

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY1

II. THE PUBLIC NOTICE PROPERLY EMBODIES THE ADMINISTRATION’S
FOCUS ON DEREGULATION AND GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY2

III. THE COMMISSION HAS REPEATEDLY RECOGNIZED THE VALUE OF LIGHT-
TOUCH REGULATION5

IV. THIS PROCEEDING IS CRITICAL TO ACHIEVING BOTH THE COMMISSION’S
STATUTORY MANDATES AND ITS POLICY OBJECTIVES7

V. CTIA ENCOURAGES THE COMMISSION TO UPDATE ITS SYSTEMS AND
DATABASES10

VI. CONCLUSION.....11

APPENDIX: Regulations, Policies, and Proceedings Identified by CTIA for
Modification or Deletion..... A-1–A-23

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)
)
In Re: Delete, Delete, Delete) GN Docket No. 25-133
)

COMMENTS OF CTIA

CTIA¹ respectfully submits these comments in response to the Federal Communications Commission’s (“FCC” or “Commission”) Public Notice in the above-referenced proceeding.²

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

CTIA supports the Commission’s efforts in this proceeding to identify and implement “deregulatory initiatives that would facilitate and encourage American firms’ investment in modernizing their networks, developing infrastructure, and offering innovative and advanced capabilities.”³ The Public Notice is a welcome and important step toward implementing the Trump Administration’s government-wide deregulatory effort that seeks to promote government efficiency and drive competition and innovation. As the Commission has repeatedly recognized, light-touch regulation spurs innovation and investment and promotes U.S. leadership in the

¹ CTIA – The Wireless Association® (“CTIA”) (www.ctia.org) represents the U.S. wireless communications industry and the companies throughout the mobile ecosystem that enable Americans to lead a 21st century connected life. The association’s members include wireless providers, device manufacturers, and suppliers, as well as apps and content companies. CTIA vigorously advocates at all levels of government for policies that foster continued wireless innovation and investment. CTIA represents a broad diversity of stakeholders, and the specific positions outlined in these comments may not reflect the views of all individual members. The association also coordinates the industry’s voluntary best practices, hosts educational events that promote the wireless industry and co-produces the industry’s leading wireless tradeshow. CTIA was founded in 1984 and is based in Washington, D.C.

² *In Re: Delete, Delete, Delete*, GN Docket No. 25-133, Public Notice, DA 25-219 (rel. Mar. 12, 2025) (“Public Notice”).

³ *Id.* at 1.

development and deployment of cutting-edge technologies. This proceeding is critical to continuing to foster this pro-competitive regulatory environment. CTIA is pleased to assist the Commission in its efforts by identifying a wide range of FCC regulations for modification or deletion in the attached Appendix. The Appendix also identifies ongoing FCC proceedings that could be closed with no further action and suggests other steps the agency could take to further its efficiency objectives. Finally, CTIA encourages the Commission to take the opportunity presented by this proceeding to review and update some of its systems and databases, which create inefficiencies and impose unnecessary costs due to their suboptimal design and lack of accessibility.

II. THE PUBLIC NOTICE PROPERLY EMBODIES THE ADMINISTRATION'S FOCUS ON DEREGULATION AND GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY

The Public Notice is wholly consistent with the Trump Administration's recent efforts to promote governmental efficiency and unleash innovation and prosperity through deregulation. Indeed, as Executive Order 14192 recognizes, "[t]he ever-expanding morass of complicated Federal regulation imposes massive costs on the lives of millions of Americans, creates a substantial restraint on our economic growth and ability to build and innovate, and hampers our global competitiveness."⁴ Through this and other Executive Orders, the Trump Administration has directed administrative agencies to take numerous steps in the near term that are designed to alleviate these challenges. Among other things, agencies must (1) develop more accurate and thorough cost-benefit analyses, and (2) ensure that implementing regulations reflect the single, best meaning of the authorizing statute.

⁴ *Executive Order 14192 of January 31, 2025, Unleashing Prosperity Through Deregulation*, 24 Fed. Reg. 9065, § 1 (Feb. 6, 2025) ("EO 14192").

To ensure proper focus on the costs and benefits of regulatory action, Executive Order 14219 requires agencies to “initiate a process to review all regulations . . . for consistency with law and Administration policy” and to provide to the Office of Management and Budget (“OMB”) a list of regulations that “impose significant costs upon private parties that are not outweighed by public benefits” or that “harm the national interest by significantly and unjustifiably impeding technology innovation [and] infrastructure development.”⁵ Executive Order 14192, meanwhile, directs agencies to identify at least ten existing regulations for each proposed new regulation, and to ensure that the total incremental cost of all new regulations finalized in fiscal year 2025 “be significantly less than zero.”⁶ Consistent with these directives, the Public Notice explains that cost-benefit analyses are relevant “where a rule when originally adopted was not grounded in a proper assessment of the relevant costs and benefits of the requirement, or where the initial cost-benefit evaluation was highly uncertain.”⁷ The Public Notice also seeks comment on whether there are rules that “if eliminated or modified, could result in greater benefits relative to the associated costs” of the rules, or that are otherwise “unnecessary,” “outdated,” or “ill-suited to [their] purpose.”⁸

The regulatory review directed by Executive Order 14219 also requires agencies to focus on the legality of existing regulations, in particular ordering identification to OMB of “regulations that are based on anything other than the best reading of the underlying statutory authority or prohibition,” and regulations that are “based on unlawful delegations of legislative

⁵ *Executive Order 14219 of February 19, 2025, Ensuring Lawful Governance and Implementing the President’s “Department of Government Efficiency” Deregulatory Initiative*, 90 Fed. Reg. 10583, § 2 (Feb. 25, 2025) (“EO 14219”).

⁶ EO 14192 § 3.

⁷ Public Notice at 2-3.

⁸ *Id.* at 3.

power” or otherwise “raise serious constitutional difficulties.”⁹ It further directs agencies to “de-prioritiz[e] actions to enforce regulations that are based on anything other than the best reading of a statute” or that “go beyond the powers vested in the Federal Government by the Constitution.”¹⁰ The Public Notice similarly recognizes that under the Supreme Court’s decision in *Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo*, “courts need not and under the [Administrative Procedure Act] may not defer to an agency interpretation of the law simply because a statute is ambiguous.”¹¹ In doing so, the FCC seeks comment on whether there are any rules based on a past FCC interpretation that should be revisited.¹²

After the Public Notice was issued, on April 9, 2025, the Administration released a Memorandum directing agencies to prioritize evaluating the lawfulness of regulations pursuant to *Loper Bright* and other relevant Supreme Court cases in conducting the regulatory review required by Executive Order 14219.¹³ Following completion of the regulatory review, the Memorandum directs agencies to “immediately take steps to effectuate the repeal of any regulation, or the portion of any regulation, that clearly exceeds the agency’s statutory authority or is otherwise unlawful,” including acting without notice-and-comment procedures where doing so is consistent with the Administrative Procedure Act.¹⁴ This Presidential Memorandum further underscores the importance and urgency of ensuring that federal regulations are consistent with governing law.

⁹ EO 14219 § 2.

¹⁰ *Id.* § 3.

¹¹ Public Notice at 4 (quoting *Loper Bright Enters. v. Raimondo*, 603 U.S. 369, 413 (2024)).

¹² *Id.*

¹³ Memorandum on Directing the Repeal of Unlawful Regulations (Apr. 9, 2025), www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/04/directing-the-repeal-of-unlawful-regulations/.

¹⁴ *Id.*

The Administration estimates that recent deregulatory efforts have already saved families thousands of dollars.¹⁵ The Public Notice now offers an important opportunity to advance the Administration’s deregulatory and government efficiency goals. CTIA supports the FCC’s efforts to modernize its rules by identifying and modifying or eliminating regulations that are not beneficial on net or that are not grounded in the FCC’s lawful authority.

