



PUBLIC NOTICE

Federal Communications Commission
45 L Street NE
Washington, DC 20554

News Media Information 202 / 418-0500
Internet: <https://www.fcc.gov>

DA 26-171

Released: March 2, 2026

STREAMLINED RESOLUTION OF REQUESTS RELATED TO ACTIONS BY THE UNIVERSAL SERVICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMPANY

CC Docket No. 02-6
WC Docket No. 23-234
WC Docket No. 21-93
WC Docket No. 02-60
WC Docket No. 18-213
WC Docket No. 11-42

Pursuant to our procedure for resolving requests for review, requests for waiver, and petitions for reconsideration of decisions related to actions taken by the Universal Service Administrative Company (USAC) that are consistent with precedent (collectively, Requests), the Wireline Competition Bureau (Bureau) grants, dismisses, or denies the following Requests.¹ The deadline for filing petitions for reconsideration or applications for review concerning the disposition of any of these Requests is 30 days from the release date of this Public Notice.²

Schools and Libraries (E-Rate) **CC Docket No. 02-6**

Dismiss for Failure to Comply with the Commission's Basic Filing Requirements³

¹ See *Streamlined Process for Resolving Requests for Review of Decisions by the Universal Service Administrative Company*, CC Docket Nos. 96-45 and 02-6, WC Docket Nos. 02-60, 06-122, 08-71, 10-90, 11-42, and 14-58, Public Notice, 29 FCC Rcd 11094 (WCB 2014). Sections 54.719(b), 54.1718(a)(1), and 54.2012(b)(2) of the Commission's rules provide that any person aggrieved by an action taken by a division of USAC, after first seeking review at USAC, may seek review from the Commission. Sections 54.719(c), 54.1718(a)(3), and 54.2012(a)(3) of the Commission's rules provide that parties seeking waivers of the Commission's rules shall seek review directly from the Commission. In this Public Notice, we have reclassified as Requests for Waiver any appeals seeking review of a USAC decision that appropriately should have requested a waiver of the Commission's rules. Similarly, we have reclassified as Requests for Review any appeals seeking a waiver of the Commission's rules but that are, in fact, seeking review of a USAC decision.

² See 47 CFR §§ 1.106(f), 1.115(d); see also 47 CFR § 1.4(b)(2) (setting forth the method for computing the amount of time within which persons or entities must act in response to deadlines established by the Commission).

³ 47 CFR § 54.721 (setting forth general filing requirements for requests for review of decisions issued by USAC, including the requirement that the request for review include supporting documentation); see also *Wireline Competition Bureau Reminds Parties of Requirements for Request for Review of Decisions by the Universal Service Administrative Company*, CC Docket Nos. 96-45, 02-6, WC Docket Nos. 02-60, 06-122, 10-90, 11-42, 13-184, 14-58, Public Notice, 29 FCC Rcd 13874 (WCB 2014) (reminding parties submitting appeals to the Bureau of the general filing requirements contained in the Commission's rules which, along with a proper caption and reference to the applicable docket number, require (1) a statement setting forth the party's interest in the matter presented for review; (2) a full statement of relevant, material facts with supporting affidavits and documentation; (3) the question

(continued....)

Regional Office of Education #1, IL, No Application Number Given, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Apr. 7, 2022)

Tech Electronics, Inc. (Whiteside School District 115), IL, Application No. 201003291, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Feb. 10, 2026)

Dismissing Petitions for Reconsideration⁴

Calvary Chapel Christian School, PA, Application No. 251043301, Petition for Reconsideration, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Oct. 24, 2025)⁵

Developmental Disabilities Institute, NY, Application No. 171027139, Petition for Reconsideration, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Apr. 28, 2023)

Responsive Services International, Inc. (Olton Independent School District), TX, Application No. 476223, Petition for Reconsideration, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Sept. 30, 2025)⁶

presented for review, with reference, where appropriate, to the relevant Commission rule, order or statutory provision; and (4) a statement of the relief sought and the relevant statutory or regulatory provision pursuant to which such relief is sought); *Universal Service Contribution Methodology; Request for Review by Alternative Phone, Inc. and Request for Waiver*, WC Docket No. 06-122, Order, 26 FCC Rcd 6079 (WCB 2011) (dismissing without prejudice a request for review that failed to meet the requirements of section 54.721 of the Commission's rules).

⁴ See, e.g., *Requests for Waiver and Review of Decisions of the Universal Service Administrator by Allan Shivers Library et al.; Schools and Libraries Universal Service Support Mechanism*, CC Docket No. 02-6, Order, 29 FCC Rcd 10356, 10357, para. 2 (WCB 2014) (*Allan Shivers Library Order*) (dismissing petitions for reconsideration that fail to identify any material error, omission, or reason warranting reconsideration, and rely on arguments that have been fully considered and rejected by the Bureau within the same proceeding).

