

(a) Except as provided in paragraphs (d) and (e) of this section, in connection with any price cap tariff filing proposing rate changes, the price cap local exchange carrier must calculate an API for each affected basket pursuant to the following methodology:

\* \* \* \* \*

18. Section 61.47 is amended by revising paragraphs (f), (i)(2), and (i)(5) to read as follows:

**§ 61.47 Adjustments to the SBI; pricing bands.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(f) A price cap local exchange carrier may establish density zones pursuant to the requirements set forth in §69.123 of this chapter, for any service in the trunking and special access baskets, other than the interconnection charge set forth in §69.124 of this chapter. The pricing flexibility of each zone shall be limited to an annual increase of 15 percent, relative to the percentage change in the PCI for that basket, measured from the levels in effect on the last day of the preceding tariff year. There shall be no lower pricing band for any density zone.

\* \* \* \* \*

(i)(1) \* \* \*

(2) Effective January 1, 1998, notwithstanding the requirements of paragraph (a) of this section, if a price cap local exchange carrier is recovering interconnection charge revenues through per-minute rates pursuant to §69.155 of this chapter, any reductions to the PCI for the basket designated in §61.42(d)(3) resulting from the application of the provisions of §61.45(b)(1)(i) and from the application of the provisions of §§61.45(i)(1) and 61.45(i)(2) shall be directed to the SBI of the service category designated in §61.42(d)(i).

\* \* \* \* \*

(5) Effective July 1, 2000, notwithstanding the requirements of paragraph (a) of this section and subject to the limitations of §61.45(i), if a price cap local exchange carrier is recovering an ATS charge greater than its Target Rate as set forth in §61.3(qq), any reductions to the PCI for the traffic sensitive or trunking baskets designated in §§61.42(d)(2) and 61.42(d)(3) resulting from the application of the provisions of §61.45(b), and the formula in §61.45(b) and from the

application of the provisions of §§61.45(i)(1), and 61.45(i)(2) shall be directed to the SBIs of the service categories designated in §§61.42(e)(1) and 61.42(e)(2).

\* \* \* \* \*

19. Section 61.48 is amended by revising paragraphs (i)(2), (i)(3) introductory text, (i)(4), and (l)(2) to read as follows:

**§ 61.48 Transition rules for price cap formula calculations.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(i) \* \* \*

(2) Simultaneous Introduction of Special Access and Transport Zones. Price cap local exchange carriers that have established density pricing zones pursuant to §69.123 of this chapter, and whose special access zone date and transport zone date occur on the same date, shall initially establish density pricing zone SBIs and bands pursuant to the methodology in §§61.47(e) through (f).

(3) Sequential Introduction of Zones in the Same Tariff Year. Notwithstanding §§61.47(e) through (f), price cap local exchange carriers that have established density pricing zones pursuant to §69.123 of this chapter, and whose special access zone date and transport zone date occur on different dates during the same tariff year, shall, on the earlier date, establish density pricing zone SBIs and pricing bands using the methodology described in §§61.47(e) through (f), but applicable to the earlier service only. On the later date, such carriers shall recalculate the SBIs and pricing bands to limit the pricing flexibility of the services included in each density pricing zone category, as reflected in its SBI, as follows:

\* \* \* \* \*

(4) Introduction of Zones in Different Tariff Years. Notwithstanding §§61.47(e) through (f), those price cap local exchange carriers that have established density pricing zones pursuant to §69.123 of this chapter, and whose special access zone date and transport zone date do not occur within the same tariff year, shall, on the earlier date, establish density pricing zone

SBIs and pricing bands using the methodology described in §§61.47(e) through (f), but applicable to the earlier service only.