III. THE COMMISSION HAS REPEATEDLY RECOGNIZED THE VALUE OF LIGHT-TOUCH REGULATION

The Commission has acknowledged that light-touch regulation helps to promote investment and innovation, allow competition to drive market solutions and constrain prices, and enable U.S. leadership in next-generation technologies.¹⁶ Congress has reinforced this principle, including through the seminal Telecommunications Act of 1996 (“1996 Act”), which transformed the Communications Act “[t]o promote competition and reduce regulation in order to secure lower prices and higher quality services for American telecommunications consumers and encourage the rapid deployment of new telecommunications technologies.”¹⁷

For decades following adoption of the 1996 Act, the Commission honored this principle by employing a light-touch regulatory framework to broadband internet access service (“BIAS”) under Title I of the Communications Act. The internet flourished under this approach. Only briefly in 2015 did the FCC switch course to regulate BIAS under the common-carrier

¹⁵ The Council of Economic Advisers, *The Economic Effects of Federal Deregulation since January 2017: An Interim Report* (June 2019), <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/The-Economic-Effects-of-Federal-Deregulation-Interim-Report.pdf>.

¹⁶ *See, e.g.*, Modernizing Unbundling and Resale Requirements in an Era of Next-Generation Networks and Services, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, WC Docket No. 19-308, 34 FCC Rcd 11290, 11345 (2019) (Separate Statement of Commissioner Carr) (“The secret to the American success story in telecom has been our commitment to facilities-based competition and light-touch regulation.”).

¹⁷ Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-104, Preamble, 110 Stat. 56.

framework set forth in Title II of the Act—a decision reversed not long thereafter in the 2018 Restoring Internet Freedom (“RIF”) Order under then-Chairman Ajit Pai. More recently, the Sixth Circuit held that the FCC lacked statutory authority for its 2024 attempt under prior leadership to “resurrect[]” the “heavy-handed regulatory regime” of Title II regulation for BIAS.¹⁸ In so doing, the court ensured that the FCC will continue to employ the light-touch regulatory framework that, in the words of now-Chairman Carr, “has allowed the free and open Internet to thrive in this country and our Internet economy to become the envy of the world.”¹⁹

CTIA has repeatedly expressed and demonstrated through empirical evidence that a light-touch regulatory framework is critical for investment, innovation, and competition. As CTIA explained in 2023, “[c]ompetition among BIAS providers—especially for mobile BIAS . . . flourished under the 2018 RIF Order” and its deregulatory approach.²⁰ Indeed, in the period governed by the RIF Order, broadband investment increased year over year—“[t]he nationwide rollout of 5G happened nearly twice as fast as 4G,” and “[t]his investment . . . enabl[ed] new technologies to increase speed, reduce latency, and enhance wireless service qualities, resulting in innovations across industry” and “the dramatic rise of the Internet of Things.”²¹ And once the COVID-19 pandemic hit, posing unprecedented challenges, “[t]he performance of U.S. broadband networks” posed a “stark contrast to Europe . . . where networks could not keep up with demand.”²²

¹⁸ *In re MCP No. 185*, 124 F.4th 993, 997 (6th Cir. 2025).

¹⁹ Press Release, *Carr Warns Against Following Europe’s Lead on Internet Controls* (Oct. 4, 2023), www.fcc.gov/document/carr-warns-against-following-europes-lead-internet-controls.

²⁰ Comments of CTIA, WC Docket No. 23-320, at 93 (filed Dec. 14, 2023).

²¹ *Id.* at 14.

²² *Id.* at 9. Europe has adopted heavy-handed net neutrality legislation. *See* 2015 O.J. (L 310) ISSN 1977-0677.

Settling the decades-long debate over the regulatory treatment of broadband in favor of a market-based approach has positioned the industry for success, but there is still more to do. A thorough analysis of existing regulations with an eye toward deregulation that can reduce inefficiencies, level the playing field between competitors, and stimulate economic growth is needed. This proceeding can facilitate that review and identify additional areas for modernization. And Chairman Carr's priorities, including in areas such as streamlining infrastructure deployment, are key to ensuring this result. CTIA encourages the Commission to take up the mantle of the Administration's deregulatory-focused Executive Orders and carry out Congress's directive in the 1996 Act.

IV. THIS PROCEEDING IS CRITICAL TO ACHIEVING BOTH THE COMMISSION'S STATUTORY MANDATES AND ITS POLICY OBJECTIVES

A robust, competitive marketplace—not regulation—is ultimately the greatest protector of the public interest. Notwithstanding Congress's intention in the 1996 Act to spur competition and innovation, the Commission has at times been slow (or even opposed) to removing legacy regulatory burdens that no longer make sense in light of an evolving and increasingly competitive landscape or that impose different regulatory standards on similarly situated competitors. This inaction hinders progress in the marketplace and raises costs for consumers.

Indeed, there are numerous places in the FCC's rules where outdated, overcomplicated, burdensome, or duplicative regulations are hampering the communications ecosystem without benefitting consumers. Often, these onerous regulations fail to recognize the competitive realities of the marketplace and impose significant costs that impact technological development. There are also areas where Commission rules duplicate the work of other agencies or seek to regulate matters outside of the Commission's core expertise and statutory mandate. In yet other areas, the FCC has imposed unnecessary regulatory burdens by relying on an aggressive or

untenable statutory interpretation, leading to an uncertain and/or unfavorable investment climate for regulated entities. Moreover, certain open proceedings launched under prior FCC administrations offer solutions in search of problems or otherwise look to expand or repeat these mistakes.

To aid the Commission's efforts in conducting this review and addressing these issues, CTIA offers its substantive input in the attached Appendix. The Appendix contains several tables that identify a range of FCC regulations for which modification or deletion would be appropriate, as well as ongoing FCC proceedings that could be closed with no further action and other steps the Commission could take to further its deregulatory agenda. Each entry briefly discusses the bases for deregulatory action, consistent with the policy factors identified in the Public Notice. The tables are grouped into the following umbrella topics:

Promoting Broadband Services. Ensuring all Americans have access to high-speed broadband requires robust private sector investment and deployment, but onerous regulations add costs, uncertainty, and distractions that make extending broadband more difficult. The FCC can continue the important work of unleashing the power of broadband for all Americans by taking a fresh look at regulations imposed on broadband providers and cutting red tape that inhibits broadband services and deployment. These broadband deregulation initiatives could include streamlining the unduly burdensome broadband data collection process, refining the broadband labeling rules, closing the data cap proceeding, and returning the Section 706 report to its statutory purpose.

Supporting Public Safety During Emergencies. CTIA recommends updating or deleting overly granular, repetitious outage reporting requirements that interfere with service restoration while not furthering situational awareness, and focusing stakeholder resources on supporting

effective, efficient, and reliable delivery of critical emergency alerts to consumers. CTIA also encourages the Commission to close certain proceedings that would undermine public safety.

Promoting Wireless Innovation and Efficient Use of Spectrum. The FCC can encourage wireless deployment and innovative and efficient use of radiofrequency spectrum by streamlining its outdated and legally dubious environmental and historic review rules, revising unnecessarily restrictive equipment authorization rules and practices, improving the spectrum leasing process through updates to regulations and to the Universal Licensing System (“ULS”), and revising certain technical regulations that unnecessarily limit spectrum use.

Aligning FCC Security Initiatives with the Federal Government’s Risk-Based, Collaborative Approach. CTIA urges the Commission to take a fresh look at security-related matters. In particular, the Commission should pursue a risk-based, flexible approach to cybersecurity that allows industry to develop innovative solutions that protect consumers from novel threats, and should close proceedings that contravene that principle. The FCC also should ensure that the national security reviews conducted by the Committee for the Assessment of Foreign Participation in the United States Telecommunications Services Sector (“Team Telecom”), and related FCC regulations, are both properly tailored to national security risks posed by a given transaction and subject to procedural standards that give much-needed certainty to FCC-regulated entities and communications industry investors.

