

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS  
COMMISSION****47 CFR Part 64****[WC Docket Nos. 12–375, 23–62; FCC 24–75; FR ID 237667]****Incarcerated People’s  
Communications Services;  
Implementation of the Martha Wright-  
Reed Act; Rates for Interstate Inmate  
Calling Services****AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.**ACTION:** Final rule; dismissal, partial grant and partial denial of petitions for reconsideration, clarification and waiver.

**SUMMARY:** In this document, the Federal Communications Commission (Commission) addresses and resolves multiple pending petitions in the incarcerated people’s communications services (IPCS) proceeding. The Commission grants the Hamilton Relay, Inc. petition for reconsideration of certain aspects of the *2022 ICS Order* released on September 30, 2022. The Commission dismisses the United Church of Christ and Public Knowledge petition for reconsideration of the *2021 ICS Order* released on May 24, 2021. The Commission dismisses the portion of the NCIC Inmate Communications petition for reconsideration of the *2021 ICS Order* that it had not previously addressed. The Commission dismisses a petition filed by Securus Technologies, LLC seeking clarification of one aspect of the *2021 ICS Order* and dismiss in part and otherwise denies the Securus petition for waiver of certain Commission rules.

**DATES:** August 26, 2024.**ADDRESSES:** Federal Communications Commission, 45 L Street NE, Washington, DC 20554.

*People with Disabilities:* To request materials in accessible formats for people with disabilities (Braille, large print, electronic files, audio format), send an email to [fcc504@fcc.gov](mailto:fcc504@fcc.gov), or call the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at (202) 418–0530 (voice) or (202) 418–0432 (TTY).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Stephen Meil, Pricing Policy Division of the Wireline Competition Bureau, at (202) 418–7233 or via email at [stephen.meil@fcc.gov](mailto:stephen.meil@fcc.gov), regarding the portions of this document relating to matters other than communications services for incarcerated people with disabilities, and Michael Scott, Disability Rights Office of the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, at

(202) 418–1264 or via email at [michael.scott@fcc.gov](mailto:michael.scott@fcc.gov), regarding the portions of this document relating to communications services for incarcerated people with disabilities.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a summary of the Commission’s Order on Reconsideration, Clarification and Waiver, document FCC 24–75, adopted on July 18, 2024 and released on July 22, 2024, in WC Docket Nos. 12–375 and 23–62. This summary is based on the public redacted version of the document. The full text of the document FCC 24–75 can be accessed electronically via the FCC’s Electronic Document Management System (EDOCS) website at [www.fcc.gov/edocs](http://www.fcc.gov/edocs) or via the FCC’s Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS) website at [www.fcc.gov/ecfs](http://www.fcc.gov/ecfs), or is available at the following internet address: <https://www.fcc.gov/document/fcc-caps-exorbitant-phone-video-call-rates-incarcerated-persons-their-families>.

**Synopsis****I. Order on Reconsideration,  
Clarification and Waiver**

1. We address and resolve multiple pending petitions in this proceeding. We grant the Hamilton Relay, Inc. petition for reconsideration of certain aspects of the *2022 ICS Order*, published at 87 FR 75496 (Dec. 9, 2022). We dismiss the United Church of Christ and Public Knowledge petition for reconsideration of the *2021 ICS Order*, published at 86 FR 40682 (July 28, 2021). We also dismiss the remainder of the NCIC petition for reconsideration not previously addressed. The NCIC petition seeks reconsideration of various aspects of the Commission’s treatment of site commissions in the *2021 ICS Order*, published at 86 FR 40682. The Commission previously addressed the portions of the petition relating to its interim caps for certain ancillary service charges in the *2022 ICS Order*. Given the actions we take addressing site commissions in this Order, we now dismiss as moot the remainder of the petition. We also dismiss a petition filed by Securus seeking clarification of one aspect of the *2021 ICS Order* and dismiss in part and otherwise deny the Securus petition for waiver of certain Commission rules.

**A. Hamilton Petition for  
Reconsideration**

2. Hamilton Relay, Inc., seeks partial reconsideration of the requirement that Video Relay Service (VRS) and internet Protocol Captioned Telephone Service (IP CTS) providers update an incarcerated person’s registration

information within 30 days of the user being released from incarceration or transferred to a different correctional authority. Hamilton asserts that TRS providers will learn that an incarcerated person has been released or transferred only when notified by the correctional authority or the incarcerated person. Hamilton therefore asks us to modify § 64.611(k)(1)(iii) of our rules to require that VRS and IP CTS providers update an incarcerated person’s registration information within 30 days “of receiving written notification from such person or the correctional authority of” an incarcerated person’s release or transfer, rather than within 30 days “after” such release or transfer.” No party opposes this change.

