

We have developed a comprehensive Preliminary Economic Analysis of Impacts that assesses the impacts of the proposed rule. The full preliminary analysis of economic impacts is available in the docket for this proposed rule (Ref. 1) and at <https://www.fda.gov/about-fda/economics-staff/regulatory-impact-analyses-ria>.

VIII. Analysis of Environmental Impact

We have determined under 21 CFR 25.31(h) that this action is of a type that does not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. Therefore, neither an environmental assessment nor an environmental impact statement is required.

IX. Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

FDA tentatively concludes that this proposed rule contains no collection of information. Therefore, clearance by the Office of Management and Budget under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 is not required.

X. Federalism

We have analyzed this proposed rule in accordance with the principles set forth in Executive Order 13132. We have determined that this proposed rule does not contain policies that have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the National Government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Accordingly, we conclude that the rule does not contain policies that have federalism implications as defined in the Executive order and, consequently, a federalism summary impact statement is not required.

XI. Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments

We have analyzed this proposed rule in accordance with the principles set forth in Executive Order 13175. We have tentatively determined that the rule does not contain policies that would have substantial direct effects on one or more Indian Tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian Tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian Tribes. The Agency solicits comments from tribal officials on any potential impact on Indian Tribes from this proposed action.

XII. Reference

The following reference is on display at the Dockets Management Staff (see **ADDRESSES**) and is available for viewing

by interested persons between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. Monday through Friday; it is also available electronically at <https://www.regulations.gov>. Although FDA verified the website addresses in this document, please note that websites are subject to change over time.

1. FDA/Economics Staff, "Revocation of Regulations Regarding the Mutual Recognition of Pharmaceutical Good Manufacturing Practice Reports, Medical Device Quality System Audit Reports, and Certain Medical Device Product Evaluation Reports: United States and The European Community Preliminary Regulatory Impact Analysis, Preliminary Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, Unfunded Mandates Reform Act Analysis," 2020. (Available at: <https://www.fda.gov/AboutFDA/ReportsManualsForms/Reports/EconomicAnalyses/default.htm>.)

List of Subjects in 21 CFR Part 26

Animal, Animal drugs, Biologics, Drugs, Exports, Imports.

For reasons stated in the preamble, and under the authority of 21 U.S.C. 393 and delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, FDA proposes to remove 21 CFR part 26.

Dated: September 12, 2024.

Robert M. Califf,

Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

[FR Doc. 2024-21559 Filed 9-19-24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4164-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

32 CFR Part 3

[Docket ID: DoD-2024-OS-0099]

RIN 0790-AK98

Transactions Other Than Contracts, Grants, or Cooperative Agreements for Prototype Projects; Correction

AGENCY: Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment (OUSD(A&S)), Department of Defense (DoD).

ACTION: Proposed rule; correction.

SUMMARY: On September 4, 2024, the DoD published a proposed rule titled Transactions Other Than Contracts, Grants, or Cooperative Agreements for Prototype Projects. Subsequent to publication of the proposed rule, DoD discovered that the docket identifier in the published proposed rule was incorrect. All other information in the September 4, 2024, remains the same.

DATES: This correction is effective on September 20, 2024.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patricia Toppings, 571-372-0485.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Correction

In proposed rule FR Doc. 2024-19457, published in the **Federal Register** on September 4, 2024 (89 FR 71865) make the following correction:

On page 71865, in the first column, in the document heading, the docket number "Docket ID: DoD-2021-OS-0071" is corrected to read "Docket ID: DoD-2024-OS-0099".

Dated: September 17, 2024.

Aaron T. Siegel,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2024-21551 Filed 9-19-24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6001-FR-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 64

[WC Docket Nos. 12-375, 23-62; FCC 24-75; FR ID 237560]

Incarcerated People's Communication Services; Implementation of the Martha Wright-Reed Act; Rates for Interstate Inmate Calling Services

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Federal Communications Commission (Commission) seeks additional comment on establishing permanent rate caps for video incarcerated people's communications services (IPCS) that are just and reasonable, and will fairly compensate IPCS providers, including comment on the video IPCS marketplace and the types of data needed to support its efforts to adopt permanent video IPCS rate caps in the future. It also seeks comment on the possibility of further disaggregating the very small jail rate tier and the types of cost or other data that would identify any additional distinctions within this rate tier. The Commission seeks comment on its authority to address quality of service issues raised in this proceeding and whether it should develop minimum Federal quality of service standards. It again seeks comment on whether to expand the definitions of "Prison" and "Jail" to capture the full universe of confinement facilities and specifically, the costs providers incur in providing service to confinement facilities that are not correctional institutions. It also seeks comment on whether to

incorporate into its inactive account rules a requirement that providers allow account holders to designate a third party to receive refunds from IPCS accounts. Finally, the Commission seeks comment on possibly adopting a uniform additive to the IPCS rate caps to account for correctional facility costs.