\* \* \* \* \*

(1) \* \* \*

(2) Once the reductions in paragraph (l)(1)(i) and paragraphs (l)(1)(ii)(A) and (l)(1)(ii)(B) of this section are identified, the difference between those reductions and \$2.1 billion is the total amount of additional reductions that would be made to ATS rates of price cap local exchange carriers. This amount will then be restated as the percentage of total price cap local exchange carrier Local Switching revenues as of June 30, 2000 using 2000 annual filing base period demand ("June 30 Local Switching revenues") necessary to yield the total amount of additional reductions and taking into account the fact that, if participating, a price cap local exchange carrier would not reduce ATS rates below its Target Rate as set forth in §61.3(qq). Each price cap local exchange carrier then reduces ATS rate elements, and associated SBI upper limits and PCIs, by a dollar amount equivalent to the percentage times the June 30 Local Switching revenues for that filing entity, provided that no price cap local exchange carrier shall be required to reduce its ATS rates below its Target Rate as set forth in §61.3(qq). Each price cap local exchange carrier can take its additional reductions against any of the ATS rate elements, provided that at least a proportional share must be taken against Local Switching rates.

\* \* \* \* \*

20. Section 61.49 is amended by revising paragraphs (f)(2), (f)(3), (f)(4), (g) introductory text, (g)(2), (h), (k) and (l) to read as follows:

**§ 61.49 Supporting information to be submitted with letters of transmittal for tariffs of carriers subject to price cap regulation.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(f) \* \* \*

(2) Each tariff filing submitted by a price cap local exchange carrier that introduces a new loop-based service, as defined in §61.3(pp) of this part—including a restructured unbundled basic service element (BSE), as defined in §69.2(mm) of this chapter, that constitutes a new loop-based service—that is or will later be included in a basket, must be accompanied by cost data sufficient to establish that the new loop-based service or unbundled BSE will not recover more than a just and reasonable portion of the carrier's overhead costs.

(3) A price cap local exchange carrier may submit without cost data any tariff filings that introduce new services, other than loop-based services.

(4) A price cap local exchange carrier that has removed its corridor or interstate intraLATA toll services from its interexchange basket pursuant to §61.42(d)(4)(ii), may submit its tariff filings for corridor or interstate intraLATA toll services without cost data.

(g) Each tariff filing submitted by a price cap local exchange carrier that introduces a new loop-based service or a restructured unbundled basic service element (BSE), as defined in §69.2(mm) of this chapter, that is or will later be included in a basket, or that introduces or changes the rates for connection charge subelements for expanded interconnection, as defined in §69.121 of this chapter, must also be accompanied by:

(1) \* \* \*

(2) Working papers and statistical data. (i) Concurrently with the filing of any tariff change or tariff filing for a service not previously offered, the issuing carriers must file the working papers containing the information underlying the data supplied in response to paragraph (h)(1) of this section, and a clear explanation of how the working papers relate to that information.

(ii) All statistical studies must be submitted and supported in the form prescribed in §1.363 of the Commission's rules.

(h) Each tariff filing submitted by a price cap local exchange carrier that introduces or changes the rates for connection charge subelements for expanded interconnection, as defined in §69.121 of this chapter, must be accompanied by cost data sufficient to establish that such charges will not recover more than a just and reasonable portion of the carrier's overhead costs.

\* \* \* \* \*

(k) In accordance with §§61.41 through 61.49, price cap local exchange carriers that elect to file their annual access tariff pursuant to section 204(a)(3) of the Communications Act shall submit supporting material for their interstate annual access tariffs, absent rate information, 90 days prior to July 1 of each year.

(l) On each page of cost support material submitted pursuant to this section, the issuing carrier shall indicate the transmittal number under which that page was submitted.

**Subpart H—[Removed]**

21. Remove Subpart H consisting of §§ 61.151 through 61.153.

**Subpart G—[Redesignated as Subpart H]**

22. Redesignate Subpart G (§§ 61.131 to 61.136) as Subpart H.

**Subpart F—[Redesignated as Subpart G]**

23. Redesignate Subpart F (§§ 61.66 to 61.87) as Subpart G.

24. Designate §§ 61.51 through 61.59 as subpart F, and add a new subpart F heading to read as follows:

**Subpart F—Formatting and Notice Requirements for Tariff Publications**

25. Section 61.51 is added to read as follows:

**§ 61.51 Scope.**

The rules in this subpart apply to tariffs filed by issuing carriers, with the exception of the informational tariffs filed pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 226(h)(1)(A), unless otherwise noted.