⁵ Calvary Chapel Christian School failed to provide any justification for its late FCC Form 471 in its initial waiver request filed with the Commission. On reconsideration, the school now claims that a waiver of the FCC Form 471 filing deadline is warranted because of employee turnover and confusion over the E-Rate rules. In its petition, Calvary Chapel Christian School said an employee new to the E-Rate program was unfamiliar with the rules and believed that a multi-year contract did not require an FCC Form 471 application to be filed each year to receive E-Rate funding under that contract. Our rules state that a petition for reconsideration will be entertained only if the petition relies on facts or arguments that have changed or were unknown to the petitioner when it previously filed at the Commission. Because the Petitioner did not make this argument when it first filed the waiver request with the Commission on July 16, 2025, we dismiss the petition because it relies on an argument that was not raised previously. See 47 CFR § 1.106(b)(2), (c)(2) (stating that a petition for reconsideration will be entertained only if the petition relies on facts or arguments that have changed or were unknown to the petitioner when it previously filed at the Commission, unless it is required in the public interest). As an alternative and independent basis for rejecting this petition, we also deny the petition on the merits. Consistent with precedent, we find that employee confusion or misunderstanding of the E-Rate rules does not rise to the level of special circumstances required for a waiver of the Commission's rules. See, e.g., *Requests for Waiver by Nederland Independent School District, et al, Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, Changes to the Board of Directors of the National Exchange Carrier Association, Inc.*, CC Docket Nos. 96-45 and 97-21, Order, 15 FCC Rcd 19544, 19545 (WCB 2002) (*Nederland Independent School District Order*) (“[W]e have consistently held that personnel disruptions, employee medical conditions or employee confusion or misunderstanding about SLD rules and deadlines do not rise to the level of special circumstances required for a waiver.”). For these reasons, we dismiss this Petition for Reconsideration.

⁶ Responsive Services International, Inc. seeks reconsideration of the Bureau's decision denying Olton Independent School District's first petition for reconsideration because the petitioner failed to file its first petition for reconsideration within 30 days of the initial Bureau decision, as required under the Communications Act of 1934 and the Commission's rules. See 47 U.S.C. § 405(a); 47 CFR § 1.106(f) (requiring petitions for reconsideration to

(continued....)

Rosenbaum Yeshiva of North Jersey, NJ, Application No. 231014449, Petition for Reconsideration, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Jan. 29, 2026)

Late-Filed Petitions for Reconsideration⁷

Concord Christian Academy, NH, Application No. 251043488, Petition for Reconsideration, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Feb. 5, 2026)

Winton Woods City Schools, OH, Application No. 161055525, Petition for Reconsideration, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Feb. 19, 2020)

Granted⁸

*Competitive Bidding – Valid Vendor Selection*⁹

Labette County Unified School District 506, KS, Application No. 171027986, Request for Review, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Dec. 13, 2022, ex parte filed Feb. 10, 2026)

be filed within 30 days of an adverse decision); *Streamlined Resolution of Requests Related to Actions by the Universal Service Administrative Company*, CC Docket No. 02-6, WC Docket Nos. 02-60, 24-686, 24-134, 10-90, 06-122, Public Notice, DA 25-433, n.36 (WCB rel. June 2, 2025) (*June 2025 USF Streamlined Public Notice*). Because the time period for filing petitions for reconsideration is prescribed by statute, the Commission may not waive or extend the filing period. *See Reuters Ltd. v. FCC*, 781 F.2d 946, 952 (D.C. Cir. 1986) (“[W]e conclude that the Commission acted beyond its lawful authority when it entertained the belated petition for reconsideration.”); *see also Application of Metromedia Inc.*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 56 FCC 2d 909 (1975) (stating that the Commission may not waive 30-day filing period to accept a petition for reconsideration filed one day late); *Applications of Fortuna Systems Corp.*, Order on Reconsideration, 3 FCC Rcd 5122, 5123 (Com. Car. Bur. 1988). Only in extremely unusual circumstances where the “petitioner can show that its failure to file in a ... timely manner resulted from ‘extraordinary circumstances indicating that justice would thus be served,’” can the 30-day deadline be waived. *Gardner v. FCC*, 530 F.2d 1086 (D.C. Cir. 1976) (allowing a waiver of the 30-day filing deadline because the late filing was substantially due to the Commission’s failure to give personal notice of the decision). We find that Responsive Services International, Inc.’s claim that more than 30 days was needed to coordinate with other parties involved in this matter does not constitute extraordinary circumstances required to waive the 30-day deadline.