DATES: Comments are due on or before October 21, 2024; and reply comments are due on or before November 19, 2024.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by WC Docket Nos. 12–375 and 23–62, by either of the following methods:

Electronic filers: Comments may be filed electronically using the internet by accessing the Commission's Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS): <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs>.

Paper Filers: Parties who choose to file by paper must file an original and one copy of each filing. If more than one docket or rulemaking number appears in the caption of this proceeding, filers must submit two additional copies for each additional docket or rulemaking number. Filings can be sent by hand or messenger delivery, by commercial courier, or by the U.S. Postal Service. All filings must be addressed to the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission. Hand-delivered or messenger-delivered paper filings for the Commission's Secretary are accepted between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m. by the FCC's mailing contractor at 9050 Junction Drive, Annapolis Junction, MD 20701. All hand deliveries must be held together with rubber bands or fasteners. Any envelopes and boxes must be disposed of before entering the building. Commercial courier deliveries (any deliveries not by the U.S. Postal Service) must be sent to 9050 Junction Drive, Annapolis Junction, MD 20701. Filings sent by U.S. Postal Service First-Class Mail, Priority Mail, and Priority Mail Express must be sent to 45 L Street NE, Washington, DC 20554.

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.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (FNPRM), 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 FCC 24–75 document, the full text of which can be accessed electronically via the FCC's Electronic Document Management System (EDOCS) website at www.fcc.gov/edocs, or via the FCC's

Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS) website at www.fcc.gov/ecfs, or is available at the following internet address: <https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/FCC-24-75A1.pdf>.

Synopsis

I. Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

A. Establishing Permanent Rate Caps for Video Services

1. In the 2024 IPCS Report and Order, published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**, we determine that we do not have a sufficient record or sufficiently reliable data from the 2023 Mandatory Data Collection to set permanent rate caps for video IPCS. The Commission identified anomalies in the video cost data (both industry-wide and for Securus in particular) that suggest that there is significant room for growth in this nascent market and that these data were unlikely to be representative of longer term trends in the video IPCS market. For these reasons, in the 2024 IPCS Report and Order, we establish interim rates based on the best data available and delegate authority to the Wireline Competition Bureau (WCB) and the Office of Economics and Analytics (OEA) to conduct an additional mandatory data collection to obtain updated cost and other data and information from providers concerning their video IPCS offerings, among other things. We now seek further comment on establishing permanent rate caps for video IPCS that are just and reasonable, and will fairly compensate IPCS providers. We emphasize that we will keep a close eye on developments in the video IPCS marketplace, including how changes in it affect people with disabilities. We anticipate receiving detailed information on those developments as part of the IPCS providers' annual reports once WCB and Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau (CGB) revise the requirement for those reports in response to the 2024 IPCS Report and Order. We also will be receiving detailed information regarding video IPCS costs and demand and (to the extent practicable) how those costs might change over time, once WCB and OEA implement the additional data collection we require today. We ask interested parties to supplement the record in this proceeding with any information they have regarding the types of video communications services that providers offer incarcerated people, the demand for those services, the used and useful costs providers and facilities incur in the provision of those services, and other information that might help us set just and reasonable, and fairly

compensatory, permanent rate caps for video IPCS. While the course of this proceeding, including the Commission's efforts regarding inmate calling services prior to the enactment of the Martha Reed-Wright Act, make us acutely aware of all the steps involved in determining just and reasonable, and fairly compensatory, permanent rate caps, we intend to move quickly to complete that task with regard to video IPCS once we have the requisite information.