26. Section 61.52 is amended by removing paragraph (a), redesignating paragraphs (b) and (c) as paragraphs (a) and (b) and revising new paragraph (a) introductory text, and paragraph (b) to read as follows:

**§ 61.52 Form, size, type, legibility, etc.**

(a) Pages of tariffs must be numbered consecutively and designated as "Original title page," "Original page 1," "Original page 2," etc.

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) All issuing carriers shall file all tariff publications and associated documents, such as transmittal letters, requests for special permission, and supporting information, electronically in accordance with the requirements set forth in §61.13 through §61.17.

27. Section 61.55 is amended by revising paragraph (a) to read as follows:

**§ 61.55 Contract-based tariffs.**

(a) This section shall apply to price cap local exchange carriers permitted to offer contract-based tariffs under §69.727(a) of this chapter.

\* \* \* \* \*

28. Section 61.58 is amended by revising paragraphs (a)(2)(ii), (d), (e)(1) and adding new paragraph (f) to read as follows:

**§ 61.58 Notice requirements.**

(a) \* \* \*

(2) \* \* \*

(ii) Local exchange carriers may elect not to file tariffs pursuant to section 204(a)(3) of the Communications Act. For dominant carriers, any such tariffs shall be filed on at least 16 days' notice. For nondominant carriers, any such tariffs shall be filed on at least one days' notice.

\* \* \* \* \*

(d)(1) A price cap local exchange carrier that is filing a tariff revision to remove its corridor or interstate intraLATA toll services from its interexchange basket pursuant to §61.42(d)(4)(ii) shall submit such filing on at least fifteen days' notice.

(2) A price cap local exchange carrier that has removed its corridor and interstate intraLATA toll services from its interexchange basket pursuant to §61.42(d)(4)(ii) shall file subsequent tariff filings for corridor or interstate intraLATA toll services on at least one day's notice.

(e) Non-price cap local exchange carriers and/or services. (1) Tariff filings in the instances specified in paragraphs (e)(1) (i), (ii), and (iii) of this section by dominant carriers must be made on at least 15 days' notice.

\* \* \* \* \*

(f) All tariff filings of domestic and international non-dominant carriers must be made on at least one days' notice.

29. Section 61.59 is amended by revising paragraphs (b) and (c) to read as follows:

**§ 61.59 Effective period required before changes.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) Changes to rates and regulations for dominant carriers that have not yet become effective, i.e., are pending, may not be made unless the effective date of the proposed changes is at least 30 days after the scheduled effective date of the pending revisions.

(c) Changes to rates and regulations for dominant carriers that have taken effect but have not been in effect for at least 30 days may not be made unless the scheduled effective date of the proposed changes is at least 30 days after the effective date of the existing regulations.

30. Section 61.66 is revised to read as follows:

**§ 61.66 Scope.**

The rules in this subpart apply to all issuing carriers, unless otherwise noted.

31. Section 61.68 is amended by revising paragraph (a) to read as follows:

**§ 61.68 Special notations.**

(a) Any tariff filing made pursuant to an Application for Special Permission, Commission decision or order must contain the following statement:

Issued under authority of (specific reference to the special permission, Commission decision, or order) of the Commission.

\* \* \* \* \*

32. Section 61.83 is revised to read as follows:

**§ 61.83 Consecutive numbering.**

Issuing carriers should file tariff publications under consecutive FCC numbers. If this cannot be done, a memorandum containing an explanation of the missing number or numbers must be submitted.

Supplements to a tariff must be numbered consecutively in a separate series.

33. Section 61.86 is revised to read as follows:

**§ 61.86 Supplements.**

An issuing carrier may not file a supplement except to suspend or cancel a tariff publication, or to defer the effective date of pending tariff revisions. A carrier may file a supplement for the voluntary deferral of a tariff publication.

