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By the Chief, Auctions and Spectrum Access Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau:

# INTRODUCTION

1. In this Memorandum Opinion and Order, we deny a request filed by NBVDS Investment, L.L.C. (NBVDS) for waiver of the deadline for filing a short-form application to participate in Auction 101. NBVDS failed to file its short-form application (FCC Form 175) prior to the closing of the filing window and now seeks a waiver of section 1.2105 of the Commission’s rules so that it may seek to become qualified to bid in Auction 101. For the reasons set forth below, we deny NBVDS’s request for waiver.

# BACKGROUND

1. On August 3, 2018, the Commission established application and bidding procedures for the auction of 3,072 Upper Microwave Flexible Use Services licenses in the 27.5-28.35 GHz (28 GHz) bands (Auction 101).[[1]](#footnote-3) At the same time, the Commission established the procedures for the auction of licenses in the 24 GHz band (Auction 102).[[2]](#footnote-4) The Commission announced that the windows for electronically filing a separate short-form application to participate in Auction 101 and/or 102 would run concurrently and open at 12:00 p.m. Eastern Time (ET) on September 5, 2018 and close at 6:00 p.m. ET on September 18, 2018.[[3]](#footnote-5)
2. NBVDS submitted its short-form application to participate in Auction 102 prior to the close of the window on September 18, 2018, but did not submit an application for Auction 101.[[4]](#footnote-6)
3. On September 28, 2018, NBVDS filed a request for a waiver of section 1.2105 to permit the submission of an application for Auction 101 and sought expedited action.[[5]](#footnote-7) In support of its Request, NBVDS asserts that its Auction 101 Form 175 application was “completed” prior to the 6:00 p.m. ET deadline on September 18, but it could not certify and submit its application because a “widespread” and “unprecedented” Distributed Denial of Service (DDoS) event disrupted its ability to access its application between 5:55 p.m. ET and the 6:00 p.m. deadline.[[6]](#footnote-8)

# DISCUSSION

1. To receive a waiver under section 1.925 of the Commission’s rules, a petitioner must demonstrate that: (1) the underlying purpose of the rule would not be served or would be frustrated by application to the instant case, and that a grant of the waiver would be in the public interest, or (2) in view of the unique or unusual factual circumstances of the instant case, application of the rule would be inequitable, unduly burdensome or contrary to the public interest, or that the applicant has no reasonable alternative to seeking a waiver of the rule.[[7]](#footnote-9) For the reasons described below, we find that NBVDS has not demonstrated that its request for waiver meets either prong of this standard, and we therefore deny its request.
2. NBVDS has failed to demonstrate that a waiver of the requirement to certify and submit a short-form application by the filing deadline would not frustrate the purpose of the rule. The Commission has long explained that uniform deadlines for various stages of the auction application process provide applicants with certainty and give the Commission time for orderly application review and auction preparation.[[8]](#footnote-10) The underlying purpose of rules establishing deadlines is best served by their consistent application, which serves the public interest by providing fair and equal treatment to applicants by subjecting them to the same timeframes for making auction-related decisions.[[9]](#footnote-11)
3. As a result, in the *Auctions 101 and 102 Procedures Public Notice*, the Commission stated: “**Late applications will not be accepted.**”[[10]](#footnote-12) It further made clear that an applicant “bears full responsibility” for submitting a timely application and warned that if an applicant “fails to make the required certifications in its FCC Form 175 by the filing deadline, its application will be deemed unacceptable for filing and cannot be corrected after the filing deadline.”[[11]](#footnote-13) The Commission “strongly urged” applicants to “file early” and affirmed that applicants “are responsible for allowing adequate time for filing their applications.”[[12]](#footnote-14) The Wireless Telecommunications Bureau subsequently released short-form application instructions and an online tutorial that emphasized the importance of the short-form application deadline.[[13]](#footnote-15)
4. NBVDS claims that the Commission’s policy objectives would not be frustrated by a waiver because the DDoS event that prevented NBVDS from certifying and submitting its application was an “unusual and compelling circumstance.”[[14]](#footnote-16) We do not agree. The auction process includes multiple succeeding deadlines, including application filing deadlines, the upfront payment deadline, and deadlines at the end of each round of bidding, which must be strictly observed to assure that an auction is fair and objective to all participants. A waiver of the short-form filing deadline would compromise these deadlines and undermine auction integrity. Absent strict enforcement, participants would have opportunities to argue what they *meant* to do–e.g., certify and submit an application by the deadline, place a bid, etc.–rather than what they actually did in the Commission’s auction-related systems in the time allotted to all participants equally. For this reason, the Commission advises applicants that they must take responsibility for their own action or inaction in the auction process.[[15]](#footnote-17)
5. We are not persuaded that NBVDS’s asserted intent to deliver enhanced broadband services using 28 GHz spectrum to current and future customers in rural areas outweighs the public interest benefit in consistent enforcement of the Commission’s auction-related deadlines.[[16]](#footnote-18) To the extent NBVDS qualifies to bid in Auction 102, which will begin after the close of Auction 101, we would expect that NBVDS could bid for the 24 GHz spectrum offered in that auction to be used in the same manner in the same areas of the country.
6. In addition, NBVDS presents no unique facts that persuade us that it would be unfair or inequitable to deny NBVDS’s requested relief. By its own admission, NBVDS waited until approximately 5:55 p.m. ET to attempt to certify and submit its short-form application for Auction 101.[[17]](#footnote-19) That is the last *five* *minutes* of the *two-week* short-form application filling window. Indeed, having done an internal staff investigation in response to phone calls from NBVDS and its counsel, we know that NBVDS’s Auction 102 application was the last one submitted. Only two other applicants submitted applications in the last 30 minutes before the deadline. NBVDS provides no reason–and importantly, takes no responsibility–for its failure to act sooner. Had NBVDS planned ahead, the purported “unprecedented” DDoS attack that NBVDS first noticed at 5:43 p.m. ET would have been immaterial.[[18]](#footnote-20)
7. NBVDS bases its argument that unique facts justify a waiver on a Commission public notice from 1985 that is wholly unrelated to the spectrum auction context.[[19]](#footnote-21) Assuming that this precedent would apply here, the facts alleged by NBVDS are not equivalent to the examples the Commission provided of “a debilitating earthquake or a city-wide power outage that brings transportation to a halt.”[[20]](#footnote-22) In fact, the 43-minute disruption or degradation of internet service on a particular provider’s network may be more comparable to issues with copying machines or delivery services, which the Commission explained do not warrant a waiver of a filing deadline.[[21]](#footnote-23) It was a temporary, relatively isolated issue that may have prevented the delivery of some data to the Commission’s Auction Application System. Notably, it was not severe enough to prevent NBVDS from submitting its Auction 102 application minutes earlier.
8. Furthermore, the Commission’s cautionary language in the public notice more strongly supports the denial of NBVDS’s Request. The Commission warned:

[A]pplicants who wait until the eleventh hour to meet Commission deadlines will be held to assume the risk for almost all events which may occur to prevent timely filing. To minimize the risk, applicants should build into their schedules a reasonable margin of error in anticipation of circumstances which may cause delay.[[22]](#footnote-24)

NBVDS did not heed this direction. Contrary to NBVDS’s claim that it had no reasonable alternative due to the DDoS attack,[[23]](#footnote-25) it did in fact have one: planning ahead.

1. We disagree with NBVDS that denying its Request would “chang[e] the [short-form application] deadline without notice.”[[24]](#footnote-26) To the contrary, NBVDS is asking us to *extend* the deadline and accept required certifications that were provided to the Commission in its Request over 10 days later and by its own admission, seven days after learning of the DDoS attack.[[25]](#footnote-27) We are aware of no issue with the Commission’s Auction Application System that would have shortened the short-form application filing window–and none is alleged by NBVDS.[[26]](#footnote-28) No applicant or potential applicant for Auctions 101 and 102 has identified a problem with the functionality of the Auction Application System during the entirety of the filing window, and two applicants besides NBVDS successfully submitted applications during the last 30 minutes the filing window was open. As a result, all potential applicants would have the same opportunity to participate in the auction only if we deny NBVDS’s Request.[[27]](#footnote-29) Despite NBVDS’s claim that its Auction 101 short-form application “was already complete” by the deadline,[[28]](#footnote-30) that is simply not true. Our records indicate that NBVDS never visited two required pages of the Auction 101 application,[[29]](#footnote-31) and NBVDS’s submission of its former defaulter/delinquency statement and its certifications along with its Request belies that claim.[[30]](#footnote-32)

# ORDERING CLAUSES

1. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED, pursuant to Sections 4(i) and 309 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i) and 309, and section 1.925 of the Commission’s rules, 47 CFR § 1.925, that NBVDS Investment, L.L.C.’s Request for Waiver, dated September 27, 2018, is DENIED.
2. This action is taken pursuant to delegated authority under sections 0.283, 0.131 and 0.331 of the Commission’s rules, 47 CFR §§ 0.283, 0.131 and 0.331.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Margaret W. Wiener

Chief, Auctions and Spectrum Access Division

Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
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