3. As some commenters anticipate, this concern may be less pressing as a result of our determination above to allow enterprise registration for IP CTS in carceral settings. Nevertheless, to the extent that individual registration continues to be used, we agree that TRS providers are not expected to independently track the location status of incarcerated users who have individually registered for IP CTS or VRS. The allowed thirty-day period for updating registration information should begin upon the provider’s receipt of written notification of the incarcerated person’s release or transfer. Accordingly, we amend § 64.611(k)(1)(iii) to clarify the rule. We modify Hamilton’s proposed language to reflect that written notification may be received from the incarcerated person, the correctional authority, or the IPCS provider.

4. We also modify this provision to clarify the updated information that TRS providers must transmit to the TRS User Registration Database when an individual who registers for VRS or IP CTS while incarcerated is released. In addition to the individual’s residential address and Registered Location (if required), the update shall include any other required registration information not previously provided.

5. We therefore grant Hamilton’s Petition for Reconsideration with the modifications described herein.

**B. Securus Petition for Clarification**

6. We dismiss as moot Securus’s Petition for Clarification, which “addresses only contractually prescribed site commission payments.” With respect to such payments, Securus seeks clarification as to whether providers may use “revenues from ICS rates to pay site commission costs above the \$0.02 rate cap,” provided that the total charged to consumers does not exceed the applicable rate cap.

Securus's concern stems from the Commission's statement in the *2021 ICS Order* in which it confirmed that the \$0.02 per minute allowance for contractually prescribed site commissions "does not prevent or prohibit the payment of additional site commission amounts to correctional facilities should the calling services providers and the facility enter into a contract resulting in the provider making per-minute payments to the facility higher than \$0.02." Securus contends that the Commission's language "creates ambiguity over whether providers may pay additional site commissions from end user revenues collected under the provider-related rate component." In Securus's view, "[f]ailure to clarify the limits of site commission cost recovery from ICS rates . . . could result in some providers being competitively disadvantaged in the bidding process by which ICS service providers are selected to serve carceral facilities."

7. Our actions in the *2024 IPCS Report and Order*, which end the practice of paying site commissions, effectively moot Securus's request for clarification. Because the rules we adopt in connection with site commissions apply prospectively, there are no retroactive implications from these actions that we need to consider. Our reforms eliminate site commission payments associated with IPCS. Because IPCS providers will no longer be able to pay site commissions associated with their IPCS offerings, we need not clarify whether providers may use IPCS revenues to pay such site commissions.

### C. Securus Waiver Petition

8. We dismiss in part and otherwise deny the Securus Waiver Petition. In its Waiver Petition, Securus seeks a waiver of §§ 64.6030, 64.6080, and 64.6090 of the Commission's rules so that "Securus and other providers" can offer "alternative rate options that promote increased calling while reducing costs." Because we adopt rules, in the *2024 IPCS Report and Order*, specifically allowing alternate pricing plans, including flat-rate pricing, Securus's requests for a waiver of § 64.6030, which specifies the use of mandatory rate caps on a per-minute basis, and § 64.6090, which prohibits flat-rate calling, are moot and are therefore dismissed.

9. We deny Securus's request for a waiver of § 64.6080, which prohibits per-call and per-connection charges, to the extent that request would permit a provider to impose such one-time charges in addition to any base rates for alternate pricing plans. We retain today

a key consumer protection rule at § 64.6080, and Securus does not explain why a waiver of this section of the rules is necessary in light of the alternate pricing plan rules we adopt in the Order.

## II. Procedural Matters

10. *Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis*. As required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, as amended (RFA), the Commission has prepared a Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (FRFA) relating to this Report and Order and this Order on Reconsideration, Clarification, and Waiver. The FRFA is set forth in below.

11. *Congressional Review Act*. The Commission will not send a copy of this Order on Reconsideration, Clarification, and Waiver to Congress and the Government Accountability Office pursuant to the Congressional Review Act (CRA), see 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A), because it does not adopt any rule as defined in the CRA, 5 U.S.C. 804(3).

12. *Paperwork Reduction Act Analysis*. The Order on Reconsideration, Clarification, and Waiver does not contain new or modified information collection requirements subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. Therefore, it does not contain any new or modified information collection burdens for small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees, pursuant to the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2002, Public Law 107–198, see 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(4).

13. *People with Disabilities*. To request materials in accessible formats for people with disabilities (Braille, large print, electronic files, audio format), send an email to [fcc504@fcc.gov](mailto:fcc504@fcc.gov) or call the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at 202–418–0530.

## III. Final Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis

14. As required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, as amended (RFA), Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analyses (IRFAs) were incorporated in the *Incarcerated People's Communications Services; Implementation of the Martha Wright-Reed Act; Rates for Interstate Inmate Calling Services*, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) in WC Docket Nos. 23–62 and 12–375 (released in March 2023), in the Sixth Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in WC Docket No. 12–375 (released in September 2022), and in the Fifth Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in WC Docket No. 12–375 (released in May 2021). The Federal Communications Commission (Commission) sought written public

comment on the proposals in those documents, including comment on the IRFAs. No comments were filed addressing the IRFA. This present Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (FRFA), relating to the Report and Order and the Order on Reconsideration, Clarification and Waiver (collectively, Report and Order), conforms to the RFA.