34. Section 61.87 is amended by revising paragraph (a) introductory text, paragraphs (a)(1)(i), (a)(1)(ii), (a)(3), and (c) to read as follows:

**§ 61.87 Cancellation of tariffs.**

(a) An issuing carrier may cancel an entire tariff. Cancellation of a tariff automatically cancels every page and supplement to that tariff except for the canceling Title Page or first page.

\* \* \* \* \*

(i) The issuing carrier whose tariff is being canceled must revise the Title Page or the first page of its tariff indicating that the tariff is no longer effective, or

(ii) The issuing carrier under whose tariff the service(s) will be provided must revise the Title Page or first page of the tariff to be canceled, using the name and numbering shown in the heading of the tariff to be canceled, indicating that the tariff is no longer effective. This carrier must also file with the Commission the new tariff provisions reflecting the service(s) being canceled. Both filings must be effective on the same date and may be filed under the same transmittal.

\* \* \* \* \*

(3) A carrier canceling its tariff, as described in this section, must comply with §§61.54(b)(1) and 61.54(b)(5), as applicable.

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) When a carrier ceases to provide service(s) without a successor, it must cancel its tariff pursuant to the notice requirements of §61.58, as applicable, unless otherwise authorized by the Commission.

35. Section 61.132 is revised to read as follows:

**§ 61.132 Method of filing concurrences.**

A carrier proposing to concur in another carrier's effective tariff must deliver one copy of the concurrence to the issuing carrier in whose favor the concurrence is issued. The concurrence must be signed by an officer or agent of the carrier executing the concurrence, and must be numbered consecutively in a separate series from its FCC tariff numbers. At the same time the issuing carrier revises its tariff to reflect such a concurrence, it must file one copy of the concurrence electronically with the Commission in accordance with the requirements set forth in §61.13 through §61.17. The concurrence must bear the same effective date as the date of the tariff filing reflecting the concurrence. Carriers shall file revisions reflecting concurrences in their tariffs on the notice period specified in §61.58.

36. Section 61.134 is revised to read as follows:

**§ 61.134 Concurrences for through services.**

An issuing carrier filing rates or regulations for through services between points on its own system and points on another carrier's system (or systems), or between points on another carrier's system (or systems), must list all concurring, connecting or other participating carriers as provided in §61.54 (f), (g) and (h). A concurring carrier must tender a properly executed instrument of concurrence to the issuing carrier. If rates and regulations of the other carriers engaging in the through service(s) are not specified in the issuing carrier's tariff, that tariff must state where the other carrier's rates and regulations can be found. Such reference(s) must contain the FCC number(s) of the referenced tariff publication(s), the exact name(s) of the carrier(s) issuing such tariff publication(s), and must clearly state how the rates and regulations in the separate publications apply.

37. Section 61.191 is revised to read as follows:

**§ 61.191 Carrier to file supplement when notified of suspension.**

If an issuing carrier is notified by the Commission that its tariff publication has been suspended, the carrier must file, within five business days from the release date of the suspension order, a consecutively

numbered supplement without an effective date, which specifies the schedules which have been suspended.

**PART 64 – MISCELLANEOUS RULES RELATING TO COMMON CARRIERS**

38. The authority citation for part 64 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 47 U.S.C. 154, 254(K); secs. 403(b)(2)(B), (c), Pub. L. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56. Interpret or apply 47 U.S.C. 201, 218, 222, 225, 226, 228, and 254(k) unless otherwise noted.

39. Section 64.709 is amended by revising paragraphs (d)(1) and (d)(2) to read as follows:

**§ 64.709 Informational tariffs.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(d) \* \* \*

(1) The original of the cover letter shall be submitted to the Secretary without attachments, along with FCC Form 159, and the appropriate fee to the address set forth in §1.1105 of this chapter.

(2) Carriers should file informational tariffs and associated documents, such as cover letters and attachments, electronically in accordance with §§61.13 and 61.14 of this chapter.