2. In 2023, the Commission sought comment on how it could best ensure that the rates and charges for video IPCS are just and reasonable (88 FR 27850, May 3, 2023). We now invite further comment on the video IPCS marketplace, including the types of costs incurred by video IPCS providers and the pricing and other associated practices under which such providers presently offer video services to incarcerated people. What types of video communications services are currently being offered to incarcerated people and what additional video services are likely to be offered in the near future? Is there a difference between video communications depending on the technology used? For example, are kiosks the primary means of video IPCS or are tablets more prevalent? What role does application-based video IPCS play in the IPCS market and how is that role likely to change in the future with increased deployment of tablets? Do providers use third-party applications, or develop applications internally? Do providers that develop such applications internally offset their development costs by selling them to other providers? Are there trends favoring the use of one technology over the other, for example, in costs, deployment, or usage? Is there a cost difference between different types of technologies, whether hardware-based or software-based, or among different versions of the same types of technologies? Are these technologies used in different ways? For example, are kiosks used more commonly for on-site video visitation? Do different hardware or software platforms entail differences in the manner in which video IPCS is offered, for example, as to quality of service or the variety of features offered with the service? Within the categories of safety and security services that we identify as used and useful in the 2024 IPCS Report and Order, are any such services or functions particular to video IPCS that—given the developing nature of the market—are still in the process of deployment or development?

3. We also seek comment on trends that may characterize the video IPCS market. What trends are there, if any, in

the costs of providing video IPCS? Are the substantial investments providers reported making in video equipment in the 2023 Mandatory Data Collection continuing or is investment in them trending to more stable, sustainable levels? Under what circumstances would it be appropriate to determine that the market has reached a more mature stage, potentially warranting the adoption of permanent, rather than interim, rates? What trends are there, if any, in demand for video IPCS? To what extent are providers' investments in and deployment of video equipment and network architecture stimulating demand for video IPCS? Are there trends in the costs of deploying these technologies as they become more widely available? Are there trends in the relative usage of these technologies to access video IPCS, including video visitation, versus other services provided via the same technologies or platforms, such as educational or entertainment services? How should we measure the relative use of these technologies among different services? What proportion of equipment and platform costs are devoted to providing video IPCS as compared to providing other services? Given the common usage of these equipment and platforms, what are appropriate methods for allocating costs among video IPCS, audio IPCS, and other non-IPCS that use the same equipment and platforms? What trends are there, if any, in providers' investment in the platforms necessary to support the provision of video IPCS?

4. Additional Mandatory Data Collection. In the 2024 IPCS Report and Order, we direct staff to conduct an additional mandatory data collection to obtain updated data on video IPCS and the IPCS industry in general. We seek comment on the types of data that would be most helpful for the Commission to collect to support its efforts to adopt permanent video IPCS rate caps in the future. We invite comment on any changes the Commission should consider making to the 2023 Mandatory Data Collection as it considers developing the additional data collection. Are there any types of data that the Commission should consider adding to that collection to ensure it meets the Commission's needs? We also seek comment on the relative benefits and burdens that collecting additional data would entail. Finally, we seek comment on the appropriate timeframe in which to conduct this data collection to ensure that the data we receive reflect a sufficiently mature video IPCS market to

be suitable as the basis for setting permanent video IPCS rate caps.

B. Further Disaggregating the Very Small Jail Tier

5. In the 2024 IPCS Report and Order, we establish five rate cap tiers based on facility type and size, based on the best evidence available, in both the record and the data provided in the 2023 Mandatory Data Collection, reflecting the factors driving providers' costs. Of the four size tiers for jails, the smallest size tier (*i.e.*, for those jails with an average daily population of less than 100) makes up approximately half of all jails for which we had available data. Given the relative share of jail facilities comprising this tier, we recognize that there may be additional distinctions within this tier that are not effectively captured by the available data and that the number of facilities in this tier, of necessity, limits the granularity of the analysis for this smallest jail tier. For example, certain small providers that serve very small jails failed to submit data in response to the 2023 Mandatory Data Collection that we found to be reliable and therefore excluded from our analysis. Although we find that the available data are sufficiently robust for setting permanent audio rate caps at the tiers we adopt in the 2024 IPCS Report and Order, obtaining more reliable data from these providers may establish a better more comprehensive understanding of the costs of serving this smallest tier of jails. Commenters suggest that the smallest facilities are subject to particularly high costs, due to, for example, more frequently being located in rural areas. Accordingly, we seek comment on the types of cost or other data that would be most helpful for the Commission to collect from providers serving this tier of facilities to ascertain whether, and if so how, to further disaggregate this tier to capture any variability that may exist within segments of this tier. Are there any particular types of data that the Commission should consider adding to our subsequent data collection to ensure that it meets the Commission's needs in this regard? We also seek comment on, if the data suggests that this tier should be further disaggregated, how to do so in a manner that accurately reflects providers' costs, but also minimizes the burden on providers to administer or on consumers to understand.