### A. Need for, and Objectives of, the Report and Order

15. The Report and Order implements the expanded authority granted to the Commission by the Martha Wright-Reed Act to establish a compensation plan that ensures both just and reasonable rates and charges for incarcerated people's audio and video communications services and fair compensation for incarcerated people's communication services (IPCS) providers. The Report and Order fundamentally reforms the regulation of IPCS in all correctional facilities, regardless of the technology used to deliver these services, and significantly lowers the IPCS rates that incarcerated people and their loved ones will pay.

16. The reforms adopted by the Report and Order: (1) utilize the expanded authority granted the Commission, in conjunction with the Commission's preexisting statutory authority, to adopt just and reasonable IPCS rates and charges for all intrastate, interstate, and international audio and video IPCS, including video visitation services, that ensure fair compensation for providers; (2) lower existing per-minute rate caps for audio IPCS, based on industry-wide cost data submitted by IPCS providers, while permitting states to maintain IPCS rates lower than the Commission's rate caps; (3) lower the overall prices consumers pay for IPCS and simplify the pricing structure by incorporating the costs of ancillary services in the rate caps and prohibiting providers from imposing any separate ancillary service charges on IPCS consumers; (4) prohibit IPCS providers from making site commission payments for IPCS and preempt state and local laws and regulations requiring such commissions; (5) limit the costs associated with safety and security measures that can be recovered in the per-minute rates to only those costs that the Commission finds used and useful in the provision of IPCS; (6) allow, subject to conditions, IPCS providers to offer alternate pricing plans for IPCS that comply with the rate caps we establish; (7) revise and strengthen accessibility requirements for IPCS for incarcerated people with disabilities; (8) revise and strengthen existing consumer disclosure and inactive account requirements; and (9)

revise the existing annual reporting and certification requirements. The Report and Order also addresses petitions for reconsideration, clarification and waiver pending in this proceeding.

*B. Summary of Significant Issues Raised by Public Comments in Response to the IRFA*

17. There were no comments filed that specifically addressed the proposed rules and policies presented in the IRFA.

*C. Response to Comments by the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration*

18. Pursuant to the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010, which amended the RFA, the Commission is required to respond to any comments filed by the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration (SBA), and to provide a detailed statement of any change made to the proposed rules as a result of those comments. The Chief Counsel did not file any comments in response to the proposed rules in this proceeding.

*D. Description and Estimate of the Number of Small Entities to Which Rules Will Apply*

19. 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 rules they adopt. 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 Small Business Administration (SBA).

20. *Small Businesses, Small Organizations, Small Governmental Jurisdictions.* Our actions, over time, may affect small entities that are not easily categorized at present. We therefore describe, at the outset, three broad groups of small entities that could be directly affected herein. First, while there are industry specific size standards for small businesses that are used in the regulatory flexibility analysis, according to data from the Small Business Administration’s (SBA) Office of Advocacy, 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 33.2 million businesses.

21. Next, the type of small entity described as a “small organization” is generally “any not-for-profit enterprise which is independently owned and operated and is not dominant in its field.” The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) uses a revenue benchmark of \$50,000 or less to delineate its annual electronic filing requirements for small exempt organizations. Nationwide, for tax year 2022, there were approximately 530,109 small exempt organizations in the U.S. reporting revenues of \$50,000 or less according to the registration and tax data for exempt organizations available from the IRS.

22. Finally, the small entity described as a “small governmental jurisdiction” is defined generally as “governments of cities, counties, towns, townships, villages, school districts, or special districts, with a population of less than fifty thousand.” U.S. Census Bureau data from the 2022 Census of Governments indicate there were 90,837 local governmental jurisdictions consisting of general purpose governments and special purpose governments in the United States. Of this number, there were 36,845 general purpose governments (county, municipal, and town or township) with populations of less than 50,000 and 11,879 special purpose governments (independent school districts) with enrollment populations of less than 50,000. Accordingly, based on the 2022 U.S. Census of Governments data, we estimate that at least 48,724 entities fall into the category of “small governmental jurisdictions.”

23. *Wired Telecommunications Carriers.* The U.S. Census Bureau defines this industry as establishments primarily engaged in operating and/or providing access to transmission facilities and infrastructure that they own and/or lease for the transmission of voice, data, text, sound, and video using wired communications networks. Transmission facilities may be based on a single technology or a combination of technologies. Establishments in this industry use the wired telecommunications network facilities that they operate to provide a variety of services, such as wired telephony services, including VoIP services, wired (cable) audio and video programming distribution, and wired broadband internet services. By exception, establishments providing satellite television distribution services using facilities and infrastructure that they operate are included in this industry. Wired Telecommunications Carriers are

also referred to as wireline carriers or fixed local service providers.