⁷ *See, e.g., Petitions for Reconsideration by Rockwood School District and Yakutat School District; Schools and Libraries Universal Service Support Mechanism*, CC Docket No. 02-6, Order, 26 FCC Rcd 13004 (WCB 2011) (*Rockwood School District Order*) (dismissing two petitions for reconsideration because they were filed more than 30 days after the date of the Bureau’s decisions); 47 CFR § 1.106(f) (requiring petitions for reconsideration to be filed within 30 days of the date of the Bureau’s decision).

⁸ We remand these applications to USAC and direct USAC to complete its review of the applications and issue a funding decision based on a complete review and analysis, no later than 90 calendar days from the release date of this Public Notice. In remanding these applications to USAC, we make no finding as to the ultimate eligibility of the equipment/services or the petitioners’ applications. We also waive sections 54.507(d) and 54.514(a) of the Commission’s rules and direct USAC to waive any procedural deadline that might be necessary to effectuate our ruling. *See* 47 CFR § 54.507(d) (requiring non-recurring services to be implemented by September 30 following the close of the funding year); 47 CFR § 54.514(a) (codifying the invoice filing deadline rule).

⁹ Consistent with our obligation to conduct a *de novo* review of appeals of decisions made by USAC, we grant this request for review. *See* 47 CFR § 54.723. Based on the facts and circumstances of these cases, we disagree with USAC’s conclusion and find that Labette County Unified School District 506 properly selected its vendor in accordance with the E-Rate program’s rules and procedures. *See, e.g., Request for Review of a Decision of the Universal Service Administrator by Grand Rapids; Schools and Libraries Universal Service Support Mechanism*, CC Docket No. 02-6, Order, 23 FCC Rcd 15413, 15416, para. 6 (WCB 2008) (*Grand Rapids Order*) (conducting *de novo* review of the facts and circumstances to determine whether USAC’s decision was in error).

*Discount Calculation – Documentation Submitted on Appeal Demonstrates Compliance*¹⁰

Global Community Charter, NY, Application Nos. 251039872, 251041679, Request for Review, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Sept. 17, 2025, supplemented Dec. 8, 2025)¹¹

Putnam Academy of Arts and Sciences, Inc., FL, Application No. 251003386, Request for Review, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Sept. 23, 2025)

*Equipment Manufacture or Equivalent*¹²

Sweet Springs School District R7, MO, Application No. 241018369, Request for Review, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Sept. 17, 2025)

*Granting Applicant Additional Time to Respond*¹³

Southern Westchester BOCES, NY, Application No. 241013407, Request for Review, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed July 16, 2024)

*Ministerial and Clerical Error*¹⁴

Alvarado Independent School District, TX, Application No. 251042761, Request for Waiver, CC

¹⁰ See, e.g., *Requests for Review of the Decision of the Universal Service Administrator by Academia Claret et al.; Schools and Libraries Universal Service Support Mechanism*, CC Docket No. 02-6, Order, 21 FCC Rcd 10703, 10709, para. 13 (WCB 2006) (*Academia Claret Order*) (granting discount calculation appeals when it appears that the applicants may have fully complied with USAC’s procedures).

¹¹ We find that Global Community Charter’s appeal to USAC for Application No. 251039872 was timely filed and we now resolve the filing on the merits. See *infra* note 16.

¹² See *Request for Review of the Decision of the Universal Service Administrator by Queen of Peace High School; Schools and Libraries Universal Service Support Mechanism*, CC Docket No. 02-6, Order, 26 FCC Rcd 16466, para 1 (WCB 2011) (*Queen of Peace Order*) (noting that the E-Rate program competitive bidding rules prohibit applicants from including a particular manufacturer’s name, brand, product or service in an FCC Form 470 or RFPs unless they also use the words “or equivalent” in such a description and consider alternatives). Although Sweet Springs School District R7’s request for proposal (RFP) makes reference to a specific make and model, the narrative on its FCC Form 470 references its RFP and states that “make/model all equivalent brands will be considered.” We find that this reference to a particular piece of equipment, with the “or equivalent” language, does not indicate that the service provider was involved in the district’s competitive bidding process.

¹³ See, e.g., *Requests for Review of the Decision of the Universal Service Administrator by Alpaugh Unified School District et al.; Schools and Libraries Universal Service Support Mechanism*, CC Docket No. 02-6, Order, 22 FCC Rcd 6035 (2007) (*Alpaugh Unified School District Order*); *Requests for Review of Decisions of the Universal Service Administrator by Ben Gamla Palm Beach et al.; Schools and Libraries Universal Service Support Mechanism*, CC Docket No. 02-6, Order, 29 FCC Rcd 1876 (WCB 2014) (*Ben Gamla Palm Beach Order*) (granting requests for review of applicants that had been denied funding because they failed to respond to USAC’s request for information within the USAC-specified time frame).