C. Quality of Service

6. Many commenters raise concerns in the record regarding the quality of IPCS. Dropped calls, lack of enough communications devices at facilities, frozen video screens, and other

technological shortcomings are ongoing challenges for incarcerated people and their loved ones. As an initial matter, we seek comment on scope of the Commission's authority to address quality of service issues related to these communications services, including to establish and enforce service quality rules or standards for the provision of IPCS. The Commission long has relied on its section 201(b) authority to address traffic delivery and call completion concerns. In addition, the Commission has recognized that "[a]n inherent part of any rate setting process is not only the establishment of the rate level and rate structure, but the definition of the service or functionality to which the rate will apply." We thus believe that quality of service considerations are within the purview of our establishment of a compensation plan to ensure just and reasonable rates for IPCS under section 276(b)(1)(A). Do commenters agree that our traditional sources of statutory authority over these communications and providers—sections 276 and 201—convey jurisdiction for the regulation of service quality? Are there alternative statutory provisions on which we could rely to regulate the service quality of IPCS? Does the source of our authority differ depending on the type of communication, *i.e.*, audio or video IPCS?

7. Assuming the Commission has statutory bases to address service quality issues, we seek comment on whether the Commission should develop minimum Federal quality of service standards. If Federal standards are warranted, how should such standards or rules be developed? Should there be different standards or rules for different types of facilities or providers? Should the Commission establish the same or different standards for audio and video IPCS? Are there technical considerations that may warrant different standards for video services, or for different types of video services? How would the Commission monitor and enforce such standards? Similarly, are there service quality issues caused by factors beyond the control of the IPCS provider, such as broadband congestion or network failures? If so, how would Federal standards account for these factors?

8. We also seek comment on the types of service quality issues that should be addressed by any Federal standards. Should the standards simply address the most common issues reported in the record or attempt to cover any issue that materially impacts the communication service? If the Commission adopted service quality standards, how would

such standards be monitored and enforced and through what procedures? Under what circumstances, if any, should the standards require refunds to IPCS consumers?

9. Finally, are there any existing service quality standards or regulations in the IPCS marketplace today? To the extent that parties support adoption of Federal service quality standards, we anticipate that existing standards or regulations might provide a model for Federal efforts. Do prison and jail facilities currently have rules or regulations in place to address the service quality of IPCS? Do contracts between correctional institutions and providers include service quality standards, and, if so, what kinds of standards and what type of metrics for monitoring such standards are included? Have states adopted any regulations designed to address service quality of communications in correctional facilities? Parties should address these and any additional issues related to the service quality of IPCS.

D. Expanding the Definitions of Prisons and Jails

10. In the 2024 IPCS Report and Order, we modify the definition of “Jail” to encompass all immigration detention facilities, but we decline, at this time, to further expand the definitions of “Prison” and “Jail” in our rules, as requested by some parties, to capture the full universe of confinement facilities such as civil commitment, residential, group and nursing facilities. Several commenters support expanding the definition of “Jail” to cover civil commitment facilities, residential facilities, group facilities, and nursing facilities in which people with disabilities, substance abuse problems, or other conditions are routinely detained. In both 2022 and 2023, the Commission sought comment on modifying the definitions of “Jail” and “Prison” in its rules “to ensure that they capture the full universe of confinement facilities.” In addition, the Commission sought comment in 2022 on its authority to apply the inmate calling services rules, “including those addressing communication disabilities, to these facilities.” Although we agree that individuals in these facilities should benefit from the protections of just and reasonable rate caps and other consumer protection rules that we adopt here, we conclude that the Commission lacks sufficient information and data to address the requests. For this reason, we seek further comment on the costs providers incur in providing service to confinement facilities that are not correctional institutions.

11. Some parties contend that the definition of payphone service in section 276 of the Communications Act is, in pertinent part, limited to payphone service provided “in correctional institutions” and does not extend to confinement facilities that allegedly are not “correctional” in nature. Others assert that the protections of our rules should be extended to benefit individuals in confinement facilities generally. We seek comment on whether our statutory authority under section 276 can be interpreted to extend to confinement facilities. Are there other sources of statutory authority that would allow us to extend our regulations to cover these facilities?

