before the end of the eighth year service milestone are: 1) ineligible, 2) unreasonable to deploy to, or 3) part of a development newly built after year six for which the cost and/or time to deploy before the end of the support term would be reasonable. See *RDOF Order*

To demonstrate a location is ineligible, the Bureau stated that RDOF carriers “must first successfully challenge the location through the [Broadband Data Collection’s] Fabric challenge process.” Separately, for locations that the RDOF carrier claims are unreasonable to serve, the Bureau adopted a process for carriers to demonstrate that the locations are unreasonable to serve and set forth some factors that it indicated it would consider, but declined to adopt specific criteria or presumptions, finding that “each RDOF carrier will be uniquely situated” and “it would be best to examine each situation on a case-by-case basis.” See *High-Cost Fabric Order*.

The Bureau is seeking Paperwork Reduction Act approval for the process that it will use to determine whether a location is unreasonable to serve. It is not seeking PRA approval for the Fabric challenge process that carriers were instructed to utilize to demonstrate that a location is ineligible. Volt appears to be conflating the two processes as its comments are focused on concerns with the Fabric challenge process.

The Paperwork Reduction Act does not apply to the Fabric challenge process, as part of the processes required by the Broadband Deployment Accuracy and Technological Availability Act (Broadband DATA Act), pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 646(b). As such, challenge process questions are beyond the scope of this response.

9. *Payments or gifts to respondents.* The Commission does not anticipate providing any payment or gifts to respondents.
10. *Assurances of confidentiality.* There are no assurances of confidentiality. If a respondent is submitting information that it believes is confidential, it may request confidential treatment of such information under section 0.459 of the Commission’s rules.
11. *Questions of a sensitive nature.* This information collection does not address any matters of a sensitive nature.
12. *Estimates of the hour burden of the collection to respondents.*

a. Revised A-CAM I and ACAM II Location Adjustment Process (new requirement):

- (1) Number of Respondents: 15.

- (2) Frequency of Response: Once.
- (3) Total number of responses per respondent: One.
- (4) Estimated time per response: 5 hours.
- (5) Total annual hour burden: 75 hours.

5 hours per respondent for 15 carriers filing on an annual basis. Total annual hour burden is calculated as follows:

15 respondents x 1 report per respondent = 15 responses x 5 hours = **75 total annual hours.**

- (6) Total estimate of in-house cost to respondents: \$3,000 (75 hours x \$40/hour).
- (7) Explanation of calculation: We estimate that each carrier will take, on average, five hours to gather information for its submission and make its submission. Carriers are already expected to have familiarity with the Fabric as part of their BDC reporting, and thus we do not expect carriers will need to do significant additional analysis to make the required certification.

b. Process for Removing Unreasonable Locations for Carriers with More RDOF Locations (new requirement):

- (1) Number of Respondents: 100.
- (2) Frequency of Response: On occasion.
- (3) Total number of responses per respondent: One.
- (4) Estimated time per response: 40 hours.
- (5) Total annual hour burden: 4,000 hours.

40 hours per respondent for 100 carriers filing on an annual basis. Total annual hour burden is calculated as follows:

100 respondents x 1 report per respondent = 100 responses x 40 hours = **4,000 total annual hours.**

- (6) Total estimate of in-house cost to respondents: \$160,000 (4,000 hours x \$40/hour).
- (7) Explanation of calculation: We estimate that each carrier will take, on average, 40 hours to gather information for its submission and make its submission. Carriers are already expected to have familiarity with the Fabric as part of their Broadband

Data Collection reporting and should already be collecting information in furtherance of meeting their RDOF obligations to determine the costs of and any obstacles for meeting their deployment obligations.

c. Collection of Location Information from Participants (eliminated requirement):

- (1) Number of Respondents: 0.
- (2) Frequency of Response: N/A.
- (3) Total number of responses per respondent: 0.
- (4) Estimated time per response: 0 hours.
- (5) Total annual hour burden: 0 hours.