24. The SBA small business size standard for Wired Telecommunications Carriers classifies firms having 1,500 or fewer employees as small. U.S. Census Bureau data for 2017 show that there were 3,054 firms that operated in this industry for the entire year. Of this number, 2,964 firms operated with fewer than 250 employees. Additionally, based on Commission data in the 2022 Universal Service Monitoring Report, as of December 31, 2021, there were 4,590 providers that reported they were engaged in the provision of fixed local services. Of these providers, the Commission estimates that 4,146 providers have 1,500 or fewer employees. Consequently, using the SBA’s small business size standard, most of these providers can be considered small entities.

25. *Local Exchange Carriers (LECs).* Neither the Commission nor the SBA has developed a size standard for small businesses specifically applicable to local exchange services. Providers of these services include both incumbent and competitive local exchange service providers. Wired Telecommunications Carriers is the closest industry with an SBA small business size standard. Wired Telecommunications Carriers are also referred to as wireline carriers or fixed local service providers. The SBA small business size standard for Wired Telecommunications Carriers classifies firms having 1,500 or fewer employees as small. U.S. Census Bureau data for 2017 show that there were 3,054 firms that operated in this industry for the entire year. Of this number, 2,964 firms operated with fewer than 250 employees. Additionally, based on Commission data in the 2022 Universal Service Monitoring Report, as of December 31, 2021, there were 4,590 providers that reported they were fixed local exchange service providers. Of these providers, the Commission estimates that 4,146 providers have 1,500 or fewer employees. Consequently, using the SBA’s small business size standard, most of these providers can be considered small entities.

26. *Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers (Incumbent LECs).* Neither the Commission nor the SBA have developed a small business size standard specifically for incumbent local exchange carriers. Wired Telecommunications Carriers is the closest industry with an SBA small business size standard. The SBA small business size standard for Wired Telecommunications Carriers classifies

firms having 1,500 or fewer employees as small. U.S. Census Bureau data for 2017 show that there were 3,054 firms in this industry that operated for the entire year. Of this number, 2,964 firms operated with fewer than 250 employees. Additionally, based on Commission data in the 2022 Universal Service Monitoring Report, as of December 31, 2021, there were 1,212 providers that reported they were incumbent local exchange service providers. Of these providers, the Commission estimates that 916 providers have 1,500 or fewer employees. Consequently, using the SBA's small business size standard, the Commission estimates that the majority of incumbent local exchange carriers can be considered small entities.

**27. Competitive Local Exchange Carriers (CLECs).** Neither the Commission nor the SBA has developed a size standard for small businesses specifically applicable to local exchange services. Providers of these services include several types of competitive local exchange service providers. Wired Telecommunications Carriers is the closest industry with a SBA small business size standard. The SBA small business size standard for Wired Telecommunications Carriers classifies firms having 1,500 or fewer employees as small. U.S. Census Bureau data for 2017 show that there were 3,054 firms that operated in this industry for the entire year. Of this number, 2,964 firms operated with fewer than 250 employees. Additionally, based on Commission data in the 2022 Universal Service Monitoring Report, as of December 31, 2021, there were 3,378 providers that reported they were competitive local service providers. Of these providers, the Commission estimates that 3,230 providers have 1,500 or fewer employees. Consequently, using the SBA's small business size standard, most of these providers can be considered small entities.

**28. Interexchange Carriers (IXCs).** Neither the Commission nor the SBA have developed a small business size standard specifically for Interexchange Carriers. Wired Telecommunications Carriers is the closest industry with a SBA small business size standard. The SBA small business size standard for Wired Telecommunications Carriers classifies firms having 1,500 or fewer employees as small. U.S. Census Bureau data for 2017 show that there were 3,054 firms that operated in this industry for the entire year. Of this number, 2,964 firms operated with fewer than 250 employees. Additionally, based on Commission data in the 2022 Universal

Service Monitoring Report, as of December 31, 2021, there were 127 providers that reported they were engaged in the provision of interexchange services. Of these providers, the Commission estimates that 109 providers have 1,500 or fewer employees. Consequently, using the SBA's small business size standard, the Commission estimates that the majority of providers in this industry can be considered small entities.

**29. Local Resellers.** Neither the Commission nor the SBA have developed a small business size standard specifically for Local Resellers. Telecommunications Resellers is the closest industry with a SBA small business size standard. The Telecommunications Resellers industry comprises establishments engaged in purchasing access and network capacity from owners and operators of telecommunications networks and reselling wired and wireless telecommunications services (except satellite) to businesses and households. Establishments in this industry resell telecommunications; they do not operate transmission facilities and infrastructure. Mobile virtual network operators (MVNOs) are included in this industry. The SBA small business size standard for Telecommunications Resellers classifies a business as small if it has 1,500 or fewer employees. U.S. Census Bureau data for 2017 show that 1,386 firms in this industry provided resale services for the entire year. Of that number, 1,375 firms operated with fewer than 250 employees. Additionally, based on Commission data in the 2022 Universal Service Monitoring Report, as of December 31, 2021, there were 207 providers that reported they were engaged in the provision of local resale services. Of these providers, the Commission estimates that 202 providers have 1,500 or fewer employees. Consequently, using the SBA's small business size standard, most of these providers can be considered small entities.