12. Some parties contend that IPCS regulations should only apply to “corrections-type communications systems” because the various types of confinement facilities may not have the same cost characteristics as correctional facilities. We seek comment on whether confinement facilities outside the scope of facilities historically encompassed by our rules have cost characteristics that are substantially similar to the facilities our rules traditionally have addressed. Do confinement facilities make available communications services and impose similar types of usage restrictions as correctional facilities? Parties addressing these issues should detail any cost and service differences, and how such differences might result in different rate caps for non-correctional confinement facilities.

E. Treatment of Unused Balances In IPCS Accounts

13. In the 2024 IPCS Report and Order, we adopt permanent rules designed to ensure that IPCS account holders receive refunds of any unused funds in their accounts once the accounts are deemed inactive. We invite comment on whether to incorporate into those rules a requirement that providers allow account holders to designate a family member or other individual as an additional person eligible to receive refunds. We ask that commenters address the relative benefits and burdens of such a measure. We also ask how we might tailor such a measure to facilitate timely refunds without unduly burdening providers. Should we, for example, require providers to give account holders the opportunity to provide their designees’ contact information, including residential addresses, phone numbers, and email addresses? Should we specify, in addition, that a designee receive any inactivity and refund notices that would be provided to the account holder and

be allowed to request refunds on the account holder’s behalf?

F. Uniform Additive To Account for Correctional Facility Costs

14. We seek comment on whether we should adopt a uniform additive to our IPCS rate caps to account for correctional facility costs. In the 2024 IPCS Report and Order, we permit IPCS providers to reimburse correctional facilities for the used and useful costs they may incur in allowing access to IPCS. Some commenters express concern that the reimbursement we permit may be difficult for IPCS providers to implement, particularly in determining which costs are used and useful for purposes of reimbursement. As an alternative, some commenters propose the use of an “explicit additive to the rate caps for audio and video IPCS.” Under this proposal, rather than permit IPCS providers and correctional facilities to negotiate for reimbursement under our current audio and video IPCS rates caps, the Commission would adopt a uniform facility cost additive. One commenter suggests that this approach “would properly account for the security needs of facilities (and corresponding costs caused by making IPCS available)” and would “help to ensure the continued widespread availability of IPCS.” We seek comment on this proposal, including the extent to which an additive would be a reasonable method to ensure that correctional facilities are able to recover the used and useful costs they incur in making IPCS available. Is such an additive preferable to the freely-negotiated reimbursement we allow in the 2024 IPCS Report and Order? Why or why not? Would a uniform additive allow correctional facilities to better adapt to the IPCS rate structure the Commission adopts in the 2024 IPCS Report and Order? Why or why not?

15. We seek broad comment on the contours of any possible rate additive. In particular, we seek comment on the appropriate amount of a rate additive for used and useful correctional facility costs. One commenter suggests that \$0.02 could be established as a maximum cost recovery amount. This would be consistent with the approach the Commission took for prisons and jails with average daily populations of 1,000 or more in the 2021 ICS Order (86 FR 40682, July 28, 2021). Pay Tel’s outside consultant, estimates, on the basis of an informal survey of 30 correctional facilities with average daily populations below 1,000 that the average used and useful costs may be \$0.08 per minute. Which data should the Commission rely on in determining

the appropriate additive and why? To the extent commenters believe more data are needed, should the Commission seek those data through an additional data collection? How can we ensure that we receive reliable data on correctional facilities' used and useful costs for purposes of establishing a rate additive? Obtaining reliable correctional facility cost data has been a perennial problem in these proceedings. In 2021, the Commission sought comment on how to obtain reliable correctional facility data (86 FR 40416, July 28, 2021). The Commission also sought facility cost data in the 2023 Mandatory Data Collection. As we explain above, however, commenters have not provided updated facility cost data. Finally, we invite comment on how the Commission should implement a rate additive within the zones of reasonableness determined in the 2024 IPCS Report and Order.

G. Effect on Small Entities

16. We seek comment on the effect that our proposals to adopt permanent video IPCS rate caps, quality of service rules, and expanded definitions of "Prison" and "Jail" in our rules would have on small entities, and whether any rules that we adopt should apply differently to small entities. We seek input on the effect, if any, on small entities of any other issues upon which we inquire in this document. We also seek comment on how we should take into account the impact on small businesses and, in particular, any disproportionate impact or unique burdens that small businesses may face, in effectuating the questions and proposals in this document. Parties should also address any alternative proposals that would minimize the burdens on small businesses.