\* \* \* \* \*

**APPENDIX B****Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis**

1. An initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA) was incorporated in the *ETFS NPRM*.<sup>1</sup> The Commission sought written public comment on the proposals in the *ETFS NPRM*, including comment on the IRFA. No comments were received. This present Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (FRFA) conforms to the RFA.<sup>2</sup>

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

2. Today, the Commission adopts a Report and Order to extend the requirement to file tariffs and associated documents electronically via the Electronic Tariff Filing System (ETFS) to all tariff filing entities. The Commission concludes that requiring the electronic filing of all tariffs and associated documents would benefit the public. The Commission concludes that the proposed rules will become effective, and therefore, the ETFS will be available for all tariff filers to use 120 days after a final order in this docket implementing such a requirement (or summary thereof) is published in the Federal Register. After the final rules are effective, tariff filers will have a 60 day transition to begin using the ETFS system to file their tariffs and associated documents. The Commission also concluded that the Chief of the Wireline Competition Bureau would administer the adoption of this extended electronic filing requirement.

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

3. There were no comments raised that specifically addressed the rules and policies proposed in the IRFA.

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

4. 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 rules, if adopted.<sup>3</sup> The RFA generally defines the term "small entity" as having the same meaning as the terms "small business," "small organization," and "small governmental jurisdiction."<sup>4</sup> In addition, the term "small business" has the same meaning as the term "small-business concern" under the Small Business Act.<sup>5</sup> A "small-business

---

<sup>1</sup> The RFA has been amended by the Contract with America Advancement Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-121, 110 Stat. 847 (1996) (CWAAA). Title II of the CWAAA is the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (SBREFA); *see also ETFS NPRM*, 25 FCC Rcd at 9551-54.

<sup>2</sup> *See* 5 U.S.C. § 604.

<sup>3</sup> *See* 5 U.S.C. § 603(b)(3).

<sup>4</sup> *See* 5 U.S.C. § 601(6).

<sup>5</sup> *See* 5 U.S.C. § 601(3) (incorporating by reference the definition of "small-business concern" in the Small Business Act, 15 U.S.C. § 632). Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 601(3), the statutory definition of a small business applies "unless an agency, after consultation with the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration and after opportunity for public comment, establishes one or more definitions of such term which are appropriate to the activities of the agency and publishes such definition(s) in the Federal Register."

concern" is one which: (1) is independently owned and operated; (2) is not dominant in its field of operation; and (3) satisfies any additional criteria established by the Small Business Administration.<sup>6</sup>

5. **Total Number of Telephone Companies Affected.** The United States Bureau of the Census (Census Bureau) reports that, at the end of 1992, there were 3,497 firms engaged in providing telephone services, as defined therein, for at least one year.<sup>7</sup> This number contains a variety of different categories of carriers, including local exchange carriers, interexchange carriers, competitive access providers, cellular carriers, mobile service carriers, operator service providers, pay telephone operators, covered specialized mobile radio providers, and resellers. It seems certain that some of these 3,497 telephone service firms may not qualify as small entities or small incumbent LECs because they are not "independently owned and operated."<sup>8</sup> For example, a personal communications service (PCS) provider that is affiliated with an interexchange carrier having more than 1,500 employees would not meet the definition of a small business. It is reasonable to conclude that fewer than 3,497 telephone service firms are small entity telephone service firms or small incumbent LECs that may be affected by the proposed rules, herein adopted.

6. **Competitive Access Providers.** Neither the Commission nor the SBA has developed a definition of small entities specifically applicable to competitive access services providers (CAPs). The closest applicable definition under the SBA rules is for telephone communications companies other than except radiotelephone (wireless) companies.<sup>9</sup> According to the most recent data, there are 349 CAPs and competitive LECs engaged in the provision of competitive local exchange services.<sup>10</sup> We do not have data specifying the number of these carriers that are not independently owned and operated, or have more than 1,500 employees, and thus are unable at this time to estimate with greater precision the number of CAPs that would qualify as small business concerns under the SBA's definition. Consequently, we estimate that there are less than 349 small entity CAPs providing competitive local exchange services that may be affected by the Report and Order.