**30. Toll Resellers.** Neither the Commission nor the SBA have developed a small business size standard specifically for Toll Resellers. Telecommunications Resellers is the closest industry with a SBA small business size standard. The Telecommunications Resellers industry comprises establishments engaged in purchasing access and network capacity from owners and operators of telecommunications networks and reselling wired and wireless telecommunications services (except satellite) to businesses and households. Establishments in this industry resell

telecommunications; they do not operate transmission facilities and infrastructure. Mobile virtual network operators (MVNOs) are included in this industry. The SBA small business size standard for Telecommunications Resellers classifies a business as small if it has 1,500 or fewer employees. U.S. Census Bureau data for 2017 show that 1,386 firms in this industry provided resale services for the entire year. Of that number, 1,375 firms operated with fewer than 250 employees.

Additionally, based on Commission data in the 2022 Universal Service Monitoring Report, as of December 31, 2021, there were 457 providers that reported they were engaged in the provision of toll services. Of these providers, the Commission estimates that 438 providers have 1,500 or fewer employees. Consequently, using the SBA's small business size standard, most of these providers can be considered small entities.

**31. Other Toll Carriers.** Neither the Commission nor the SBA has developed a definition for small businesses specifically applicable to Other Toll Carriers. This category includes toll carriers that do not fall within the categories of interexchange carriers, operator service providers, prepaid calling card providers, satellite service carriers, or toll resellers. Wired Telecommunications Carriers is the closest industry with a SBA small business size standard. The SBA small business size standard for Wired Telecommunications Carriers classifies firms having 1,500 or fewer employees as small. U.S. Census Bureau data for 2017 show that there were 3,054 firms in this industry that operated for the entire year. Of this number, 2,964 firms operated with fewer than 250 employees. Additionally, based on Commission data in the 2022 Universal Service Monitoring Report, as of December 31, 2021, there were 90 providers that reported they were engaged in the provision of other toll services. Of these providers, the Commission estimates that 87 providers have 1,500 or fewer employees. Consequently, using the SBA's small business size standard, most of these providers can be considered small entities.

**32. Payphone Service Providers (PSPs).** Neither the Commission nor the SBA have developed a small business size standard specifically for payphone service providers, a group that includes incarcerated people's services providers. Telecommunications Resellers is the closest industry with a SBA small business size standard. The Telecommunications Resellers industry

comprises establishments engaged in purchasing access and network capacity from owners and operators of telecommunications networks and reselling wired and wireless telecommunications services (except satellite) to businesses and households. Establishments in this industry resell telecommunications; they do not operate transmission facilities and infrastructure. Mobile virtual network operators (MVNOs) are included in this industry. The SBA small business size standard for Telecommunications Resellers classifies a business as small if it has 1,500 or fewer employees. U.S. Census Bureau data for 2017 show that 1,386 firms in this industry provided resale services for the entire year. Of that number, 1,375 firms operated with fewer than 250 employees. Additionally, based on Commission data in the 2022 Universal Service Monitoring Report, as of December 31, 2021, there were 36 providers that reported they were engaged in the provision of payphone services. Of these providers, the Commission estimates that 32 providers have 1,500 or fewer employees. Consequently, using the SBA's small business size standard, most of these providers can be considered small entities.

33. *Telecommunications Relay Service (TRS) Providers.* Telecommunications relay services enable individuals who are deaf, hard of hearing, deafblind, or who have a speech disability to communicate by telephone in a manner that is functionally equivalent to using voice communication services. Internet-based TRS connects an individual with a hearing or a speech disability to a TRS communications assistant using an internet Protocol-enabled device via the internet, rather than the public switched telephone network. Video Relay Service (VRS) one form of internet-based TRS, enables people with hearing or speech disabilities who use sign language to communicate with voice telephone users over a broadband connection using a video communication device. Internet Protocol Captioned Telephone Service (IP CTS) another form of internet-based TRS, permits a person with hearing loss to have a telephone conversation while reading captions of what the other party is saying on an internet-connected device. A third form of internet-based TRS, internet Protocol Relay Service (IP Relay), permits an individual with a hearing or a speech disability to communicate in text using an internet Protocol-enabled device via the internet, rather than using a text telephone (TTY) and the public

switched telephone network. Providers must be certified by the Commission to provide VRS and IP CTS and to receive compensation from the TRS Fund for TRS provided in accordance with applicable rules. Analog forms of TRS, text telephone (TTY), Speech-to-Speech Relay Service, and Captioned Telephone Service, are provided through state TRS programs, which also must be certified by the Commission.