¹⁴ See, e.g., *Requests for Waiver and Review of Decisions of the Universal Service Administrator by Ann Arbor Public Schools et al.; Schools and Libraries Universal Service Support Mechanism*, CC Docket No. 02-6, Order, 25 FCC Rcd 17319, 17320, nn.5, 9, 12, 19 (WCB 2010) (*Ann Arbor Public Schools Order*) (permitting correction when applicant entered the wrong FCC Form 470 number, wrong billed entity number, or wrong billed entity number/worksheet number on their FCC Form 471; permitting a correction when applicant entered the monthly charge as the annual charge; explaining that failure to enter an item from the source list onto the application is a ministerial/clerical error that can be permitted correction; permitting a correction when the applicant entered the wrong expiration date for a contract; and permitting a correction when the applicant selected the wrong term of service).

Docket No. 02-6 (filed Jan. 20, 2026)

Centerville Community School District, IA, Application No. 251039171, Request for Waiver, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Sept. 26, 2025)

River Springs Charter School, CA, Application No. 251041447, Request for Waiver, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Nov. 13, 2025)

Ronan School District 30, MT, Application No. 251012887, Request for Waiver, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Oct. 2, 2025)

St. Christopher School, IN, Application No. 251010749, Request for Waiver, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Jan. 2, 2026)

*Ministerial and Clerical Error – Invoicing*¹⁵

CVIN, LLC (CENIC-Corporation For Education Network Initiatives In California), CA, Application No. 231020202, Request for Waiver, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Dec. 9, 2025)

Eagle Broadband, LLC (Albion Public Library), NE, Application No. 241039666, Request for Waiver, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Oct. 30, 2025)

Webb Consolidated Independent School District, TX, Application No. 241035095, Request for Waiver, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Jan. 28, 2026)

*Timely Filed Appeal*¹⁶

Venus Independent School District, TX, Application No. 251024297, Request for Waiver, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Jan. 8, 2026)

*USAC Decision Issued After Invoice Deadline*¹⁷

Kings Community Action Organization, Inc., CA, Application No. 211012939, Request for

¹⁵ See *Requests for Review and/or Waiver of Decisions of the Universal Service Administrator by Accomack County Public School et al.; Schools and Libraries Universal Service Support Mechanism*, CC Docket No. 02-6, Order, 38 FCC Rcd 330, 334-35, 337, paras. 7-9 (WCB 2023) (*Accomack County Public School Order*) (granting a waiver where the E-Rate invoice filer inadvertently entered the wrong application or funding request number on a timely-filed BEAR or SPI form and granting a waiver where the appeals involved a procedural error on the part of the E-Rate participant, not a failure to adhere to a core program requirement or a misuse of funds).

¹⁶ See, e.g., *Request for Review of a Decision of the Universal Service Administrator by Sundale Elementary School District; Schools and Libraries Universal Service Support Mechanism*, CC Docket No. 02-6, Order, 29 FCC Rcd 4124 (WCB 2014) (*Sundale Elementary School District Order*) (remanding an appeal to USAC that was timely filed); 47 CFR § 54.720(a). We find that the appeal was timely filed with USAC in relation to the revised funding commitment decision letter for a service substitution. On remand, USAC should work with Venus Independent School District to correct the mistakes detailed in its Oct. 22, 2026 appeal.

¹⁷ 47 CFR § 54.514(a)(3); see also *Modernizing the E-Rate Program for Schools and Libraries*, WC Docket No. 13-184, Order, 35 FCC Rcd 14426, 14431, para. 15 (2020) (*2020 Invoicing Rule Modification Order*) (authorizing the Bureau to grant a waiver in instances where a program participant was unable to timely submit an invoice because they were awaiting a post-commitment decision from USAC, or received a decision approving a post-commitment request or granting an appeal of a previously denied or reduced funding request after the invoice filing deadline had passed).

Waiver, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Feb. 27, 2023)

Denied

*Competitive Bidding – No FCC Form 470 Filed*¹⁸

Colegio Santisima Trinidad, Inc., PR, Application No. 241020925, Request for Review, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed June 11, 2024)

*Competitive Bidding – Price Not Primary Factor in Vendor Selection*¹⁹

Keller Independent School District, TX, Application No. 201039285, Request for Review and/or Waiver, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Jan. 28, 2023, supplemented May 17, 2023)

*Failure to Repay Debt in Timely Manner – Red Light Rule*²⁰

Coleman Public Library, TX, Application No. 251003181, Request for Waiver, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Dec. 23, 2025)

¹⁸ See 47 CFR § 54.504(c) (stating that applicants must seek competitive bids for E-Rate eligible services by posting a Form 470 and waiting at least 28 days before entering into a contract for services); *Application for Review of the Decision of the Universal Service Administrator by Aberdeen School District, et al.; Schools and Libraries Universal Service Support Mechanism*, CC Docket No. 02-6, Order, 22 FCC Rcd 8757, 8763, para. 10 (2007) (*Aberdeen School District Order*) (denying an appeal for an applicant that requested E-Rate program funds without posting a new FCC Form 470 for the services).