7. **Interexchange Carriers.** Neither the Commission nor the SBA has developed a size standard for small businesses specifically applicable to interexchange services (IXCs). The closest applicable definition under the SBA rules is for telephone communications companies other than radiotelephone (wireless) companies.<sup>11</sup> According to the most recent data, there are 204 carriers engaged in the provision of interexchange services.<sup>12</sup> We do not have data specifying the number of these carriers that are not independently owned and operated or have more than 1,500 employees, and thus are unable at this time to estimate with greater precision the number of IXCs that would qualify as small business concerns under the SBA's definition. Consequently, we estimate that there are less than 204 small entity IXCs that may be affected by the Report and Order.

---

<sup>6</sup> See 15 U.S.C. § 632.

<sup>7</sup> U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *1992 Census of Transportation, Communications, and Utilities: Establishment and Firm Size*, at Firm Size 1-123 (1995) (*1992 Census*).

<sup>8</sup> See generally 15 U.S.C. § 632(a)(1).

<sup>9</sup> 13 C.F.R. § 121.201, NAICS codes 51331, 51333, and 51334.

<sup>10</sup> FCC, Common Carrier Bureau, Industry Analysis Division, *Carrier Locator* at Table 1.

<sup>11</sup> 13 C.F.R. § 121.201, NAICS codes 51331, 51333, and 51334.

<sup>12</sup> FCC, Common Carrier Bureau, Industry Analysis Division, *Carrier Locator* at Table 1.

8. **Operator Service Providers (OSPs).** Neither the Commission nor the SBA has developed a small business size standard specifically for operator service providers. The appropriate size standard under SBA rules is for the category Wired Telecommunications Carriers. Under that size standard, such a business is small if it has 1,500 or fewer employees.<sup>13</sup> According to Commission data, 28 carriers have reported that they are engaged in the provision of operator services.<sup>14</sup> Of these, an estimated 27 have 1,500 or fewer employees and one has more than 1,500 employees.<sup>15</sup> Consequently, the Commission estimates that the majority of OSPs are small entities.

**D. Description of Projected Reporting, Recordkeeping and Other Compliance Requirements**

9. In this Report and Order, the Commission is expanding mandatory electronic filing to all tariff filers, which include competitive LECs. The Report and Order requires that all tariff filers must follow the Commission's rules for electronic tariff filing and file via ETFS their tariffs, tariff revisions, base documents and associated documents, including applications for special permission. Moreover, in order to provide uniformity for tariff filings, the Report and Order extends certain procedural requirements to all tariff filing entities, including: specific formatting and composition requirements, the use of FCC registration numbers and the use of transmittal numbers.

**E. Steps Taken to Minimize Significant Economic Impact on Small Entities, and Significant Alternatives Considered**

10. The RFA requires an agency to describe any significant, specifically small business, alternatives 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."<sup>16</sup>

11. In the *ETFS NPRM*, we sought comment from all interested parties and no parties objected to the electronic filing proposals. The Commission believes that most carriers are familiar with the Electronic Tariff Filing System, if not currently using it. As such, the Commission believes the burden on small entities will be minimal. In addition, to assist tariff filers that have not used ETFS previously, including small entity filers, the Commission is allowing carriers a 180-day transition period before they will be required to begin using ETFS.

**F. Federal Rules that May Duplicate, Overlap, or Conflict with the Proposed Rules**

12. None.

---

<sup>13</sup> See 13 C.F.R. § 121.201, NAICS code 517110.

<sup>14</sup> See *Trends in Telephone Service* at Table 5.3.

<sup>15</sup> See *id.*

<sup>16</sup> 5 U.S.C. § 603(c)(1)-(c)(4).