34. Neither the Commission nor the SBA have developed a small business size standard specifically for TRS Providers. All Other Telecommunications is the closest industry with a SBA small business size standard. Internet Service Providers (ISPs) and Voice over internet Protocol (VoIP) services, via client-supplied telecommunications connections are included in this industry. The SBA small business size standard for this industry classifies firms with annual receipts of \$35 million or less as small. U.S. Census Bureau data for 2017 show that there were 1,079 firms in this industry that operated for the entire year. Of those firms, 1,039 had revenue of less than \$25 million. Based on Commission data there are 14 certified internet-based TRS providers and two analog forms of TRS providers. The Commission however does not compile financial information for these providers. Nevertheless, based on available information, the Commission estimates that most providers in this industry are small entities.

35. *All Other Telecommunications.* This industry is comprised of establishments primarily engaged in providing specialized telecommunications services, such as satellite tracking, communications telemetry, and radar station operation. This industry also includes establishments primarily engaged in providing satellite terminal stations and associated facilities connected with one or more terrestrial systems and capable of transmitting telecommunications to, and receiving telecommunications from, satellite systems. Providers of internet services (e.g., dial-up ISPs) or Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) services, via client-supplied telecommunications connections are also included in this industry. The SBA small business size standard for this industry classifies firms with annual receipts of \$40 million or less as small. U.S. Census Bureau data for 2017 show that there were 1,079 firms in this industry that operated for the entire year. Of those firms, 1,039 had revenue of less than \$25 million. Based on this data, the Commission estimates that the majority

of "All Other Telecommunications" firms can be considered small.

*E. Description of Projected Reporting, Recordkeeping, and Other Compliance Requirements for Small Entities*

36. IPCS providers, including any that may be small entities, will need to change their operations, recordkeeping, and reporting to comply with the requirements of the Report and Order. These requirements include compliance with the rate caps the Report and Order establishes for IPCS. While the new rate cap structure is lower than the preexisting per-minute rate caps, given that the rate caps are based on cost data provided by IPCS providers, including smaller providers, small entities are likely to be able to recover their costs in the same manner as larger providers. Additionally, because the rate caps apply to both interstate and intrastate IPCS, the new rate cap structure reduces the recordkeeping and reporting burdens of complying with the Commission's rules with regards to audio IPCS because providers will no longer need to determine the jurisdictional nature of each call. The Report and Order's requirements also include a prohibition on the assessment of ancillary service charges associated with IPCS, which will greatly reduce the recordkeeping burdens on providers and simplify their billing operations.

37. The Report and Order prohibits IPCS providers from paying site commissions of any kind associated with IPCS and eliminates the requirement under the Commission's rules for providers to label, and disclose the source of, those payments on consumers' bills. The Report and Order requires that, where facilities claim to incur costs related to IPCS, providers are to determine whether those costs are in fact used and useful in the provision of IPCS and are, therefore, reimbursable under the Commission's rules. These changes will reduce the burdens of the Commission's billing rules, while requiring that IPCS providers make determinations regarding whether cost claims submitted to them by facilities are consistent with Commission requirements.

38. The Report and Order allows providers the option to offer alternate pricing plans in addition to providing IPCS at per-minute rates. IPCS providers may elect whether to offer such plans, and should they elect to do so, they may determine the format of such plans, provided that these plans comply with the Commission's generally applicable IPCS rules, certain specified limitations, and other safeguards adopted in the Report and Order. The Report and Order

establishes additional requirements for alternative pricing plans regarding renewed communications, automatic renewals, and consumer cancellation.

39. The Report and Order adopts consumer disclosure requirements applicable to all IPCS, including requirements that providers disclose their IPCS rates, charges, and associated practices on their publicly available websites in a manner that is easily accessible and available to all members of the public. Providers must also make these disclosures available via their online and mobile applications, if consumers use such applications to enroll, and on paper, upon a consumer's request. The Report and Order further requires providers to make available billing statements and statements of account to account holders on a monthly basis, and details regarding the timing, manner, and content requirements for these and other disclosure documents for alternate pricing plans. The Report and Order also ensures that the consumer disclosure rules, as amended, apply to all IPCS providers subject to the Commission's expanded jurisdiction under the Martha Wright-Reed Act.

40. The Report and Order extends the Commission's rules regarding inactive accounts to apply to all accounts that can be used to pay an IPCS-related rate or charge, to the extent they are controlled by IPCS providers or their affiliates. The Report and Order reaffirms that providers are barred from improperly disposing of unused funds in inactive accounts (which includes disposing of such funds before 180 calendar days of continuous account inactivity has passed), and are required to undertake reasonable efforts to refund unused funds. The Report and Order expands upon these rules, including by requiring providers to (1) contact the relevant account holder if and when they become aware that an incarcerated person has been released or transferred or upon the expiration of the 180-day inactivity period, (2) issue refunds within 30 calendar days of a request from an account holder, or of an account being deemed inactive (even in the absence of such a request), and (3) notify account holders of the status of IPCS accounts prior to their being deemed inactive. However, the Report and Order limits the requirement for automatic refunds (*i.e.*, in the absence of a consumer's specific request) to account balances of greater than \$1.50. The Report and Order also clarifies what "reasonable efforts" entail, the procedures to follow if "reasonable efforts" to refund inactive accounts fail, and which refund mechanisms

providers may use. Additionally, the Report and Order reaffirms and clarifies the exception to these rules that allows a provider to dispose of funds in inactive accounts in compliance with a controlling judicial or administrative mandate.