H. Digital Equity and Inclusion

17. The Commission, as part of its continuing effort to advance digital equity for all, including people of color, persons with disabilities, persons who live in rural or Tribal areas, and others who are or have been historically underserved, marginalized, or adversely affected by persistent poverty or inequality, invites comment on any equity-related considerations and benefits (if any) that may be associated with the proposals and issues discussed herein. Section 1 of the Communications Act provides that the Commission "regulat[es] interstate and foreign commerce in communication by wire and radio so as to make [such service] available, so far as possible, to all the people of the United States, without discrimination on the basis of

race, color, religion, national origin, or sex." Specifically, we seek comment on how our proposals may promote or inhibit advances in diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility, as well as the scope of the Commission's relevant legal authority. The term "equity" is used here consistent with Executive Order 13985 as the consistent and systematic fair, just, and impartial treatment of all individuals, including individuals who belong to underserved communities that have been denied such treatment, such as Black, Latino, and Indigenous and Native American persons, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders and other persons of color; members of religious minorities; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ+) persons; persons with disabilities; persons who live in rural areas; and persons otherwise adversely affected by persistent poverty or inequality.

I. OPEN Government Data Act

18. We also seek comment on whether any of the information proposed to be collected in this would constitute "data assets" for purposes of the OPEN Government Data Act and, if so, whether such information should be published as "open Government data assets"?

II. Procedural Matters

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

20. *Initial Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) Analysis.* This document may contain new or modified information collection(s) subject to the PRA. If the Commission adopts any new or modified information collection requirements, they will be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review under section 3507(d) of the PRA. OMB, the general public, and other Federal agencies are invited to comment on the new or modified information collection requirements

contained in this proceeding. In addition, pursuant to the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2002, we seek specific comment on how we might "further reduce the information collection burden for small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees."

21. *Providing Accountability Through Transparency Act.* Consistent with the Providing Accountability Through Transparency Act, Public Law 118–9, a summary of the FNPRM will be available on <https://www.fcc.gov/proposed-rulemakings>.

22. *OPEN Government Data Act.* The OPEN Government Data Act, requires agencies to make "public data assets" available under an open license and as "open Government data assets," *i.e.*, in machine-readable, open format, unencumbered by use restrictions other than intellectual property rights, and based on an open standard that is maintained by a standards organization. This requirement is to be implemented "in accordance with guidance by the Director" of the OMB. The term "public data asset" means "a data asset, or part thereof, maintained by the Federal Government that has been, or may be, released to the public, including any data asset, or part thereof, subject to disclosure under [the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)]." A "data asset" is "a collection of data elements or data sets that may be grouped together," and "data" is "recorded information, regardless of form or the media on which the data is recorded." We seek comment in the FNPRM on whether any of the information proposed to be collected would constitute "data assets" for purposes of the OPEN Government Data Act and, if so, whether such information should be published as "open Government data assets."

23. *Comment Period and Filing Procedures.* Pursuant to sections 1.415 and 1.419 of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR 1.415, 1.419, interested parties may file comments and reply comments on or before the dates indicated in the **DATES** section of this document. All filings must refer to WC Docket Nos. 23–62 and 12–375. The Protective Order issued in this proceeding permits parties to designate certain material as confidential. Filings which contain confidential information should be appropriately redacted, and filed pursuant to the procedure described therein.

24. *Electronic Filers:* Comments may be filed electronically using the internet by accessing the Commission's Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS): <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs>. See

Electronic Filing of Documents in Rulemaking Proceedings, 63 FR 24121 (1998).

25. *Paper Filers*: Parties who choose to file by paper must file an original and one copy of each filing. If more than one docket or rulemaking number appears in the caption of this proceeding, filers must submit two additional copies for each additional docket or rulemaking number.

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

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

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

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

30. Comments and reply comments must include a short and concise summary of the substantive arguments raised in the pleading. Comments and reply comments must also comply with § 1.49 and all other applicable sections of the Commission's rules. We direct all interested parties to include the name of the filing party and the date of the filing on each page of their comments and reply comments. All parties are encouraged to use a table of contents, regardless of the length of their submission. We also strongly encourage parties to track the organization set forth in the FNPRM in order to facilitate our internal review process.