**STATEMENT OF  
CHAIRMAN JULIUS GENACHOWSKI**

Re: *Electronic Tariff Filing System*, WC Docket No. 10-141

When I became Chairman in 2009, I said that this Commission would “use technology and new media to . . . improve [the] overall operations of the FCC – running efficiently [and] communicating effectively.” Moving government processes from paper to digital, and from offline to online, is central to this commitment, and is important for several reasons. It drives additional broadband use; it empowers app developers and consumers to use public data in innovative ways; and it drives process efficiencies and reduces costs both for the private sector and for government.

Over the last two years, thanks to the excellent leadership of our Managing Director, Steve Van Roekel; our Bureau Chiefs; and our Data Innovation Initiative team, we’ve made substantial progress on this agenda. We’ve shifted toward electronic notification of docket filings and fees, moved filings on privacy policies and international telephone traffic from paper to digital, and made all information associated with docketed proceedings available electronically.

Today, we take another step to modernize the Commission’s processes by enabling all carriers to file tariffs in digital form, over the Internet, rather than sending in copies on paper or CDs, as some carriers have been required to do for many years.

This reform will have several benefits. It will make it easier for carriers to comply with their obligations, it will allow state and federal officials, the public, and the media easier and more transparent access to tariff filings, and it will help the Commission conduct industry analysis more efficiently and effectively. It will also save a lot of trees.

Going forward, we will continue to scour the Commission for opportunities to move processes from paper to digital, and act as quickly as we can to get the job done. I look forward to hearing additional ideas about how to continue integrating digital technology into the way we work here at the FCC from our Bureaus and Offices in the coming months. And I thank the staff of the Wireline Competition Bureau for their work on this item.



**STATEMENT OF  
COMMISSIONER MICHAEL J. COPPS**

**Re:** *Electronic Tariff Filing System*, WC Docket No. 10-141

I'm happy to support today's Order which extends electronic tariff filing to all carriers submitting tariffs and tariff-related documents to the Commission. This Order is a good reminder that as we seek to extend the tools of the Digital Age to every citizen in the land, we need to keep pace here at the FCC. We are long overdue to address some of these areas, but with items like this we are making progress. This Commission is doing more than ever before to make the information we collect easily available to and usable by the public we are here to serve. My thanks to the staff in the Wireline Competition Bureau and the Office of the Managing Director for their work on this Order.

**STATEMENT  
COMMISSIONER ROBERT M. McDOWELL**

Re: *Electronic Tariff Filing System*, WC Docket No. 10-141

As a general matter, I support efforts to streamline Commission procedures to make them more efficient for both the government and the public. This order achieves that goal. It makes good sense that nondominant carriers be required to follow the same electronic tariff filing system that incumbent local exchange carriers have used for years.

So, after today's order goes into effect, gone are the days of relying on an antiquated process of filing tariffs on physical paper and diskettes. At least the "filing process" of the tariff system will be modernized. On that note, I hope that in the future the Commission will look beyond reforming the filing procedures and also consider whether the day will ever come when we can discard the tariff system overall. In fact, I propose that the Commission initiate a proceeding to examine whether, how and when we could accomplish such a goal. If history is to be our guide, we are likely to find that markets and innovation have moved beyond the regulatory structures of the past.

I thank the Wireline Competition Bureau staff their diligence on this order. Also, I commend the Chairman for his leadership in finding ways to modernize the Commission's data collection procedures overall and look forward to working with all of my colleagues on streamlining other cumbersome and outdated FCC procedures.

**STATEMENT OF  
COMMISSIONER MIGNON L. CLYBURN**

Re: *Electronic Tariff Filing System*, WC Docket No. 10-141

Consumers, carriers, and this agency stand to benefit from an electronic tariff filing system that's available online. An easier administrative process that all carriers must use will be more efficient and effective. It will save time, money, and trees, and ultimately, should result in better service. This is another example of a good government result from an agency that is focused on encouraging broadband deployment, adoption, and use. I would like to thank the staff for their work on this item, which I expect, will be a welcome and universally embraced improvement to many who frequently work with and rely upon tariffs.