Modernizing the Commission’s Approach to Section 222. The Commission should reevaluate its regulations implementing Section 222 of the Communications Act,²³ with an eye toward a light-touch regulatory framework that will make privacy regulation more consistent across different technologies and services, better align FCC resources and priorities to areas

²³ 47 U.S.C. § 222.

within the scope of the agency's statutory authority, and avoid obsolete or unduly burdensome requirements that cannot keep pace with technological development.

Addressing Other Rules and Proposals That Are Unnecessary, Overly Complex, or Exceed FCC Authority. Finally, the FCC should look to other regulatory frameworks and requirements that do not fit into any of the above categories, but nonetheless impose unnecessary burdens, fail to meet stated objectives, or stray from the Commission's statutory mandate. Proposed reforms include deleting or modifying unnecessary recordkeeping and certification requirements, removing ineffective text blocking requirements, creating consistent requirements for *pro forma* transactions, and closing various proceedings that rest on untenable claims of legal authority and propose unnecessary or ineffective new regulations.

The initiatives identified by CTIA will allow the Commission to take numerous deregulatory steps to promote the objectives of the Trump Administration and the agency. CTIA would be pleased to provide additional record support for the modification or elimination of these regulations as the deregulatory process moves forward.

V. CTIA ENCOURAGES THE COMMISSION TO UPDATE ITS SYSTEMS AND DATABASES

In addition to the substantive recommendations included in the Appendix, CTIA encourages the Commission to take the opportunity presented by this proceeding to review and update its systems and databases, particularly the Experimental Licensing System ("ELS") and ULS. The inefficiencies caused by the databases' unintuitive designs, coupled with their frequent inaccessibility due to technical issues, cost Commission staff and businesses many hours of wasted time and resources.

In particular, the ULS database experiences outages and slowness far too often during business hours, making it difficult to file applications and conduct important diligence on

licenses and applications. When the database is online, it is slow to respond to queries and often “times out” during requests. Moreover, the ELS database frequently crashes during the application filing process, locking the applicant out of completing an application. When this occurs, the applicant must contact Office of Engineering and Technology (“OET”) staff to ask them to manually reset the application before the applicant may proceed. And most applications on ELS must be completed in one sitting and cannot be saved. Indeed, if the applicant attempts to exit the application during the filing process, the applicant will be locked out of completing the application; the applicant must then have a member of OET staff manually reset the application. This slows down application processing and diverts time and resources from both FCC staff and outside parties.

VI. CONCLUSION

CTIA hopes this information is helpful to the Commission and looks forward to continuing to work with the agency to unleash innovation through deregulation.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Amy E. Bender

Amy E. Bender
Vice President, Regulatory Affairs

Umair Javed
Senior Vice President and General Counsel

Scott K. Bergmann
Senior Vice President, Regulatory Affairs

CTIA
1400 Sixteenth Street, NW
Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036
202-736-3200
www.ctia.org

April 11, 2025

APPENDIX: Regulations, Policies, and Proceedings Identified by CTIA for Modification or Deletion

Table of Contents

ACTIONS TO PROMOTE BROADBAND SERVICES..... A-2

ACTIONS TO SUPPORT PUBLIC SAFETY DURING EMERGENCIES A-6

ACTIONS TO PROMOTE WIRELESS INNOVATION AND EFFICIENT USE OF SPECTRUM A-8

ACTIONS TO ALIGN FCC SECURITY INITIATIVES WITH RISK-BASED, GOVERNMENT-WIDE APPROACH..... A-13

ACTIONS TO MODERNIZE THE COMMISSION’S APPROACH TO SECTION 222 A-16

ACTIONS TO ADDRESS OTHER RULES AND PROPOSALS THAT ARE UNNECESSARY, OVERLY COMPLEX, OR EXCEED FCC AUTHORITY A-19

APPENDIX: Regulations, Policies, and Proceedings Identified by CTIA for Modification or Deletion

ACTIONS TO PROMOTE BROADBAND SERVICES			
Subject Area	Regulation(s) Proceeding(s)	Proposed Action	Justification
Broadband Data Collection (“BDC”)	Fixed: 39 FCC Rcd 7539, 7555 & n.94 (2024) Mobile: 47 C.F.R. § 1.7006(e)(6), (e)(7)(iii), (f)(6), (f)(7) <i>FCC, Broadband Data Collection: Data Specifications for Provider Infrastructure Data in the Challenge, Verification, and Audit Processes</i> (Feb. 20, 2024), https://us-fcc.box.com/v/bdc-infrastructure-spec .	Delete the fixed restoration process; delete the mobile restoration rule and related process.	The fixed and mobile restoration processes are unduly burdensome, not necessary given the certification and verification protections in the rules, and are not explicitly required by the Broadband DATA Act. The FCC already has adopted a series of checks to confirm the accuracy of each submission. For example, each submission must be certified under penalty of perjury by a corporate officer and engineer. The FCC also has authority to conduct audits and verification requests and can take enforcement action for overstated or otherwise inaccurate data. ¹
	47 C.F.R. § 1.7006(e)(4)(v)	Revise referenced rule to expand circumstances in which a provider may respond to a cognizable challenge using infrastructure data.	The FCC’s regulations governing the challenge process are unnecessarily restrictive. Providers should be able to respond to a challenge using infrastructure data instead of on-the-ground speed tests; they should also be able to use infrastructure data for a hex where there are no roads.

APPENDIX: Regulations, Policies, and Proceedings Identified by CTIA for Modification or Deletion

ACTIONS TO PROMOTE BROADBAND SERVICES			
Subject Area	Regulation(s) Proceeding(s)	Proposed Action	Justification
Broadband Data Collection (Cont'd)	47 C.F.R. § 1.7004(d)	Delete the requirement in the referenced rule to provide a professional engineer (“PE”) certification.	Given the continuing shortage of licensed PEs with expertise in radiofrequency (“RF”) engineering and broadband network design, permanently eliminating the PE certification requirement would provide certainty to providers regarding their certification obligations and avoid the need to continue using piecemeal waivers to address this persistent feature of the broadband industry and RF engineering workforce. The Commission’s proposed alternative certification qualifications, as tested under the prior two PE waiver orders, are sufficient to ensure reliable submissions.
	47 C.F.R. § 1.7006(c)(1)	Modify standards for on the ground test data to better reflect commercially available testing protocols.	The standards in the rule are burdensome and unnecessary, and prevent use of commercially available testing resources that do not collect all of the enumerated metrics (or do not collect them in the way required by the FCC).
	47 C.F.R. § 1.7006(c)(2)	Modify parameters for infrastructure data submitted in response to a verification inquiry.	The parameters for infrastructure data set out in the rule are burdensome and unnecessary. Pursuant to its delegated authority, the Bureau should take action to relax these parameters.
	47 C.F.R. § 1.7006(d), (e)	Modify rule to prohibit challenges in the lead-up to the next filing deadline.	Responding to challenges based on a prior filing’s data when new, updated data will imminently be filed with the FCC is unnecessary and burdensome. Instead, there should be a cut-off date in the lead-up to the next filing deadline where “X” days prior to the BDC filing date, the challenge opportunity for the current public-facing maps is closed. When the public-facing map is updated, challenges are once again open until “X” days prior to the next filing.