¹⁹ See, e.g., *Request for Review of the Decision of the Universal Service Administrator by Ysleta Independent School District et al.; Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service; Changes to the Board of Directors of the National Exchange Carrier Association, Inc.*, CC Docket Nos. 96-45, 97-21, Order, 18 FCC Rcd 26407, 26429, para. 50 (2003) (*Ysleta Order*) (concluding that price must be the primary factor in selecting a winning bid); see also 47 C.F.R. §§ 54.503, 54.511 (requiring applicants to use price as the primary factor in the vendor selection process). We also see no reason to waive the Commission's competitive bidding requirements under the facts presented by the petitioner. In determining the winning bidder, Keller Independent School District weighed two vendors equally in the price category, even though the quote not selected was \$96,903 less expensive. The Commission has previously indicated its concern about practices that undermine the framework of the competitive bidding process. See *Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service*, CC Docket No. 96-45, Report and Order, 12 FCC Rcd 8776, 9076-80, paras. 570-80 (1997) (*Universal Service First Report and Order*) (requiring applicants to conduct a fair and open competitive bidding process when seeking support for eligible products and services); *Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service; Access Charge Reform; Price Cap Performance Review for Local Exchange Carriers; Transport Rate Structure and Pricing; End User Common Line Charge*, CC Docket Nos. 96-45, 96-262, 94-1, 91-213, and 95-72, Report and Order and Fourth Order on Reconsideration, 13 FCC Rcd 5318, 5425-26, para. 185 (1997) (stating that competitive bidding is a key component of the Commission's effort to ensure that universal service funds support services that satisfy the precise needs of an institution, and that the services are provided at the lowest possible rates).

²⁰ See 47 CFR § 1.1910(b)(3) (requiring the Commission to dismiss any application if a debtor is delinquent or has not made other satisfactory arrangements to pay within 30 days of the date of notice); see, also e.g., *Requests for Review of Decisions of the Universal Service Administrator by Net56, Inc., Wheeling School District 21, Schools and Libraries Support Mechanism*, CC Docket No. 02-6, Order, 28 FCC Rcd 13122, 13126, para 6 (WCB 2013) (*Net56 Order*) (denying E-Rate applicant's request for a waiver of the red light rule and dismissing their funding year 2010 application where the applicant's only justification for not paying the debt was that it was never notified by USAC). Coleman Public Library argues that its funding year 2025 applications should be funded because, even though it was on red light status when it applied for funding, it eventually repaid the debt. We note that subsequent repayment of the delinquent amount that is in violation of the red light rule does not reverse the dismissal of the application. See *id.* (denying funding of applications for E-Rate support even though the red light debt had been satisfied).

*Recovery for Ineligible Services*²¹

Fairfield School District, CT, Application No. 231010695, Request for Review, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Nov. 14, 2024)

*Late-Filed FCC Form 486*²²

Plainfield Public School District, NJ, Application No. 241030560, Request for Review, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Jan. 5, 2026)

*Late-Filed Invoice or Invoice Deadline Extension*²³

NE Colorado Cellular, Inc. (Akron Head Start), CO, Application No. 241011984, Request for Waiver, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Jan. 16, 2026)

Puerto Rico Telephone Company (Puerto Rico Department of Education), PR, Application No. 181039479, Request for Waiver, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Sept. 1, 2021)

*Untimely Filed Appeals or Waiver Requests*²⁴

Al Madrasa Al Islamiya, NY, Application No. 161022039, Request for Waiver, CC Docket No.

²¹ In the *Commitment Adjustment Implementation Order*, the Commission established procedures to recover funds disbursed to parties that obtained the funds in violation of the Commission's E-rate program. See *Changes to the Board of Directors of the National Exchange Carrier Association, Inc., Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service*, 97-21, 96-45, Order, 15 FCC Rcd 22975 (2001) (*Commitment Adjustment Implementation Order*). In the *Schools and Libraries Fourth Report and Order*, the Commission modified the rules governing COMAD recovery actions to allow USAC to pursue recovery actions against the party responsible for the violation such as the school, library, or service provider. See *Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, Changes to the Board of Directors for the National Exchange Carrier Association, Inc., Schools and Libraries Universal Service Support Mechanism*, CC Docket Nos. 96-45, 97-21 and 02-6, Order on Reconsideration and Fourth Report and Order, 19 FCC Rcd 15252, 15255-15257, paras. 10-15 (2004) (*Schools and Libraries Fourth Report and Order*). In this case, USAC correctly sought recovery from the school, which procured the services and entered into an agreement with the service provider for the services later found to be ineligible.