31. *Ex Parte Rules*. This proceeding shall be treated as a "permit-but-disclose" proceeding in accordance with the Commission's *ex parte* rules. 47 CFR 1.1200 through 1.1216. Persons making *ex parte* presentations must file a copy of any written presentation or a memorandum summarizing any oral presentation within two business days after the presentation (unless a different deadline applicable to the Sunshine period applies).

32. Persons making oral *ex parte* presentations are reminded that memoranda summarizing the presentation must (1) list all persons attending or otherwise participating in

the meeting at which the *ex parte* presentation was made, and (2) summarize all data presented and arguments made during the presentation. If the presentation consisted in whole or in part of the presentation of data or arguments already reflected in the presenter's written comments, memoranda or other filings in the proceeding, the presenter may provide citations to such data or arguments in his or her prior comments, memoranda, or other filings (specifying the relevant page and/or paragraph numbers where such data or arguments can be found) in lieu of summarizing them in the memorandum. Documents shown or given to Commission staff during *ex parte* meetings are deemed to be written *ex parte* presentations and must be filed consistent with § 1.1206(b). In proceedings governed by § 1.49(f) or for which the Commission has made available a method of electronic filing, written *ex parte* presentations and memoranda summarizing oral *ex parte* presentations, and all attachments thereto, must be filed through the electronic comment filing system available for that proceeding, and must be filed in their native format (e.g., .doc, .xml, .ppt, searchable .pdf). Participants in this proceeding should familiarize themselves with the Commission's *ex parte* rules.

33. *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 or call the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at 202-418-0530.

34. *Availability of Documents*. Comments, reply comments, and *ex parte* submissions will be publicly available online via ECFS.

III. Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

35. As required by the RFA, the Commission has prepared this IRFA of the possible significant economic impact on small entities by the policies and rules proposed in this document. Written public comments are requested on this IRFA. Comments must be identified as responses to the IRFA and must be filed by the deadlines for comments. The Commission will send a copy of the FNPRM, including the IRFA, to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration (SBA). In addition, the FNPRM and the IRFA (or summaries thereof) will be published in the **Federal Register**.

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

36. The Commission seeks additional comment on establishing permanent rate caps for video incarcerated people's communications services (IPCS) that are just and reasonable, and will fairly compensate IPCS providers. Specifically, the Commission requests that parties supplement the record with additional information on the video IPCS marketplace, including the types of video communications services that providers offer incarcerated people, the demand for those services, the used and useful costs providers and facilities incur in the provision of those services, and other information that might help us set just and reasonable, and fairly compensatory, permanent rate caps for video IPCS. It also requests comment on the types of data that would be most helpful for the Commission to collect to support its efforts to adopt permanent video IPCS rate caps.

37. The Commission also seeks comment on quality of service issues that have been raised in this proceeding. This includes comment on the Commission's legal authority to address quality of service issues and whether it should develop minimal quality of service standards. It seeks comment on the types of service quality issues that should be addressed and whether there should be different standards or rules for different types of facilities or providers.

38. The Commission again seeks comment on revisions to its definitions of "Prison" and "Jail," and specifically, the costs providers incur in providing service to confinement facilities that are not correctional institutions. The Commission also seeks comment on whether its statutory authority under section 276 can be interpreted to extend to confinement facilities. Finally, the Commission seeks comment on possibly obtaining additional data about serving very small jails, the possible designation of a third party to receive refunds from IPCS accounts and possibly adopting a uniform additive to the IPCS rate caps to account for correctional facility costs.

B. Legal Basis

39. The proposed action is authorized pursuant to sections 1, 2, 4(i)-(j), 201(b), 218, 220, 225, 255, 276, and 403 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).

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

40. The RFA directs agencies to provide a description of, and where feasible, an estimate of the number of small entities that may be affected by the proposed rule revisions, if adopted. The RFA generally defines the term “small entity” as having the same meaning as the terms “small business,” “small organization,” and “small governmental jurisdiction.” In addition, the term “small business” has the same meaning as the term “small-business concern” under the Small Business Act. A “small-business concern” is one which: (1) is independently owned and operated; (2) is not dominant in its field of operation; and (3) satisfies any additional criteria established by the SBA.

41. *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 SBA’s 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.

42. 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.

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.”

43. *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 Voice over internet Protocol (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.

44. 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.

45. 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.

46. *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.

47. *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.

48. *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.

49. *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 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 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.

50. *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 an 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.