APPENDIX: Regulations, Policies, and Proceedings Identified by CTIA for Modification or Deletion

ACTIONS TO PROMOTE BROADBAND SERVICES			
Subject Area	Regulation(s) Proceeding(s)	Proposed Action	Justification
Broadband Data Collection (Cont'd)	47 C.F.R. § 1.7006(e)(4)	Modify referenced rule to preclude the Office of Economics and Analytics (“OEA”) from requesting additional types of data sets.	OEA can currently request additional data (either on-the-ground or infrastructure) in adjudicating a challenge, which can require preparation of entirely different data sets. The agency should instead be able to adjudicate based on the type of data submitted.
Broadband Labels	47 C.F.R. § 8.2	Carve out businesses that are buying standardized (mass-market) off the shelf plans from the rules. That is, limit the rules to consumers only. Consider how the regime can be further streamlined beyond the specific reforms below.	The FCC should ensure that the broadband labeling regime serves its intended purpose and provides value to consumers without imposing undue costs on providers. Appropriately tailoring the range of customers entitled to the labels and looking for additional ways to further streamline the regime will help to avoid unnecessary burdens and give providers the flexibility they need to offer dynamic services in a competitive marketplace.
	47 C.F.R. § 8.2(a)(1)-(7)	Eliminate the point of sale disclosure in (a)(1)-(2) as applied to in-store and telephone sales channels; eliminate the machine-readability requirement in (a)(3); eliminate requirement in subsection (a)(4) to provide the label in multiple languages; revise the label itself so as not to require state/local government fees; modify the rule to allow providers to link to the label during the buy flow rather than display it in its entirety.	While broadband labels may further assist consumers in selecting a provider, the labels cannot, and should not, be viewed as the repository of all the information a consumer may ever need. The FCC's use of the labels for goals beyond informing the purchase decision will undermine their effectiveness. Moreover, “unjustified or unduly burdensome” disclosure requirements cannot survive First Amendment scrutiny. ²

APPENDIX: Regulations, Policies, and Proceedings Identified by CTIA for Modification or Deletion

ACTIONS TO PROMOTE BROADBAND SERVICES			
Subject Area	Regulation(s) Proceeding(s)	Proposed Action	Justification
Broadband Labels FNPRM ³	CG Docket No. 22-2	Close proceeding with no further action on Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (“FNPRM”).	The accessibility guidelines adopted in the Report and Order have worked well for consumers, and there is no need to be more prescriptive in the context of the labels.
Broadband Data Cap Notice of Inquiry (“NOI”) ⁴	WC Docket No. 23-199	Close proceeding.	The NOI sought comment on the regulation of usage-based broadband plans. In light of the Sixth Circuit’s decision on BIAS classification, the FCC lacks authority to adopt such caps—and as a policy matter, such regulation would be a mistake. The broadband industry thrives on competition, not heavy-handed market intervention.
Section 706 Report	GN Docket No. 22-270	Return to narrower and more appropriate conception of data to be included.	The prior FCC expanded the annual report required by Section 1302(b) to encompass “universal service” issues like affordability and adoption and suggested that it needed to collect additional data on those expanded topics in the future. The expansion of the Section 706 report and its data collection requirements was not the best possible reading of the statute; further, it imposed costs on private parties that are not outweighed by the benefits.

APPENDIX: Regulations, Policies, and Proceedings Identified by CTIA for Modification or Deletion

ACTIONS TO SUPPORT PUBLIC SAFETY DURING EMERGENCIES			
Subject Area	Regulation(s) Proceeding(s)	Proposed Action	Justification
Outage Reporting	47 C.F.R. § 4.5(e)-(f)	Increase the outage reporting thresholds from the current 900,000 user minutes thresholds to at least 1,800,000 user minutes, and categorically exempt non-service-affecting events, such as those affecting a de minimis number of cell sites.	Outage reporting thresholds have not kept pace with wireless industry changes, such as the densification of cell sites that provides overlapping site coverage and redundancy. The current thresholds inundate service providers and local governments with paperwork burdens even for non-service-affecting outage events. The existing thresholds, which significantly and unjustifiably impede disaster response and impose costs on private parties that are not outweighed by the benefits, should be revised to reflect market realities.
National Emergency Address Database (“NEAD”)	47 C.F.R. §§ 9.10(i)(1)(iii); 9.10(i)(4)(ii); 9.10(i)(4)(iii)	Delete the rules related to the NEAD.	The NEAD faced certain challenges and ultimately ceased operation with the NEAD’s vendor certifying destruction of the database, consistent with National Institute of Standards and Technology guidelines for media sanitization. The FCC’s NEAD-related rules are no longer needed and should be deleted.
Wireless Emergency Alerts (“WEA”)	47 C.F.R. §§ 10.480, 10.500(e), 10.210(c)	Eliminate new multilingual alerts requirements in sections 10.480 and 10.500(e) in favor of promoting use of embedded links; delete WEA database rule in section 10.210(c) that duplicates other available data.	WEA stakeholders (including participating providers and device manufacturers) must focus resources supporting effective, efficient, and reliable delivery of critical emergency alerts to consumers. Complex enhancements that are poorly understood by Alert Originators and the public undermine confidence in and use of this life-saving tool. CTIA has recommended that the Commission address multilingual alerting by promoting the use of embedded links in WEAs. Additionally, the WEA database rule imposes an unnecessary filing requirement. In addition to coverage data already available from the FCC’s broadband maps, alert originators can find information about coverage and WEA-capable device information on participating providers’ websites.

APPENDIX: Regulations, Policies, and Proceedings Identified by CTIA for Modification or Deletion

ACTIONS TO SUPPORT PUBLIC SAFETY DURING EMERGENCIES			
Subject Area	Regulation(s) Proceeding(s)	Proposed Action	Justification
Alerting Paradigm NPRM ⁵	PS Docket Nos. 15-94, 15-91	Close proceeding with no further action on Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (“NPRM”).	The proposed automated performance requirements for WEAs would necessitate costly changes to network architectures, system software, mobile devices, Alert Originator systems, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (“FEMA”) gateway, and other components of the current system. Several proposals for performance reporting also rely on the use of a device’s location, raising significant privacy issues that could lead consumers to opt-out of receiving alerts. This implicates the Communications Act’s requirements to safeguard subscriber data and would undermine the effectiveness of the WEA system.
Expanded NORS/DIRS Reporting FNPRM ⁶	PS Docket Nos. 21-346, 15-80, and 04-35	Close proceeding with no further action on FNPRM.	The Commission’s existing reporting regime already provides situational awareness for mobile BIAS outages; reporting on the availability and location of mobile recovery assets in the Disaster Information Reporting System (“DIRS”) would not further situational awareness.

APPENDIX: Regulations, Policies, and Proceedings Identified by CTIA for Modification or Deletion

ACTIONS TO PROMOTE WIRELESS INNOVATION AND EFFICIENT USE OF SPECTRUM			
Subject Area	Regulation(s) Proceeding(s)	Proposed Action	Justification
Environmental and Historic Preservation	47 C.F.R. §§ 1.1301-1.1320	Modify the referenced rules in favor of a modern, streamlined regime.	Streamlined, commonsense environmental review procedures are critical to broadband deployment. FCC rules implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) must be revisited in light of changes to NEPA, the President's direction, and court decisions. As explained in CTIA’s recent Petition for Rulemaking, ⁷ the FCC's current NEPA rules are burdensome and obsolete, particularly with regard to geographic licensing, and the Commission should start a proceeding to revise these rules and update its review procedures. For similar reasons, and to maintain consistency, the FCC should update its National Historic Preservation Act (“NHPA”) rules.
Competitive Bidding	47 C.F.R. § 1.2105(c)	Delete the referenced rule.	Antitrust rules already punish collusion and bid-rigging punishable with treble damage, civil penalties, and jail time. The Commission’s rule prohibiting certain communications during the auction process is redundant and unnecessary. The rules also appear to impose a strict liability standard.
Equipment Authorization	47 C.F.R. § 2.906	Modify the referenced rule in favor of a streamlined process.	The FCC can streamline its equipment authorization process by expanding its Supplier’s Declaration of Conformity (“SDoC”) procedure to all of Part 15. Because the SDoC procedure requires a responsible party located in the U.S., this change would allow Part 15 equipment to bypass the equipment authorization process while still affording the FCC access to the necessary data to prove compliance with the rules.

