**Before the**

 **Federal Communications Commission**

**Washington, D.C. 20554**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| In the Matter ofAmendment to the Commission’s Rules Concerning Effective CompetitionImplementation of Section 111 of the STELA Reauthorization Act | **)****)****)****)****)****)****)** | MB Docket No. 15-53 |

**ORDER**

**Adopted: April 6, 2015 Released: April 7, 2015**

By the Chief, Media Bureau:

1. This Order denies a motion by the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB) and Public Knowledge (PK) requesting that we narrow the scope of issues addressed in the above-captioned proceeding, or in the alternative that we grant an extension of the comment and reply comment deadlines.[[1]](#footnote-2) On March 16, 2015, the Commission unanimously adopted and released the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking seeking comment on how to improve the effective competition process.[[2]](#footnote-3) Following publication of the NPRM in the Federal Register, comments are due on April 9, 2015 and reply comments are due on April 20, 2015.[[3]](#footnote-4)
2. In their Motion, NAB and PK contend that the NPRM has a broader scope than Section 111 of the STELA Reauthorization Act of 2014 (STELAR) requires.[[4]](#footnote-5) Due to the June 2, 2015 statutory deadline for adopting rules implementing Section 111, the Motion requests that the Commission “significantly narrow the scope of this proceeding to issues and questions specific to STELAR implementation . . . .”[[5]](#footnote-6) In the alternative, the Motion requests that the Commission extend the comment and reply comment deadlines, which it asserts “are shorter than for a typical rulemaking of this size and scope.”[[6]](#footnote-7) The Motion proposes a comment deadline of May 11, 2015 and a reply comment deadline of May 26, 2015.[[7]](#footnote-8) NAB and PK claim that, if the Commission does not narrow the scope of the proceeding, comment deadline extensions are needed “so that affected parties can fully digest the NPRM’s questions and develop the most robust submissions” in response to the NPRM.[[8]](#footnote-9) The National Cable & Telecommunications Association (NCTA) and the American Cable Association (ACA) filed oppositions to the Motion.[[9]](#footnote-10)
3. We decline to limit the scope of this proceeding, and we emphasize that the Commission has clear authority to conduct its proceedings as it determines will best enable it to carry out its responsibilities.[[10]](#footnote-11) The Commission has determined that the most administratively efficient approach in this proceeding is to consider all issues raised in the NPRM.[[11]](#footnote-12) Accordingly, we will not narrow the issues under consideration in this proceeding. Nor will we extend the comment deadlines, as any such extension would render it impossible for the Commission to meet the statutory deadline of June 2, 2015 through reasoned decision-making.[[12]](#footnote-13)
4. For these reasons, we deny the request that we narrow the scope of this proceeding, and we also deny the request for an extension of time. This action is taken under delegated authority pursuant to Sections 0.61 and 0.283 of the Commission’s Rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.61, 0.283.

 FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

 William T. Lake,

 Chief, Media Bureau
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