41. The Report and Order modifies the scope and content of the annual reporting requirements, to reflect the Commission's expanded jurisdiction under the Martha Wright-Reed Act, to include the full scope of IPCS and all providers of IPCS, and to reflect the changes to the Commission's rules adopted in the Report and Order. The Report and Order also amends the Commission's part 14 rules as appropriate to reflect the Martha Wright-Reed Act's expansion of the Communications Act's definition of "advanced communication service." It also modifies the Commission's rules to allow a form of enterprise registration for the use of Internet Protocol Captioned Telephone Service (IP CTS) in carceral facilities and clarifies that internet-based IPCS providers may provide access to traditional (TTY-based) TRS via real-time text. The Report and Order on Reconsideration also amends the Commission's rules to require that VRS and IP CTS providers update an incarcerated person's registration information within 30 days of receiving written notification from such person, the correctional authority, or IPCS provider of an incarcerated person's release or transfer.

#### *F. Steps Taken To Minimize the Significant Economic Impact on Small Entities, and Significant Alternatives Considered*

42. The RFA requires an agency to provide, "a description of the steps the agency has taken to minimize the significant economic impact on small entities . . . including a statement of the factual, policy, and legal reasons for selecting the alternative adopted in the final rule and why each one of the other significant alternatives to the rule considered by the agency which affect the impact on small entities was rejected."

43. In the Report and Order, the Commission adopts a new, more comprehensive set of rate caps that differentiate between prisons and jails, and between four different sizes of jails—large, medium, small and very small—based on average daily population (ADP). The use of four different size tiers is supported in the record and accounts for differences in costs incurred by providers serving these different facility sizes. The Commission conducts a cost analysis

specific to each size tier using data submitted by IPCS providers and adopts new rate caps for each of these facility size and type categories for both audio and video IPCS. The Commission believes that these actions properly recognize that some jails may be more costly for providers to serve than prisons, and similarly that jails with smaller ADPs may be more costly for providers to serve than those with larger ADPs.

44. Compliance with the Commission's new audio and video rate caps and its rules eliminating site commission payments will be required by January 1, 2025 for prisons and for jails with ADPs of 1,000 or above incarcerated persons where no site commissions mandated by law are currently paid; by April 1, 2025 for jails with ADPs less than 1,000 where no site commissions mandated by law are currently paid; and by July 1, 2025 for all size facilities where site commissions mandated by law are currently paid. The Commission extended the compliance deadline for providers serving smaller jails to account for the additional time that these facilities, and the providers that serve them, may need to adapt to the changes adopted in the Report and Order.

45. The Commission recognizes that it cannot foreclose the possibility that in certain limited instances, certain providers, possibly smaller providers with less ability to spread their costs over a larger number of facilities or minutes of use, may not be able to recover their costs of providing IPCS under the rate caps adopted in the Report and Order. To minimize the burden on such providers, the Commission retains, with modifications, its waiver process, which allows providers to seek relief from its rules at the facility or contract level if they can demonstrate that they are unable to recover their used and useful IPCS-related costs at that facility or for that contract. The Commission modifies this process to reflect the provisions of the Martha Wright-Reed Act, including its new authority thereunder. The waiver process will allow the Commission to review individual providers' data and potentially allow these providers to charge rates that enable them to recover their costs of providing IPCS at that facility or under that contract. This waiver process should benefit any IPCS providers that may be small businesses unable to recover their costs under the new rate caps.

46. In the Report and Order, the Commission prohibits providers from assessing ancillary service charges in

addition to per-minute rates for IPCS. The Commission incorporates the costs of providing ancillary services in its rate caps to allow providers the opportunity to recover their average costs of providing these ancillary services, while eliminating the burden of administering independent billing processes for each of these services. At the same time, eliminating all separately assessed ancillary service charges prevents providers from engaging in rent-seeking activity in their application of these charges, helping to ensure that IPCS rates and charges are just and reasonable.

47. The Commission revises its rules to make clear that IPCS providers may meet the requirement to provide access to traditional TRS via real-time text, as an alternative to TTY transmissions, if real-time text transmission is supported by the available devices and reliable service can be provided by this method. Permitting this alternative affords providers further flexibility in conducting their operations, and accommodates the needs of smaller providers that may have insufficient resources to expand or otherwise adjust their service format and infrastructure to enable TTY transmission.