APPENDIX: Regulations, Policies, and Proceedings Identified by CTIA for Modification or Deletion

ACTIONS TO PROMOTE WIRELESS INNOVATION AND EFFICIENT USE OF SPECTRUM			
Subject Area	Regulation(s) Proceeding(s)	Proposed Action	Justification
Equipment Authorization (Cont'd)	47 C.F.R. § 2.964; OET Knowledge Database (“KDB”) Publication No. 388624	Modify the referenced rule and OET guidance in favor of a streamlined process.	The FCC has extensive experience with regulating device compliance with the FCC rules through the certification program and use of telecommunication certification bodies (“TCBs”) to perform much of the work of the Commission. The Commission can streamline its operations and rely on TCBs by requiring OET to remove from the Pre-Approval Guidance (“PAG”) list any items that have been on the list for more than two years and provide a report documenting how long items have been on the PAG list for specific technologies with recommendations for additional PAG items that could be removed from the list in favor of TCB review.
	47 C.F.R. § 2.1204(a)(11)	Modify the referenced rule by easing restrictions to reflect market realities.	The pre-market activities in Section 2.1204 are limited to a small number of devices and do not reflect market realities when it comes to importation and pre-positioning of devices, e.g. to distribution centers and retail partners; while the FCC should continue to ensure all devices sold are certified, the limits on pre-marketing activities are too stringent to be useful.
	47 C.F.R. § 2.1204(b)	Delete the referenced rule.	Requiring the “ultimate consignee” to maintain records relating to importation is impractical, because the importer is responsible for and ultimately controls retention of records related to importation; the rule effectively makes the consignee the guarantor of conduct over which it has no visibility or control.
	47 C.F.R. § 15.19(a)(3)	Modify the referenced rule.	The FCC can reduce the burden of the equipment authorization process by modifying the rule to allow the use of digital labels to meet this requirement. Devices that are subject to certification have an FCC ID, while devices subject to the SDoC have to meet the obligations under 15.105. Modifying this rule would add flexibility and help to streamline this process.

APPENDIX: Regulations, Policies, and Proceedings Identified by CTIA for Modification or Deletion

ACTIONS TO PROMOTE WIRELESS INNOVATION AND EFFICIENT USE OF SPECTRUM			
Subject Area	Regulation(s) Proceeding(s)	Proposed Action	Justification
Equipment Authorization (Cont'd)	47 C.F.R. § 15.19(a)(5)	Modify the referenced rule.	The FCC should enhance its processes by adopting an option to utilize digital labeling, such as providing on or within the packaging a QR code that would lead to a website containing an electronic version of the label. This change would offer maximum flexibility while still providing a consumer the necessary information.
	47 C.F.R. § 15.105(b)	Modify the referenced rule.	The installation and repositioning instructions in the rule are no longer relevant and should be struck from the rules.
	OET KDB Publication No. 388624	Streamline the PAG list and better utilize the TCBs.	OET should modify the PAG list by removing PWRCNG, ANTTUN, and OVER6G as all three items have considerable experience that are more than two years old.
	OET KDB	Clarify OET's KDB guidance.	OET should state expressly that lowering power without any corresponding changes to software or hardware always falls within Section 2.1043 because it does not "degrade" the reported characteristics and therefore is always a Class I permissive change.
	OET KDB	Clarify OET's KDB guidance.	OET should delegate review authority for data referencing to the TCBs.
	OET KDB Publication No. 484596	Clarify OET's KDB guidance.	OET should clarify that data referencing for similar models is permitted under the rules pursuant to KDB 484596. Any change to this process would result in redundant data capture, undermining the reductions in cost and increases in efficiency that have been enabled by data referencing.

APPENDIX: Regulations, Policies, and Proceedings Identified by CTIA for Modification or Deletion

ACTIONS TO PROMOTE WIRELESS INNOVATION AND EFFICIENT USE OF SPECTRUM			
Subject Area	Regulation(s) Proceeding(s)	Proposed Action	Justification
Spectrum Licensing and Leasing	47 C.F.R. § 1.9020(c)	Modify rule to enable lessees in a spectrum manager leasing arrangement to make administrative updates to the lease in ULS.	Administrative updates to spectrum manager leases, such as changes to the lessee’s ownership or contact information, do not impact the lease itself, and the licensee maintains de facto control of the license under this type of leasing arrangement. There is no requirement in the rules today that the licensee make these updates for the lessee.
	47 C.F.R. § 1.9020(e)(2)	The Wireless Telecommunications Bureau (“Bureau”) should no longer require licensees to include coordinates of areas leased to Contraband Interdiction Systems (“CIS”) providers in the text of attachments to new lease applications.	The Bureau requires licensees to provide the geographic coordinates of the unserved areas for leases covering prison locations in a text attachment to the lease application, in addition to directly entering the coordinates into the Form 608. In non-CIS leases, staff will act upon lease applications where the leased area is shown in the public interest statement only in a map with the coordinates uploaded to the Form 608 directly. Allowing CIS leases to follow this pattern would save the Bureau significant time, which would enable CIS providers to more quickly deploy their systems and help prevent contraband phones from operating.
	47 C.F.R. §§ 1.948(j)(1)(iv), 1.9030(e)(1)(iv)	Modify rules to identify specific, enforceable criteria dictating which applications are subject to additional processing and which must be resolved within 21 days.	Currently, the process for spectrum licensing and leasing can be very slow and burdensome as it is solely at the discretion of the FCC and subject to ULS-related delays. The FCC can streamline licensing and de facto leasing by modifying the rule to articulate specific, enforceable criteria for determining which applications are subject to additional processing and which must be resolved within 21 days. If an application is subject to additional processing, staff should be required to inform the applicant of any deficiencies in the application.

APPENDIX: Regulations, Policies, and Proceedings Identified by CTIA for Modification or Deletion

ACTIONS TO PROMOTE WIRELESS INNOVATION AND EFFICIENT USE OF SPECTRUM			
Subject Area	Regulation(s) Proceeding(s)	Proposed Action	Justification
Spectrum Licensing and Leasing (Cont'd)	47 C.F.R. §§ 1.948(j)(1)(v), 1.9030(e)(1)(v)	Modify rules to identify specific, enforceable criteria that would cause delays in application processing.	Currently, the process for licensing and leasing can be very slow and burdensome as it is solely at the discretion of the FCC and subject to ULS-related delays. The Commission should streamline licensing and de facto leasing process by creating a process to inform applicants of additional review that would delay application processing beyond 90 days, and by creating a 180-day shot clock for processing applications.
	47 C.F.R. § 1.950; 37 FCC Rcd 8825 (2022)	ULS should be updated to allow carriers to file reaggregation applications.	The <i>Enhanced Competition Incentive Program Order</i> found that allowing reaggregation would ease administrative burden on both licensees and Commission staff, yet implementing changes have still not been made to ULS. ULS should be modified to effect this improvement for both licensees and Commission benefit.
	47 C.F.R. § 22.925	Delete referenced rule.	This rule prohibiting airborne use of cell phones is an outdated rule that only applies to the cellular band (other bands have aeronautical restrictions, but that is different in kind). Mobile operators have proven they are more than capable of limiting harmful interference from airborne devices through technical capabilities.
	Mobile Rule Parts (22, 24, 27, etc.; e.g., 47 C.F.R. §§ 22.983, 24.236, 27.55)	Revise regulations to specify border power limits in terms of power flux-density rather than field strength.	The rules should be modernized to reflect the way mobile operations are deployed; specifying border field strength limits in dBµV/m penalizes wideband signals.
Spectrum for UAS Operations	WT Docket No. 22-323	Consider which technical regulations could enable new technologies and use cases.	In addition to deleting Section 22.925 as discussed above, the FCC should examine where it has bans on aeronautical use in certain bands or other restrictions that might not be appropriate for drones/other new entrants in the uncrewed aircraft/advanced air mobility space given the very different characteristics from traditional aviation operations.