0 hours per response per respondent filing. Total annual hour burden is calculated as follows:

0 respondents x 0 response x 0 hours = **0 total annual hours.**

- (6) Total estimate of in-house cost to respondents: \$0 (0 hours x \$0/hour).
- (7) Explanation of calculation: The obligations associated with this reporting requirement are no longer effective, so this requirement no longer applies. The total annual hour burden and in-house costs for respondents will therefore be 0.

d. Collection of Methods Description from Participants (eliminated requirement):

- (1) Number of Respondents: 0.
- (2) Frequency of Response: N/A.
- (3) Total number of responses per respondent: 0.
- (4) Estimated time per response: 0 hours.
- (5) Total annual hour burden: 0 hours.

0 hours per response per respondent filing. Total annual hour burden is calculated as follows:

0 respondents x 0 response x 0 hours = **0 total annual hours.**

- (6) Total estimate of in-house cost to respondents: \$0 (0 hours x \$0/hour).
- (7) Explanation of calculation: The obligations associated with this reporting requirement are no longer effective, so this requirement no longer applies. The total annual hour burden and in-house costs for respondents will therefore be 0.

e. Collection of Supporting Evidence from Participants (eliminated requirement):

- (1) Number of Respondents: 0.
- (2) Frequency of Response: N/A.
- (3) Total number of responses per respondent: 0.
- (4) Estimated time per response: 0 hours.
- (5) Total annual hour burden: 0 hours.

0 hours per respondent for 0 carriers filing on an annual basis. Total annual hour burden is calculated as follows:

0 respondents x 0 report per respondent = 0 responses x 0 hours = **0 total annual hours.**

- (6) Total estimate of in-house cost to respondents: \$ 0. (0 hours x \$0/hour).
- (7) Explanation of calculation: The obligations associated with this reporting requirement are no longer effective, so this requirement no longer applies. The total annual hour burden and in-house costs for respondents will therefore be 0.

f. Collection of Information Verifying Stakeholder Eligibility (eliminated requirement):

- (1) Number of Respondents: 0.
- (2) Frequency of Response: N/A.
- (3) Total number of responses per respondent: 0.
- (4) Estimated time per response: 0 hours.
- (5) Total annual hour burden: 0 hours.

0 hours per respondent for 0 carriers filing on an annual basis. Total annual hour burden is calculated as follows:

0 respondents x 0 report per respondent = 0 responses x 0 hours = **0 total annual hours.**

(6) Total estimate of in-house cost to respondents: \$0.

(7) Explanation of calculation: The obligations associated with this reporting requirement are no longer effective, so this requirement no longer applies. The total annual hour burden and in-house costs for respondents will therefore be 0.

g. Collection of Location Information from Stakeholders (eliminated requirement):

(1) Number of Respondents: 0.

(2) Frequency of Response: N/A.

(3) Total number of responses per respondent: 0.

(4) Estimated time per response: 0 hours.

(5) Total annual hour burden: 0 hours.

0 hours per respondent for 0 carriers filing on an annual basis. Total annual hour burden is calculated as follows:

0 respondents x 0 report per respondent = 0 responses x 0 hours = **0 total annual hours.**

(6) Total estimate of in-house cost to respondents: \$0.

(7) Explanation of calculation: The obligations associated with this reporting requirement are no longer effective, so this requirement no longer applies. The total annual hour burden and in-house costs for respondents will therefore be 0.

h. Collection of Methods Description and Supporting Evidence from Stakeholders (eliminated requirement):

(1) Number of Respondents: 0.

(2) Frequency of Response: N/A.

(3) Total number of responses per respondent: 0.

(4) Estimated time per response: 0 hours.

(5) Total annual hour burden: 0.

0 hours per respondent for 0 carriers filing on an annual basis. Total annual hour burden is calculated as follows:

0 respondents x 0 report per respondent = 0 responses x 0 hours = **0 total annual hours.**

(6) Total estimate of in-house cost to respondents: \$0 (0 hours x \$0/hour).

(7) Explanation of calculation: The obligations associated with this reporting requirement are no longer effective, so this requirement no longer applies. The total annual hour burden and in-house costs for respondents will therefore be 0.

i. Collection of Reply Information from Participants (eliminated requirement):

(1) Number of Respondents: 0.