48. The Commission revises its rules to permit providers to implement alternate pricing plans, other than per-minute pricing, subject to rules and conditions to protect IPCS consumers. Any provider that adopts these plans must offer them as a voluntary alternative to per-minute pricing. Providers are not required to offer such plans, but should they elect to do so, they will have the flexibility to determine the format of the plans they offer. Permitting this additional means of providing IPCS affords providers, including smaller providers, further flexibility in conducting their operations.

49. The Commission's rate caps incorporate the costs of only a subset of the safety and security measures reported by providers. The rate caps incorporate the costs of the two categories that the Commission finds to be both used and useful in the provision of IPCS: Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (CALEA) compliance measures and communications security services. Because cost recovery through the rate caps is only accommodated for a more limited set of such measures, providers, particularly smaller providers, may not

need to be capable of offering more sophisticated safety and security services in order to successfully compete for IPCS contracts.

#### G. Report to Congress

50. The Commission will send a copy of the Report and Order, including this FRFA, in a report to be sent to Congress pursuant to the Congressional Review Act. In addition, the Commission will send a copy of the Report and Order, including this FRFA, to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the SBA. A copy of the Report and Order and FRFA (or summaries thereof) will also be published in the **Federal Register**.

#### IV. Ordering Clauses

51. Accordingly, *it is ordered* that, pursuant to the authority contained in §§ 1, 2, 4(i)–(j), 201(b), 218, 220, 225, 255, 276, 403, and 716 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 151, 152, 154(i)–(j), 201(b), 218, 220, 225, 255, 276, 403, and 617, and the Martha Wright-Reed Just and Reasonable Communications Act of 2022, Public Law 117–338, 136 Stat 6156 (2022), this Order on Reconsideration, Clarification and Waiver *is adopted*.

52. *It is further ordered* that, pursuant to the authority contained in §§ 1, 2, 4(i)–(j), 201(b), 218, 220, 225, 255, 276, 403, and 716, of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 151, 152, 154(i)–(j), 201(b), 218, 220, 225, 255, 276, 403, and 617, and the Martha Wright-Reed Just and Reasonable Communications Act of 2022, Public Law 117–338, 136 Stat 6156 (2022), the Petition for Reconsideration, filed August 27, 2021 and amended December 14, 2022, by the United Church of Christ, OC Inc. and Public Knowledge *is dismissed* as described herein.

53. *It is further ordered* that, pursuant to the authority contained in §§ 1, 2, 4(i)–(j), 201(b), 218, 220, 225, 255, 276, 403, and 716, of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 151, 152, 154(i)–(j), 201(b), 218, 220, 225, 255, 276, 403, and 617, and the Martha Wright-Reed Just and Reasonable Communications Act of 2022, Public Law 117–338, 136 Stat 6156 (2022), the Petition for Reconsideration, filed August 21, 2021, by NCIC Inmate Communications *is dismissed* as described herein.

54. *It is further ordered* that, pursuant to the authority contained in §§ 1, 2,

4(i)–(j), 201(b), 218, 220, 225, 255, 276, 403, and 716, of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 151, 152, 154(i)–(j), 201(b), 218, 220, 225, 255, 276, 403, and 617, and the Martha Wright-Reed Just and Reasonable Communications Act of 2022, Public Law 117–338, 136 Stat 6156 (2022), the Petition for Partial Reconsideration, filed January 9, 2023, by Hamilton Relay, Inc. *is granted* as described herein.

55. *It is further ordered* that, pursuant to the authority contained in §§ 1, 2, 4(i)–(j), 201(b), 218, 220, 225, 255, 276, 403, and 716, of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 151, 152, 154(i)–(j), 201(b), 218, 220, 225, 255, 276, 403, and 617, and the Martha Wright-Reed Just and Reasonable Communications Act of 2022, Public Law 117–338, 136 Stat 6156 (2022), the Petition for Clarification, filed September 17, 2021, by Securus Technologies, LLC *is dismissed* as described herein.

56. *It is further ordered* that, pursuant to the authority contained in §§ 1, 2, 4(i)–(j), 201(b), 218, 220, 225, 255, 276, 403, and 716, of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 151, 152, 154(i)–(j), 201(b), 218, 220, 225, 255, 276, 403, and 617, and the Martha Wright-Reed Just and Reasonable Communications Act of 2022, Public Law 117–338, 136 Stat 6156 (2022), the Petition for Waiver, filed August 30, 2021, by Securus Technologies, LLC *is dismissed in part and otherwise denied* as described herein.

57. *It is further ordered* that the Commission's Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Reference Information Center, *shall send* a copy of this Order on Reconsideration, Clarification, and Waiver, including the Final Regulatory Flexibility Analyses, to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration.

58. *It is further ordered* that the Office of the Managing Director, Performance Evaluation and Records Management, *shall send* a copy of this Order on Reconsideration, Clarification, and Waiver in a report to be sent to Congress and the Government Accountability Officer pursuant to the Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

Federal Communications Commission.

**Marlene Dortch,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2024–18605 Filed 8–23–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P