²² See, e.g., *Requests for Waiver of Decisions of the Universal Service Administrator by Archdiocese of New Orleans et al.; Schools and Libraries Universal Service Support Mechanism*, CC Docket No. 02-6, Order, 31 FCC Rcd 11747, 11750, para. 10 (WCB 2016) (*Archdiocese of New Orleans Order*) (granting relief only for late-filed FCC Forms 486 that were filed no later than 120 days after the last day to receive service for the funding request at issue and where the applicants have demonstrated good cause for the late filing).

²³ See, e.g., *Requests for Waiver of Decisions of the Universal Service Administrator by Ada School District et al., Schools and Libraries Universal Service Support Mechanism*, CC Docket No. 02-6, Order, 31 FCC Rcd 3834, 3836, para. 7 (WCB 2016) (*Ada School District Order*) (denying petitioners' waiver requests for invoice filing deadline extensions who failed to seek an extension before the invoice filing deadline and did not demonstrate extraordinary circumstances to justify waiving the Commission's rules).

²⁴ See, e.g., *Requests for Review of the Decisions of the Universal Service Administrator by Agra Public Schools I-134; Schools and Libraries Universal Service Mechanism*, CC Docket No. 02-6, Order, 25 FCC Rcd 5684, 5688, para. 6 (WCB 2010) (*Agra Public Schools Order*); *Requests for Waiver or Review of Decisions of the Universal Service Administrator by Bound Brook School District; Schools and Libraries Universal Service Mechanism*, CC Docket No. 02-6, Order, 29 FCC Rcd 5823, 5823, para. 1 (WCB 2014) (*Bound Brook School District Order*) (denying requests for review and/or waiver on the grounds that the petitioners failed to: (1) submit their appeals either to the Commission or to USAC within 60 days or failed to submit their waiver requests to the Commission within 60 days as required by section 54.720(a) and (b) of the Commission's rules; and (2) did not demonstrate special circumstances required for the Commission to waive the rule).

02-6 (filed May 4, 2025)

Biblioteca Electronica Fuente de Esperanza, PR, Application Nos. 251004295, 251004311, Request for Waiver, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Jan. 23, 2026)

Convent of the Sacred Heart, NY, Application No. 251027225, Request for Waiver, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed Aug. 5, 2025)

Vero Fiber Networks (Illinois Department of Innovation and Technology Consortium), IL, Application No. 231023543, Request for Waiver, CC Docket No. 02-6 (filed May 5, 2025)

Schools and Libraries Cybersecurity Pilot Program
WC Docket No. 23-234

Denied

*Untimely Filed Appeals or Waiver Requests*²⁵

The Academy for Urban Scholars Consortium, OH, Application No. CBR253000979, Request for Reconsideration, WC Docket No. 23-234 (filed Feb, 2 2026)

Emergency Connectivity Fund Program
WC Docket No. 21-93

Partially Granted

*Waiver of the ECF Invoice Filing Deadline*²⁶

²⁵ 47 CFR § 54.2012(b)(2) (requiring parties seeking a waiver of the Commission's rules to file the request for review or waiver within 30 days). We find that the Petitioners did not file a request for waiver within 30 days of the deadline, September 15, 2025, and did not demonstrate special circumstances needed to justify a waiver of the Commission's rules. See 47 CFR § 1.3; *NetworkIP, LLC v. FCC*, 548 F.3d 116, 125-128 (D.C. Cir. 2008) (*NetworkIP LLC*); *Northeast Cellular Telephone Co. v. FCC*, 897 F.2d 1164, 1166 (D.C. Cir. 1990) (*Northeast Cellular Telephone*) (finding that a waiver of the Commission's rules is only appropriate if both (i) special circumstances warrant a deviation from the general rule, and (ii) such deviation will serve the public interest.). On the merits, we also find that Petitioners were provided 181 days (i.e., 6 months) to complete and submit their Cybersecurity Pilot FCC Form 471 and we do not find the Petitioners provided the justification required to waive or extend this deadline.

²⁶ See, e.g., *Requests for Waiver by Bluum USA Inc et al.; Establishing Emergency Connectivity Fund to Close the Homework Gap*, WC Docket No. 21-93, Order, 39 FCC 1049, 1051-52, paras. 9 (WCB 2024) (extending the ECF program's invoice filing deadline for funding requests by 60 days because the applicant or service provider was unable to timely file due to additional time needed to gather invoices). Carleton Project also seeks a waiver of the appeal deadline for a service substitution decision issued by USAC on June 18, 2025 that reduced the school's funding commitment from \$6,578 to \$2,988. That funding has been de-obligated and we do not find special circumstances to waive the 30-day appeal filing deadline. See, e.g., *Agra Public Schools Order*, 25 FCC Rcd at 5684; *Bound Brook School District Order*, 29 FCC Rcd at 5823 (denying requests for review and/or waiver on the grounds that the petitioners failed to 1) submit their appeals either to the Commission or to USAC within 60 days; or failed to submit their waiver requests to the Commission within 60 days as required by the Commission's rules; and 2) did not show special circumstances necessary for the Commission to waive the deadline). We note that the Commission adopted a shortened waiver and appeal timeframe of 30 days in the Emergency Connectivity Fund Program due to the short-term, emergency nature of the program. See 47 CFR § 54.1718; *Establishing Emergency Connectivity Fund to Close the Homework Gap*, WC Docket No. 21-93, Order, 36 FCC Rcd 8696, 8746, para. 107 (2021) (*Emergency Connectivity Fund Report and Order*). As such, requests for waiver of ECF Program rules that

(continued....)

