*Via Electronic Mail*

**DA 20-1344**

Chérie R. Kiser and Angela F. Collins

Counsel to Global Tel\*Link Corporation

Cahill Gordon & Reindel LLP

1990 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

**Re: GTL’s Request for the Commission’s Work Papers and Other Documents (WC Docket No. 12-375)**

Dear Ms. Kiser and Ms. Collins:

The Wireline Competition Bureau (WCB) hereby denies Global Tel\*Link Corporation’s (GTL) requests for “work papers and other documentation” to the extent GTL seeks information beyond what the Commission has already made available in its *Inmate Calling Services* (ICS) docket or this letter.[[1]](#footnote-3) The Commission has already provided GTL and other interested parties an opportunity to access all the information they need to be able to participate fully in the ICS rulemaking proceeding.[[2]](#footnote-4)

The *2020 ICS Further Notice* provided a detailed explanation of the methodology and analyses the Commission used in developing its proposals for new rate caps on interstate and international calls placed from prisons or jails.[[3]](#footnote-5) That explanation includes four appendices that, collectively, make clear the full technical basis for the Commission’s proposals.[[4]](#footnote-6) After releasing the *Further Notice*,the Commission also provided the parties the opportunity to access the database that Commission staff had developed to facilitate the Commission’s ability to evaluate the confidential cost and revenue data ICS providers had submitted in response to the Commission’s Second Mandatory Data Collection (the ICS Database).[[5]](#footnote-7) In addition to those confidential data, the ICS Database includes “geocoding information related to facility locations added by the Commission staff that outside parties might find difficult to replicate.”[[6]](#footnote-8) As WCB and the Office of Economics and Analytics (OEA) explained when they made the ICS Database available, the database “allow[s] interested parties to rely on a common dataset in evaluating and responding to the Commission’s rate cap proposals in this proceeding.”[[7]](#footnote-9)

GTL filed a formal request for “work papers and other documentation” on September 11, 2020, before WCB and OEA made the ICS Database available to parties in the ICS rulemaking.[[8]](#footnote-10) Subsequently, GTL’s outside counsel and economists requested and received copies of the ICS Database.[[9]](#footnote-11) Nevertheless, on October 19, 2020, GTL reiterated and expanded upon its September 11 request, complaining that “the ICS Database does not include the FCC’s underlying work papers associated with its analysis and applied methodologies.”[[10]](#footnote-12) This expanded request seeks “all input data, computer programs, and intermediate data files that were used to process the raw data received by the FCC into the data files used by the FCC in its analysis, and all computer programs, intermediate data files, and output data files that were used to generate the statistical results described in the FNPRM.”[[11]](#footnote-13)

GTL’s request seeks access to records that are not routinely available for public inspection under sections 0.457(d) and 0.457(e) of the Commission’s rules.[[12]](#footnote-14) Nevertheless, the Commission has taken all steps necessary to ensure that GTL and other interested parties have a full opportunity to participate meaningfully in this rulemaking proceeding, as required under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA).[[13]](#footnote-15) The APA requires only that agencies give interested parties notice and an opportunity to participate in the rulemaking process.[[14]](#footnote-16) By describing in detail the methodology and analyses used in developing its rate cap proposals, making clear the full technical basis for the those proposals, and making the ICS Database available to parties’ representatives, the Commission has granted participants in this proceeding access to all facts and data that the Commission relied upon in developing its proposals and that are necessary to comment on those proposals. GTL is fully capable, based on the data and explanations the Commission has provided, of replicating the Commission’s analysis and commenting on the reliability and accuracy of that analysis and the soundness of the Commission’s proposals.[[15]](#footnote-17) Nothing more is required.[[16]](#footnote-18)

In neither of its letters does GTL explain why it is unable to use the information already available to it to understand and meaningfully comment upon the Commission’s proposals in the *Further Notice*. In fact, that information is sufficient to evaluate “the statistical results described in the [*Further Notice*].”[[17]](#footnote-19) In addition to the ICS Database, GTL’s outside counsel and consultants have obtained the unredacted data other ICS providers submitted in response to the Commission’s Second Mandatory Data Collection responses and can use them to evaluate the accuracy of the provider data included in the ICS Database.[[18]](#footnote-20) In generating the ICS Database and the resulting proposals, the Commission staff used non-proprietary, standard, commercially available software and conventional analytical methodologies fully described in the *Further Notice* and its Appendices and capable of replication by GTL.[[19]](#footnote-21) GTL simply does not need anything more from the Commission to participate fully in this rulemaking.

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority contained in sections 4(i) and 4(j) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i)-(j), and sections 0.91 and 0.291 of the Commission’s rules, 47 CFR §§ 0.91, 0.291, we deny GTL’s request to the extent it asks that the Commission provide it with any “work papers and other documentation” beyond the information already made available to interested parties in this proceeding. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact William A. Kehoe at (202) 418-7122, or via email at [William.Kehoe@fcc.gov](mailto:William.Kehoe@fcc.gov).

Sincerely,



Kris Anne Monteith

Chief

Wireline Competition Bureau
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