APPENDIX: Regulations, Policies, and Proceedings Identified by CTIA for Modification or Deletion

ACTIONS TO ALIGN FCC SECURITY INITIATIVES WITH RISK-BASED, GOVERNMENT-WIDE APPROACH			
Subject Area	Regulation(s) Proceeding(s)	Proposed Action	Justification
CALEA Declaratory Ruling ⁸	PS Docket No. 22-329	Rescind Declaratory Ruling.	The Declaratory Ruling adopts an “uncoordinated[] and counterproductive” ⁹ policy based on an expansive reading of the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (“CALEA”) that imposes onerous network-wide duties on covered entities. This interpretation is wholly inconsistent with CALEA’s text, structure, and purpose. The absence of any opportunity for public comment on this extraordinary departure alone warrants reconsideration. The FCC has not only exceeded its authority—it has produced unreasoned and unsupported conclusions that cannot survive arbitrary and capricious review under the Administrative Procedure Act.
Network Security NPRM ¹⁰	PS Docket No. 22-329	Close proceeding.	Building on the Declaratory Ruling that adopts an “uncoordinated[] and counterproductive” ¹¹ policy based on an expansive reading of CALEA, this proceeding seeks to add additional onerous network-wide duties on covered entities. Because the Declaratory Ruling is inconsistent with the Communications Act, the proceeding that the Commission launched to adopt additional rules based on this erroneous interpretation of the law should be terminated. Moreover, imposing such requirements would overlap with and duplicate the roles of other agencies, such as the Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) (which serves as the Sector Risk Management Agency for the Communications Sector) through proposed adoption of DHS’ Cybersecurity Performance Goals in a regulatory context.
Alerting Security NPRM ¹²	PS Docket Nos. 15-94, 15-91, 22-329	Close proceeding.	The NPRM proposed several cybersecurity, reporting, and authentication requirements for WEAs. No further action is needed on these onerous proposed mandates because participating mobile providers already have comprehensive cyber risk management plans that achieve the purposes of WEA with comparatively less administrative and other burdens. Moreover, separate WEA incident reporting would add to the patchwork of existing requirements that the federal government is actively seeking to harmonize, including cyber incident reporting requirements from <i>(cont’d on next page)</i>

APPENDIX: Regulations, Policies, and Proceedings Identified by CTIA for Modification or Deletion

ACTIONS TO ALIGN FCC SECURITY INITIATIVES WITH RISK-BASED, GOVERNMENT-WIDE APPROACH			
Subject Area	Regulation(s) Proceeding(s)	Proposed Action	Justification
Alerting Security NPRM			DHS through the Cyber Incident Reporting for Critical Infrastructure Act of 2022 (“CIRCA”), the Securities and Exchange Commission’s (“SEC”) cybersecurity incident and governance disclosure requirements, and the Federal Trade Commission (“FTC”)’s Safeguards Rule breach notification requirement—and thus represents an example of the FCC duplicating or undermining other regulatory authorities. And developing new cryptographic standards to enable authentication capabilities would require investment of time and resources well beyond what is currently contemplated in the NPRM. The benefits of authentication would also be significantly outweighed by the negative effects on the timely and reliable delivery of WEAs.
BGP NPRM ¹³	PS Docket Nos. 24-146, 22-90	Close proceeding.	The Commission should not adopt Border Gateway Protocol (“BGP”) mandates on internet service providers because they would exceed FCC authority, and would be ineffectual because they would not extend to all relevant stakeholders.
Team Telecom Referral Process	47 C.F.R. § 1.40001(a)(2)	Modify rule to limit FCC referrals of excepted transactions.	The FCC has established categories of transactions not subject to automatic referral to Team Telecom, including those where the buyer is subject to an existing mitigation agreement, was subject to recent review, and has not had changes to its foreign ownership. However, the FCC allows Team Telecom to request referral, which it does routinely for substantive transactions, making the purpose of the carveout moot. The FCC should not grant referral requests if a transaction falls within this exception.
Team Telecom Review Process	47 C.F.R. § 1.40001-1.40004, Executive Order 13913	Work with Administration to improve Team Telecom transaction review procedures.	The Team Telecom review process that applies to certain transactions involving foreign ownership is burdensome and unpredictable; it is also frequently not clearly tied to addressing national security, law enforcement, foreign policy, or trade policy issues stemming from a merger application. The Standard Triage Questions and review process seek information on risks beyond those associated with foreign ownership or arising from the transaction itself and are not focused on countries or <i>(cont’d on next page)</i>

APPENDIX: Regulations, Policies, and Proceedings Identified by CTIA for Modification or Deletion

ACTIONS TO ALIGN FCC SECURITY INITIATIVES WITH RISK-BASED, GOVERNMENT-WIDE APPROACH			
Subject Area	Regulation(s) Proceeding(s)	Proposed Action	Justification
Team Telecom Review Process (cont'd)			<p>actors of specific concern. The timeline for Team Telecom reviews can also be unpredictable. The 120-day initial review period does not begin until Team Telecom determines that the applicant’s response to all questions is complete. However, there is no required timeline for Team Telecom to send the required questions or clear standards for what a “complete” response entails. Finally, Team Telecom imposes merger conditions and/or requires mitigation agreements that can be extremely burdensome for applicants and are not narrowly tailored to the potential impacts of a transaction. As President Trump’s <i>America First Investment Policy</i> Presidential Memorandum recognized, “mitigation agreements should consist of concrete actions that companies can complete within a specific time, rather than perpetual and expensive compliance obligations.”¹⁴</p> <p>The FCC is at the center of this process, as the entity authorizing license transfers and determining whether to condition those transactions as recommended by the Committee. The FCC should work with President Trump to develop a new Executive Order that refines Team Telecom’s procedures and helps to ensure the Committee stays within its mandate and operates on timelines that can provide much-needed certainty to companies and investors that do business in America. Through transaction orders, policy statements, and regulatory reform, the FCC should ensure that it has policies in place to maintain these guardrails. These new policies should ensure that Triage questions and review processes are clearly tied to addressing national security, law enforcement, foreign policy, or trade policy issues stemming from a merger application, are narrowly tailored to countries of specific concern and potential impacts of a transaction, and are completed within a firm, ascertainable time period.</p>

APPENDIX: Regulations, Policies, and Proceedings Identified by CTIA for Modification or Deletion

ACTIONS TO MODERNIZE THE COMMISSION’S APPROACH TO SECTION 222			
Subject Area	Regulation(s) Proceeding(s)	Proposed Action	Justification
CPNI	47 C.F.R. §§ 64.2001-64.2011 and 64.5101-64.5111	Conduct a full review of the referenced rules and modify the regime to modernize and streamline obligations on providers	<p>The Commission’s current customer proprietary network information (“CPNI”) obligations on telecommunications carriers and telecommunications relay service (“TRS”) providers are outdated and overly burdensome. Accordingly, CTIA encourages the Commission to conduct a broad review of the rules implemented under Section 222 to identify opportunities to streamline and modernize the rules, many of which date back to the late 1990s before the prevalence of converged wireless networks. These rules consist of antiquated requirements related to carrier marketing practices and customer approval to use CPNI (Sections 64.2005, 64.2007, 64.5105, and 64.5107), confusing and obsolete notices for using CPNI for customary activities integral to providing service (Section 64.2008 and 64.5108), prescriptive rules governing employee training for the use of CPNI and tracking and recordkeeping requirements (64.2009(a)-(d) and 64.5109(a)-(d)), burdensome certifications (Section 64.2009(e) and 64.5109(e)), and outdated authentication and account notification requirements that should be updated to enable providers to keep pace with evolving technologies and security best practices (Section 64.2010(b)-(f) and 64.5110(b)-(f)).</p> <p>CPNI is not more sensitive than the data that others in the Internet ecosystem have access to by virtue of their customer relationships, and yet the wireless industry is subject to an outdated and burdensome regulatory regime that impedes necessary business activities in a highly competitive marketplace. Moving to a light-touch regulatory framework for Section 222 similar to that imposed on other types of communications providers will better align with the statute, allow competition and industry collaboration to guide best practices, and benefit customers by cutting down on obsolete CPNI notices that do not safeguard their accounts.</p>