Carleton Project, ME, Application No. ECF202202179, Request for Waiver, WC Docket No. 21-93 (filed Dec. 8, 2025)

Denied

*1:1 Device Initiatives*²⁷

Haddon Heights School District, NJ, Application No. ECF202208621, Request for Review, WC Docket No. 21-93 (filed Feb. 29, 2024)

*Unreasonable Support Amounts*²⁸

Montclair Child Development Center, NJ, Application No. ECF202106760, Request for Waiver, WC Docket No. 21-93 (filed Feb. 5, 2024)

*Untimely Filed Appeals or Waiver Requests*²⁹

West Palm Beach Junior Academy, FL, Application No. ECF202209492, Request for Waiver, WC Docket No. 21-93 (filed Dec. 30, 2025)

Rural Health Care Program
WC Docket No. 02-60

Denied

are filed more than 30 days after a deadline or decision will be denied and the request to increase the commitment amount is denied. Pursuant to this decision, USAC is directed to extend the invoice filing deadline for the funding request for the current obligation amount of \$2,988 and Carleton Project may file reimbursements requests up to that amount.

²⁷ See, e.g., *Request for Review and/or Waiver of Decision of the Universal Service Administrator by Child Development Resources of Ventura County, Inc.; Establishing Emergency Connectivity Fund to Close the Homework Gap*, WC Docket No. 21-93, Order, DA 26-138, para. 8 (WCB 2026) (*CDR Order*) (denying a request for review when, among other flaws, the applicant requested support for a 1:1 device initiative without evidence that a survey or other determination of need was conducted). See also *Emergency Connectivity Fund Report and Order*, 36 FCC Rcd at 8736 n.229 (addressing 1:1 initiatives that provide devices to all students regardless of need and stating that the Commission did not find “it appropriate to support the purchase of devices or services for students that already have access to an adequate device”); *Emergency Connectivity Fund FAQs*, Question 6.12, <https://www.fcc.gov/emergency-connectivity-fund-faqs> (last visited Feb. 10, 2026) (stating that applicants cannot request funding for all students as part of a 1:1 initiative and must only seek support for students and school staff who lacked access to connected devices or services).

²⁸ See, e.g., *CDR Order*, para. 8 (denying a request for review when, among other flaws, the applicant did not provide sufficient evidence that the cost of the equipment was reasonable, nor that it represented the actual costs of the equipment).

²⁹ See, e.g., *Agra Public Schools Order*, 25 FCC Rcd at 5688, para. 6; *Bound Brook School District Order*, 29 FCC Rcd at 5823, para. 1 (denying requests for review and/or waiver on the grounds that the petitioners failed to: (1) submit their appeals either to the Commission or to USAC within 60 days or failed to submit their waiver requests to the Commission within 60 days as required by the Commission’s rules; and (2) did not demonstrate special circumstances required for the Commission to waive the rule). We note that the Commission adopted a shortened waiver and appeal timeframe of 30 days in the Emergency Connectivity Fund Program due to the short-term, emergency nature of the program. See 47 CFR § 54.1718; *Emergency Connectivity Fund Report and Order*, 36 FCC Rcd at 8746, para. 107. As such, requests for waiver of ECF Program rules that are filed more than 30 days after a deadline or decision will be denied.

*Waiver of the 60-Day Appeal Deadline*³⁰

Coastal Family Health Center – Leakesville, MS, Request for Waiver, WC Docket No. 02-60, Funding Request Nos. 2222622, 2223081, 2223083, 2223084, 2223082, 2223086, 2223093, 2223097, 2223098, 2223099, 2223100, 2223101, 2223102, 2223103, 2223104, 2223105, 2223106, 2223107, 2223108, 2223109, 2223110, 2223111 (filed May 11, 2023)

Waiver of the Invoice Filing Deadline

Virginia Department of Health, VA, Request for Waiver, WC Docket No 02-60, Funding Request No. RHC20230017914 (filed Nov. 13, 2025)³¹

Central Utah Counseling Center, UT, Request for Waiver, WC Docket No. 02-60, Funding Request Nos. 23279211, 23279191, 23279181, 23276981, 23279221, 23279231, 23279201 (filed Aug. 21, 2025)³²

Connected Care Pilot Program
WC Docket No. 18-213**Granted***Waiver of the Service Delivery Deadline*³³

New England Telehealth Consortium, ME, *Sua Sponte* Waiver, WC Docket No. 18-213, Funding

³⁰ See *id.* Coastal Family Health Center received Funding Commitment Letters for 22 sites on July 14, 2022, but did not submit their appeal until February 22, 2023, several months after the 60-day appeal deadline. The petitioner did not demonstrate special circumstances required to justify waiver of the appeal filing deadline.