**STATEMENT OF  
CHAIRMAN JULIUS GENACHOWSKI**

**Re:    *Electronic Tariff Filing System*, WC Docket No. 10-141**

When I became Chairman in 2009, I said that this Commission would “use technology and new media to . . . improve [the] overall operations of the FCC – running efficiently [and] communicating effectively.” Moving government processes from paper to digital, and from offline to online, is central to this commitment, and is important for several reasons. It drives additional broadband use; it empowers app developers and consumers to use public data in innovative ways; and it drives process efficiencies and reduces costs both for the private sector and for government.

Over the last two years, thanks to the excellent leadership of our Managing Director, Steve Van Roekel; our Bureau Chiefs; and our Data Innovation Initiative team, we’ve made substantial progress on this agenda. We’ve shifted toward electronic notification of docket filings and fees, moved filings on privacy policies and international telephone traffic from paper to digital, and made all information associated with docketed proceedings available electronically.

Today, we take another step to modernize the Commission’s processes by enabling all carriers to file tariffs in digital form, over the Internet, rather than sending in copies on paper or CDs, as some carriers have been required to do for many years.

This reform will have several benefits. It will make it easier for carriers to comply with their obligations, it will allow state and federal officials, the public, and the media easier and more transparent access to tariff filings, and it will help the Commission conduct industry analysis more efficiently and effectively. It will also save a lot of trees.

Going forward, we will continue to scour the Commission for opportunities to move processes from paper to digital, and act as quickly as we can to get the job done. I look forward to hearing additional ideas about how to continue integrating digital technology into the way we work here at the FCC from our Bureaus and Offices in the coming months. And I thank the staff of the Wireline Competition Bureau for their work on this item.

**STATEMENT OF  
COMMISSIONER MICHAEL J. COPPS**

Re: *Electronic Tariff Filing System*, WC Docket No. 10-141

I'm happy to support today's Order which extends electronic tariff filing to all carriers submitting tariffs and tariff-related documents to the Commission. This Order is a good reminder that as we seek to extend the tools of the Digital Age to every citizen in the land, we need to keep pace here at the FCC. We are long overdue to address some of these areas, but with items like this we are making progress. This Commission is doing more than ever before to make the information we collect easily available to and usable by the public we are here to serve. My thanks to the staff in the Wireline Competition Bureau and the Office of the Managing Director for their work on this Order.

**STATEMENT  
COMMISSIONER ROBERT M. McDOWELL**

Re: *Electronic Tariff Filing System*, WC Docket No. 10-141

As a general matter, I support efforts to streamline Commission procedures to make them more efficient for both the government and the public. This order achieves that goal. It makes good sense that nondominant carriers be required to follow the same electronic tariff filing system that incumbent local exchange carriers have used for years.

So, after today's order goes into effect, gone are the days of relying on an antiquated process of filing tariffs on physical paper and diskettes. At least the "filing process" of the tariff system will be modernized. On that note, I hope that in the future the Commission will look beyond reforming the filing procedures and also consider whether the day will ever come when we can discard the tariff system overall. In fact, I propose that the Commission initiate a proceeding to examine whether, how and when we could accomplish such a goal. If history is to be our guide, we are likely to find that markets and innovation have moved beyond the regulatory structures of the past.

I thank the Wireline Competition Bureau staff their diligence on this order. Also, I commend the Chairman for his leadership in finding ways to modernize the Commission's data collection procedures overall and look forward to working with all of my colleagues on streamlining other cumbersome and outdated FCC procedures.

**STATEMENT OF  
COMMISSIONER MIGNON L. CLYBURN**

Re: *Electronic Tariff Filing System*, WC Docket No. 10-141

Consumers, carriers, and this agency stand to benefit from an electronic tariff filing system that's available online. An easier administrative process that all carriers must use will be more efficient and effective. It will save time, money, and trees, and ultimately, should result in better service. This is another example of a good government result from an agency that is focused on encouraging broadband deployment, adoption, and use. I would like to thank the staff for their work on this item, which I expect, will be a welcome and universally embraced improvement to many who frequently work with and rely upon tariffs.