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By the Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau:

# Introduction

1. By this Order, the Wireline Competition Bureau (Bureau) of the Federal Communications Commission grants a request filed by Public Knowledge, Benton Institute for Internet & Society, Center for Rural Strategies, Common Sense Media, Communications Workers of America, INCOMPAS, and Media Alliance (collectively, Consumer & Competition Advocacy Organizations) for extensions of the comment and reply comment deadlines[[1]](#footnote-3) established by the Bureau in response to an application filed by Embarq Florida, Inc. d/b/a CenturyLink, a Lumen company (CenturyLink) in the above-captioned proceeding. CenturyLink’s application requests authority under section 214 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended,[[2]](#footnote-4) and section 63.71 of the Commission’s rules,[[3]](#footnote-5) to discontinue legacy voice service to 26 customers on Little Gasparilla Island, Florida that would result in a technology transition (the Application).[[4]](#footnote-6) Comments and reply comments were originally due on November 3, 2021 and November 18, 2021, respectively. Pursuant to this Order, the extended comment date is November 24, 2021 and the extended reply comment date is December 16, 2021.

# BACKGROUND

1. On July 14, 2021, CenturyLink filed an application with the Commission requesting authority, under section 214 of the Act and section 63.71 of the Commission’s rules, to discontinue the legacy voice service that it offers in the Service Area, relying on the adequate replacement test established by the Commission in 2016 for evaluating technology transition discontinuance applications.[[5]](#footnote-7) On October 4, 2021, the Bureau released a *Public Notice* indicating that the Application did not qualify for streamlined processing because “CenturyLink’s application does not make the *prima facie* showing necessary for an applicant relying on the service of a third-party provider for the replacement service.”[[6]](#footnote-8) The Bureau also explained that “this is the first instance of a third-party mobile wireless voice service serving as the replacement service for legacy voice service in a technology transition discontinuance application,” and “in the absence of a prior first party showing that one or more of these mobile wireless services satisfies the adequate replacement test, a *prima facie* showing is difficult to make.”[[7]](#footnote-9)
2. The *Public Notice* established 30 and 45-day deadlines, respectively, for filing comments and reply comments in response to the Application.[[8]](#footnote-10) On October 18, 2021, the Consumer & Competition Advocacy Organizations filed a request seeking to extend the deadlines for filing comments and reply comments by 21 and seven days, respectively.[[9]](#footnote-11) The Consumer & Competition Advocacy Organizations assert that “this matter has unique, precedent-setting importance to the phase out of legacy telephone service to millions of Americans outside of the relevant service area” and that they “require time to adequately examine the record, reach out to impacted stakeholders, and provide robust comments for the record.”[[10]](#footnote-12) The Consumer & Competition Advocacy Organizations submit that “grant of the extension at this early stage will not significantly delay this process and will significantly improve the record for the FCC’s consideration.”[[11]](#footnote-13) According to the Consumer & Competition Advocacy Organizations, CenturyLink does not oppose the requested extension,[[12]](#footnote-14) nor has any party filed an opposition.

# DISCUSSION

1. As set forth in section 1.46 of the Commission’s rules, it is the policy of the Commission that extensions of time shall not be routinely granted.[[13]](#footnote-15) However, extensions may be considered “to the extent that good cause for an extension is demonstrated.”[[14]](#footnote-16) The criteria for granting requests for extensions of time “are that the extension be in the public interest, cause no harm to any party in the proceeding, and cause no significant delay.”[[15]](#footnote-17) The Commission has previously found that an extension of time is warranted when it is “necessary to ensure that the Commission receives full and informed responses and that affected parties have a meaningful opportunity to develop a complete record for the Commission’s consideration.”[[16]](#footnote-18)
2. Here, we find good cause to extend the deadline to file comments and reply comments in response to the Application, as proposed by the Consumer & Competition Advocacy Organizations and unopposed by CenturyLink. We appreciate what appears to be the unanimous support of interested parties for more fully developing the record in this proceeding. By extending the deadlines to file comments and reply comments on the Application by 21 day and seven days, respectively, we are persuaded that all interested parties will be granted sufficient time to meaningfully respond to the unique circumstances presented by the Application.[[17]](#footnote-19) Accordingly, we extend the deadline to file comments and reply comments in response to the Applicationto November 24, 2021 and December 16, 2021, respectively.[[18]](#footnote-20)

# ORDERING CLAUSES

1. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED, pursuant to sections 0.204, 0.291, and 1.46 of the Commission’s rules, 47 CFR §§ 0.204, 0.291, 1.46, that the Request for Extension of Time filed by the Consumer & Competition Advocacy Organizations on October 18, 2021 is GRANTED as described herein.
2. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the dates for filing comments and reply comments in response to the Application are EXTENDED to November 24, 2021 and December 16, 2021, respectively.
3. To request materials in accessible formats (such as Braille, large print, electronic files, or audio format), send an email to: [fcc504@fcc.gov](mailto:fcc504@fcc.gov), or call the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at (202) 418-0530 (voice) or (202) 418-0432 (TTY).
4. For further information concerning this Order, please contact Michele Levy Berlove of the Wireline Competition Bureau, Competition Policy Division, at (202) 418-1477 or [michele.berlove@fcc.gov](mailto:michele.berlove@fcc.gov).
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