(2) Frequency of Response: N/A.

(3) Total number of responses per respondent: 0.

(4) Estimated time per response: 0 hours.

(5) Total annual hour burden: 0 hours.

0 hours per respondent for 0 carriers filing on an annual basis. Total annual hour burden is calculated as follows:

0 respondents x 0 report per respondent = 0 responses x 0 hours = **0 total annual hours.**

(6) Total estimate of in-house cost to respondents: \$0 (0 hours x \$0/hour).

(7) Explanation of calculation: The obligations associated with this reporting requirement are no longer effective, so this requirement no longer applies. The total annual hour burden and in-house costs for respondents will therefore be 0.

The estimated respondents and responses and burden hours are listed below:

Information Collection Requirements	Number of Respondents	Number of Responses Per Year	Estimated Time per Response (hours)	Total Burden Hours	In-house Cost to Respondents
a. Revised A-CAM I and ACAM II Location Adjustment Process	15	1	5	75	\$3,000
b. Process for Removing Unreasonable Locations for Carriers with More RDOF Locations	100	1	40	4,000	\$160,000
c. Collection of Location Information from Participants	0	0	0	0	\$0
d. Collection of Methods Description from Participants	0	0	0	0	\$0
e. Collection of Supporting Evidence from Participants	0	0	0	0	\$0
f. Collection of Information Verifying Stakeholder Eligibility	0	0	0	0	\$0
g. Collection of Location Information from Stakeholders	0	0	0	0	\$0

Information Collection Requirements	Number of Respondents	Number of Responses Per Year	Estimated Time per Response (hours)	Total Burden Hours	In-house Cost to Respondents
h. Collection of Methods Description and Supporting Evidence from Stakeholders	0	0	0	0	\$0
i. Collection of Reply Information from Participants	0	0	0	0	\$0

TOTALS:

Total Number of Respondents: 115 respondents filing multiple times.

Total Number of Responses Annually: 115

Total Annual Hourly Burden for Requirements: (a) – (i): 4,075

Total Annual In-House Costs to Respondents: \$163,000

13. *Estimates for the cost burden of the collection to respondents.* There is no external cost burden to the respondents. Carriers should not incur capital and start-up costs or operation and maintenance of purchase of services in connection with responding to this information collection. The information collected as part of these processes should be collected and maintained as part of the customary and usual business of the applicant and to comply with A-CAM or RDOF requirements.
14. *Estimates of the cost burden to the Commission.* There will be few, if any, costs to the Commission because ensuring proper use of universal service support is already part of Commission duties.
15. *Program changes or adjustments.* The Commission is reporting program changes to this collection due to the completion of the Eligible Adjustment Location Process and the implementation of the Revised A-CAM I and A-CAM II location adjustment processes and the implementation of the process for certain RDOF carriers to demonstrate that certain locations are unreasonable to serve. As a result of these program changes, the total number of respondents decreased from 296 to 115 (-181), the total annual responses decreased from 962 responses to 115 (-847), and the total annual burden hours decreased from 10,804 to 4,075 (-6,729).

There are no adjustments to this collection.

16. *Collections of information whose results will be published.* The Commission will make any non-proprietary information publicly available on the Internet or in a public release as the Commission deems appropriate.
17. *Display of expiration date for OMB approval of information collection.* There is no paper form associated with this information collection; it is collected electronically through the Commission's Electronic Comment Filing System and a data collection system. The Commission seeks approval to not display the expiration date for OMB approval of this information collection. The Commission will use an edition date in lieu of the OMB expiration date for the data collection system. This use will prevent the Commission from having to repeatedly update the expiration date on the portal each time this collection is submitted to OMB for review and approval. OMB approval of the expiration date for the Commission's information collection will be displayed on OMB's website.
18. *Exceptions to certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions.* There are no exceptions to the certification statement.

B. Collections of Information Employing Statistical Methods:

The collection of information does not employ statistical methods.