³¹ See *Requests for Waiver by University of Virginia Health System Center for Telehealth and Lumos Networks, Inc., Rural Health Care Universal Service Support Mechanism*, CC Docket No. 02-60, Order, 38 FCC Rcd 1041, 1042-43, paras. 5-7 (WCB 2023) (noting that a health care provider should show specific “special circumstances” warranting an invoice filing deadline waiver due to a service provider’s failure to timely submit its FCC Form 463); *Requests for Waiver or Review of Decisions of the Universal Service Administrator by Indiana Telehealth Network, et al., Rural Health Care Support Mechanism*, WC Docket No. 02-60, Order, 33 FCC Rcd 12341, 12343, para. 4 (WCB 2018) (denying requests for waiver where the petitioners failed to present compelling explanations for waivers of the invoice filing deadline). Virginia Department of Health states that the time before the filing deadline “was not sufficient for both” the health care provider and the service provider “to complete the review and approval of the [FCC] Form 463.” However, this explanation does not demonstrate sufficient “special circumstances” in support of the provider’s request.

³² See *id.* The health care provider, Central Utah Counseling Center (CUCC), explains that “[t]ypically, in each year prior to FY 2023, when CUCC has received” Funding Commitment Letters from USAC, CUCC’s Chief Financial Officer (CFO) forwarded these emails to the service provider, Central Utah Telephone, Inc. It states further that, in FY 2023, the CFO did not do so. The service provider, moreover, independently received the FCL and should have known to be looking for the invoicing form. The petitioner’s explanation does not demonstrate sufficient “special circumstances” in support of the service provider’s request, as the health care provider’s own error contributed to the failure to meet the invoice filing deadline and its failure was not due to circumstances beyond its control.

³³ *Promoting Telehealth for Low-Income Consumers*, WC Docket No. 18-213, Second Report and Order, 36 FCC Rcd 10642, 10662-63, para. 48 (2021) (delegating authority to the Wireline Competition Bureau to waive certain program deadlines and grant limited extensions of deadlines). We grant a waiver of the service delivery deadline until October 31, 2026, and direct USAC to issue a new funding commitment letter consistent with the new service delivery deadline.

Request No. 24320671

Lifeline Program
WC Docket No. 11-42

Dismissed

*Untimely Filed Request for Review*³⁴

Representative Identification 10216UFS4, Request for Review, WC Docket No. 11-42 (filed Jan. 14, 2026)

Representative Identification G0SGW0F9U, Request for Review, WC Docket No. 11-42 (filed Jan. 26, 2026, supplemented Feb. 3, 2026)

For additional information concerning this Public Notice, please contact James Bachtell in the Telecommunications Access Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, at james.bachtell@fcc.gov or (202) 418-2694.

- FCC -

³⁴ See, e.g., *Requests for Review of the Decisions of the Universal Service Administrator by Agra Public Schools I-134; Schools and Libraries Universal Service Mechanism*, CC Docket No. 02-6, Order, 25 FCC Rcd 5684, 5688, para. 6 (WCB 2010); *Requests for Waiver or Review of Decisions of the Universal Service Administrator by Bound Brook School District; Schools and Libraries Universal Service Mechanism*, CC Docket No. 02-6, Order and Order on Reconsideration, 29 FCC Rcd 5823, 5823, para. 1 (WCB 2014) (denying requests for review and/or waiver on the grounds that the petitioners failed to: (1) submit their appeals either to the Commission or to USAC within 60 days or failed to submit their waiver requests to the Commission within 60 days as required by the Commission's rules; and (2) did not demonstrate special circumstances required for the Commission to waive the rule). We also dismiss Representative Identification G0SGW0F9U's request for review of USAC's decision because it failed to first appeal the decision to USAC. 47 CFR § 54.719(a)-(b) (providing that any party aggrieved by an action taken by USAC must first seek review from USAC, not the Commission); see also *Request for Review of a Decision of the Universal Service Administrator by La Canada Unified School District; Schools and Libraries Universal Service Support Mechanism*, CC Docket No. 02-6, Order, 30 FCC Rcd 4729, 4729, para. 2 (WCB 2015) (dismissing an appeal that properly belonged before USAC pursuant to Commission rules).