APPENDIX: Regulations, Policies, and Proceedings Identified by CTIA for Modification or Deletion

ACTIONS TO MODERNIZE THE COMMISSION’S APPROACH TO SECTION 222			
Subject Area	Regulation(s) Proceeding(s)	Proposed Action	Justification
Data Breach Notification	47 C.F.R. §§ 64.2011, 64.5111	Delete the referenced regulations.	<p>Consistent with CTIA’s position that the Commission should revisit its regulations based on Section 222 to better align with the statute, the Commission should delete the recently adopted data breach notification rules.</p> <p>The breach notification requirements in sections 64.2011(a), (d) and 64.5111(a), (d) are overly burdensome and lack any public benefit given the absence of a harm-based trigger for reporting. The reporting requirements in 64.2011(b) and 64.5111(b) fail to afford providers sufficient flexibility to ensure that they are able to assess a potential incident before alerting customers. The recordkeeping requirements in 64.2011(c) and 64.5111(c) impose significant costs without any corresponding benefit. And the regulation of breaches involving PII in sections 64.2011(e)(2) and 64.5111(e)(2) does not reflect the single, best reading of the statute, and is voided by the Congressional Review Act. Moreover, the rule is both obsolete and ineffective, as it conflicts with existing federal and state breach reporting regimes—including cyber incident reporting requirements from DHS’ CIRCIA rule, SEC cybersecurity incident and governance disclosure requirements, and the FTC Safeguards Rule breach notification requirement—and thus represents an example of the FCC duplicating or undermining other regulatory authorities.</p>
SIM Swap/Port Out Rules	47 C.F.R. §§ 52.37, 64.2010(h)	Delete the referenced regulations.	<p>Consistent with CTIA’s position that the Commission should revisit its rules based on Section 222 to better align with the statute, the Commission should delete the recently adopted SIM Swap/Port-Out rules.</p> <p>The <i>SIM SWAP/ Port-Out Report and Order</i> adopted burdensome regulatory requirements without conducting an adequate cost-benefit analysis. Providers have faced immense operational and technical difficulties working to implement the rules. As the Commission has</p> <p align="right"><i>(cont’d on next page)</i></p>

APPENDIX: Regulations, Policies, and Proceedings Identified by CTIA for Modification or Deletion

ACTIONS TO MODERNIZE THE COMMISSION'S APPROACH TO SECTION 222			
Subject Area	Regulation(s) Proceeding(s)	Proposed Action	Justification
SIM Swap/Port Out Rules (cont'd)			<p>recognized, the vast majority of SIM swap and port-out requests are legitimate prior to the adoption of these rules. While the Order attempted a flexible approach to some aspects of the rules, the overall rule-imposed requirements necessitating costly and complex compliance efforts that do not outweigh any potential benefits.</p> <p>In particular, the authentication requirement in section 64.2010(h)(1), the notification requirements in sections 52.37(c) and 64.2010(h)(3), and the recordkeeping requirement in section 64.2010(h)(8) are especially burdensome for the host of reasons outlined in CTIA's many comments in this proceeding. Thus, the Commission should consider eliminating these rules and as it evaluates how best to address any remaining fraud of this nature, it should look to ways that the broader mobile and Internet ecosystem can work together.</p>
SIM Swap/Port-Out Fraud FNPRM ¹⁵	WC Docket No. 21-341	Close proceeding.	<p>Consistent with CTIA's position that the Commission should revisit its rules based on Section 222 to better align with the statute, the Commission should not move ahead with the proposals set forth in this FNPRM.</p> <p>The FNPRM proposes to add more requirements onto the SIM Swap and Port-Out Fraud Rules, which as discussed above should be withdrawn because they are burdensome and exceed agency authority. These proposals include more prescriptive requirements for responding to failed authentication attempts, rules that rewrite or undermine reasonable arbitration clauses in provider agreements pertaining to SIM swaps and port-outs (which violate the Federal Arbitration Act), and rules that seek to regulate customer personal information in addition to CPNI (which go beyond FCC authority under Section 222 and the Congressional Review Act). The Commission should take a fresh look at Section 222 and move to a light-touch regulatory framework to better align with the statute and allow competition and industry collaboration to guide best practices.</p>

APPENDIX: Regulations, Policies, and Proceedings Identified by CTIA for Modification or Deletion

ACTIONS TO ADDRESS OTHER RULES AND PROPOSALS THAT ARE UNNECESSARY, OVERLY COMPLEX, OR EXCEED FCC AUTHORITY			
Subject Area	Regulation(s) Proceeding(s)	Proposed Action	Justification
Access to Advanced Communications Services	47 C.F.R. § 14.31(a)	Modify rule to require providers to keep records “until a service ceases to be offered.”	The two-year retention period imposes costs on private parties that outweigh any potential benefits. Keeping the required records during the period the service is actually offered is sufficient to satisfy the statute and meet its policy objectives.
Hearing Aid Compatibility	47 C.F.R. § 20.19(b)(3)(iii)	Delete the referenced rule.	This proceeding offers the Commission an opportunity to review the new Hearing Aid Compatibility (“HAC”) regime as a whole, including the proposals herein, in order to streamline burdens on parties subject to the rules, consistent with the Executive Orders and the intent of this proceeding, while still ensuring consumers have access to the relevant information. Currently, the FCC requires manufacturers seeking to certify a device as hearing-aid compatible to include a statement indicating compliance with the test requirements in Section 20.19 per Section 2.1033(d). The Commission also requires that all equipment certification applications include a certification of truthfulness that applies to the whole equipment application and all statements and exhibits that make up the application, including statements related to HAC. A separate and additional declaration that imposes a new sworn declaration requirement solely on the Bluetooth aspects of handsets is redundant and serves no practical utility.
	47 C.F.R. § 20.19(f)(3)(ii)	Modify the referenced rule to allow flexibility in compliance with requirement for digital labels.	A printed website address on or in product packaging will have very limited practical utility for the consumer. Providing the flexibility of printing either a QR code or a website address avoids the redundancy of having both. As the FCC considers expansion of digital labeling, it should allow for a general regulatory landing page where consumers could then navigate to the relevant information.

APPENDIX: Regulations, Policies, and Proceedings Identified by CTIA for Modification or Deletion

ACTIONS TO ADDRESS OTHER RULES AND PROPOSALS THAT ARE UNNECESSARY, OVERLY COMPLEX, OR EXCEED FCC AUTHORITY			
Subject Area	Regulation(s) Proceeding(s)	Proposed Action	Justification
Hearing Aid Compatibility (Cont'd)	47 C.F.R. § 20.19(f)(2)	Modify the referenced rule to limit the amount of technical information on the label.	It is not realistic to assume that consumers will be able to interpret the meaning of the highly technical information on the label. A better and less confusing course would be to simply label a phone as HAC on the box and rely on the manufacturer and service provider HAC webpages to provide detailed technical information for the limited number of consumers that may require or may be interested in such information.
	47 C.F.R. § 20.19(h)(2)	Modify the rule so that manufacturers and service providers are only required to offer a text-based option (such as email address, text number, or chat function), a mailing address, and a toll free number.	Service providers and manufacturers already provide multiple modes of communication to customer service and technical support. There is no need for the FCC to specify that members must have an email address, a mailing address, a text number, and a toll-free (voice) number for customer support.
	47 C.F.R. § 20.19(i)(4)-(5)	Delete the referenced rules.	The new annual certifications would add to FCC Form 855 separate and redundant information collections, affirmations, and certifications. The information required to be publicly provided on HAC webpages as well as included in the FCC's Equipment Authorization System covers all of the information required by the additional certifications.
Text Message Blocking	47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(p), (r), (s)	Delete the referenced rules.	Given the prevalence of over-the-top ("OTT") messaging, these MMS/SMS-specific requirements to block text messages under certain conditions do little to reduce spam text messages while imposing significant burdens on covered wireless providers. Market solutions and industry-led collaboration, such as CTIA's Secure Messaging Initiative, are more effective to address spam text messaging.