51. *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 an 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. 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.

52. *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.

53. *Payphone Service Providers (PSPs)*. Neither the Commission nor the SBA have developed a small business size standard specifically for payphone service providers. Telecommunications Resellers is the closest industry with an 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. 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.

54. *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.

55. 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 an SBA small business size standard. Internet Service Providers (ISPs) and 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.

56. *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 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.

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

57. *Establishing Permanent Rate Caps for Video IPCS.* The Commission seeks comments on establishing permanent video IPCS rates, including updated marketplace and cost data. To the extent that permanent video IPCS rate caps are

lower than the interim rate caps and apply to all types of facilities (including jails with average daily populations below 1,000) as detailed in the 2024 IPCS Report and Order, IPCS video providers (including any smaller entities) must comply with the new rate caps.

58. *Compliance with Quality of Service Rules.* The Commission seeks comment on adopting quality of service rules for IPCS. It also seeks comment on whether there should be different standards or rules for different types of facilities or providers. Thus, IPCS providers that are small entities may be subject to any quality of service rules ultimately adopted by the Commission.

59. *Recordkeeping, Reporting, and Certification.* The 2024 IP Report and Order directs staff to conduct an additional mandatory data collection to obtain updated data on video IPCS and the IPCS industry in general. The Commission seeks comment on the types of data that would be most helpful for it to collect to support its efforts to adopt permanent video IPCS rate caps that are just and reasonable to consumers, as well as ensuring fair compensation to providers. To the extent the Commission imposes a new mandatory data collection, providers of all sizes must maintain and report their cost data in accordance with the Commission's rules. The Commission also seeks comments on revising its definitions of "Prison" and "Jail" to capture the full universe of confinement facilities. To the extent the Commission expands these definitions as proposed, providers of communication services to these facilities may be subject to the Commission's regulations. We anticipate the information we receive in comments including where requested, cost and benefit analyses, will help the Commission identify and evaluate relevant compliance matters for small entities, including compliance costs and other burdens that may result from the proposals and inquiries we make herein.

E. Steps Taken To Minimize the Significant Economic Impact on Small Entities and Significant Alternatives Considered

60. The RFA requires an agency to describe any significant, alternatives that could minimize impacts to small entities that it has considered in reaching its proposed approach, which may include the following four alternatives (among others): (1) the establishment of differing compliance or reporting requirements or timetables that take into account the resources available to small entities; (2) the clarification, consolidation, or

simplification of compliance and reporting requirements under the rules for such small entities; (3) the use of performance rather than design standards; and (4) an exemption from coverage of the rule, or any part thereof, for such small entities.

61. The Commission seeks comments on establishing permanent rate caps for video IPCS. Data are sought from providers servicing different facility types and sizes, and information on how small providers serving jails, which may be smaller, higher-cost facilities, and larger prisons, which often benefit from economies of scale, can recover their legitimate IPCS costs related to video communications services.

62. The Commission seeks comment on adopting quality of service standards for IPCS including whether there should be different standards or rules for different types of facilities or providers. The Commission seeks information on the impact such rules may have on IPCS providers for smaller facilities. The Commission seeks comment on the costs providers incur in providing service to confinement facilities of all sizes that are not correctional institutions. Specifically, whether non-

correctional confinement facilities have cost characteristics that are substantially similar to correctional facilities.

63. The Commission seeks comment on whether any of the burdens associated the filing, recordkeeping and reporting requirements described above can be minimized for small entities and whether any of the costs associated with the proposals in this summary document can be alleviated for small entities. The Commission will consider the economic impact on small entities, as identified in comments filed in response to this summary and this IRFA, in reaching its final conclusions and promulgating rules in this proceeding.

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

64. None.

IV. Ordering Clauses

65. Accordingly, *it is ordered* that, pursuant to the authority contained in sections 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 FNPRM *is adopted*.

66. *It is further ordered* that, pursuant to applicable procedures set forth in §§ 1.415 and 1.419 of the Commission's Rules, 47 CFR 1.415, 1.419, interested parties may file comments on the FNPRM on or before 30 days after publication of a summary of the FNPRM in the **Federal Register** and reply comments on or before 60 days after publication of a summary of the FNPRM in the **Federal Register**.

67. *It is further ordered* that the Commission's Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Reference Information Center, *shall send* a copy of the FNPRM, including the Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration.

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene Dortch,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2024–19038 Filed 9–18–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P