APPENDIX: Regulations, Policies, and Proceedings Identified by CTIA for Modification or Deletion

ACTIONS TO ADDRESS OTHER RULES AND PROPOSALS THAT ARE UNNECESSARY, OVERLY COMPLEX, OR EXCEED FCC AUTHORITY			
Subject Area	Regulation(s) Proceeding(s)	Proposed Action	Justification
TCPA Wireless Provider Framework FNPRM ¹⁶	CG Docket No. 02-278	Close proceeding with no further action on FNPRM.	The FNPRM proposes amending the FCC’s longstanding recognition of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”) framework as excluding calls and texts from wireless providers to their subscribers. Limiting the framework would be contrary to Congress’ legislative design for the TCPA, would risk harming consumers, and is unsupported by the record.
SCA FNPRM ¹⁷	WC Docket No. 22-238	Close proceeding.	The FNPRM seeks input on whether Safe Connections Act (“SCA”) rules should be modified to address stalking and similar concerns related to connected cars. Wireless providers’ role in the consumer-facing aspects of connected car services is limited. Stretching the SCA to apply to these scenarios would be burdensome and raise legal authority questions.
Customer Service NOI ¹⁸	CG Docket No. 24-472	Close proceeding.	This NOI seeks comment on whether FCC “should consider a single set of customer service requirements across the different communications sectors,” but additional customer service mandates are unnecessary for wireless providers. Moreover, the FCC lacks the broad authority suggested in the NOI to adopt uniform customer service mandates.
Pre-Closing Application Process for <i>Pro Forma</i> Transactions	WT Docket No. 20-186	Streamline the patchwork of <i>pro forma</i> transfer of control application requirements that require FCC licensees to make many different filings for various license types among bureaus with differing requirements, <i>(Cont’d on next page)</i>	The FCC should streamline and make consistent the filing requirements for all types of <i>pro forma</i> license transactions, for example, by: (i) requiring only post-closing notifications for all pro forma transfers/assignments in all services, or, for services not eligible for post-closing notifications, adopt a rule providing that those <i>pro forma</i> applications are automatically granted upon filing or granted via immediate/overnight approval procedures; (ii) ruling that certain non-substantial changes in ownership do not constitute a reportable transfer of control (e.g., changes in <i>(Cont’d on next page)</i>

APPENDIX: Regulations, Policies, and Proceedings Identified by CTIA for Modification or Deletion

ACTIONS TO ADDRESS OTHER RULES AND PROPOSALS THAT ARE UNNECESSARY, OVERLY COMPLEX, OR EXCEED FCC AUTHORITY			
Subject Area	Regulation(s) Proceeding(s)	Proposed Action	Justification
<i>Pro Forma</i> Transactions (cont'd)		procedures, and deadlines, creating confusion and increasing the risk of inadvertent non-compliance.	intermediate holding companies that do not change the licensee's identity or its ultimate controlling ownership); and (iii) ruling that a licensee planning to change its organizational structure (e.g., from corporation to LLC) is not required to submit a filing for a <i>pro forma</i> change in control.
Enforcement	47 C.F.R. § 1.80, non-codified policies and procedures	Reform the FCC's enforcement rules and procedures to comply with due process principles of fair notice, consistency, and government accountability.	The Supreme Court's decision in <i>SEC v. Jarkesy</i> renders the Commission's current enforcement process for imposing civil monetary penalties unconstitutional. In recent years, the Commission's approach to enforcement has been inconsistent with due process, not afforded adequate protections, and lacked consistency.

Endnotes

¹ See, e.g., 47 U.S.C. § 642(b)(4) (corporate officer certification); 47 C.F.R. § 1.7004(d) (corporate officer and qualified engineer certifications); 47 C.F.R. § 1.7006 (describing data verification measures); FCC, *Broadband Data Collection: BDC System User Guide*, at 145 (Mar. 13, 2025), <https://us-fcc.app.box.com/v/bdc-filer-user-guide> (providing certification language, which notes that false statements can be punished by fine or imprisonment under 47 U.S.C. § 220(e)).

² See *Zauderer v. Office of Disciplinary Counsel of Supreme Court*, 471 U.S. 626, 651 (1985); *Nat'l Inst. of Fam. & Life Advocs. v. Becerra*, 138 S. Ct. 2361, 2372 (2018).

³ *Empowering Broadband Consumers Through Transparency*, CG Docket No. 22-2, Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 37 FCC Rcd 13686 (2022).

⁴ *Data Caps in Consumer Broadband Plans*, WC Docket No. 23-199, Notice of Inquiry, FCC 24-106 (2024).

⁵ *Amendment of Part 11 of the FCC's Rules Regarding EAS; Wireless Emergency Alerts*, PS Docket Nos. 15-94 & 15-91 (2025).

APPENDIX: Regulations, Policies, and Proceedings Identified by CTIA for Modification or Deletion

- ⁶ *Resilient Networks; Amendments to Part 4 of the FCC Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications; New Part 4 of the FCC's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications*, PS Docket Nos. 21-346 & 15-80, ET Docket No. 04-35, Second Report and Order and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 39 FCC Rcd 623 (2024).
- ⁷ Petition for Rulemaking of CTIA, RM-12003 (filed Mar. 27, 2025).
- ⁸ *Protecting the Nation's Communications Systems from Cybersecurity Threats*, PS Docket No. 22-329, Declaratory Ruling and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 25-9 (2025).
- ⁹ Press Release, *Carr Statement on the Biden FCC's Partisan, Counterproductive, and Eleventh-Hour Approach to Salt Typhoon* (Jan. 15, 2025), <https://x.com/BrendanCarrFCC/status/1879674875973165368> (“Carr DR Press Release”).
- ¹⁰ *Protecting the Nation's Communications Systems from Cybersecurity Threats*, PS Docket No. 22-329, Declaratory Ruling and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 25-9 (2025).
- ¹¹ Carr DR Press Release.
- ¹² *Amendment of Part 11 of the FCC's Rules Regarding Emergency Alert System; Wireless Emergency Alerts; Protecting the Nation's Communications Systems from Cybersecurity Threats*, PS Docket Nos. 15-94, 15-91, & 22-329, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 37 FCC Rcd 12932 (2022).
- ¹³ *Reporting on Border Gateway Protocol Risk Mitigation Process; Secure Internet Routing*, PS Docket Nos. 24-146 & 22-90, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 39 FCC Rcd 6101 (2024).
- ¹⁴ *America First Investment Policy*, The White House (Feb. 21, 2025), <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/02/america-first-investment-policy/>.
- ¹⁵ *Protecting Consumers from SIM Swap and Port-Out Fraud*, WC Docket No. 21-341, Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 38 FCC Rcd 11182 (2023).
- ¹⁶ *Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991*, CG Docket No. 02-278, Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 39 FCC Rcd 1988 (2024).
- ¹⁷ *Supporting Survivors of Domestic and Sexual Violence*, WC Docket No. 22-238, Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 39 FCC Rcd 3817 (2024).
- ¹⁸ *Strengthening Customer Service in the Communications Industry*, CG Docket No. 24-472, Notice of Inquiry, FCC 24-110 (2024).