

³ 5 U.S.C. § 553(b)(B).

notice and comment are “unnecessary” when “the administrative rule is a routine determination, insignificant in nature and impact, and inconsequential to the industry and to the public.”⁴

4. We have identified 11 rule provisions—covering 39 regulatory burdens, 7,194 words, and 16 pages—that plainly do not serve the public interest any longer because they govern obsolete technology,⁵ outdated marketplace conditions,⁶ expired deadlines,⁷ or repealed legal obligations.⁸ Applying the “good cause” standard discussed above, we conclude that prior notice and comment are unnecessary before repealing the rules identified in Appendix A.

5. *Direct Final Rule Process.* At times when the Commission has found prior notice and comment unnecessary before modifying or repealing rules, it simply adopted the relevant rule change without any additional process.⁹ Although we reserve the right to proceed in that manner, we elect in this decision to proceed using what commonly is known as a “direct final rule” process.¹⁰ By proceeding through a direct final rule, the Commission chooses to provide *expanded* opportunities for public comment when it is not legally required to do so under the “good cause” standard.¹¹ Under a direct final rule process, rule changes are adopted without prior notice and comment, but accompanied by an

⁴ *Util. Solid Waste Activities Grp. v. EPA*, 236 F.3d 749, 755 (D.C. Cir. 2001).

⁵ 47 CFR § 79.101 (regulating close-captioning for analog broadcast television receivers).

⁶ 47 CFR § 63.65 (1963 regulation requiring applicants to file requests “in quintuplicate” to close a “public toll station” (such as a telephone booth) in communities where the applicant will continue to provide service through another toll station and to show, *inter alia*, the distance between the toll stations and the average number of messages send-paid and received-collect for the past six months).

⁷ 47 CFR §§ 24.239-253 (relating to post-auction cost-sharing obligations that sunset in 2005).

⁸ 47 CFR § 1.789 (relating to telegraph regulations repealed 14 years ago).

⁹ *See, e.g., Promoting Telehealth in Rural America*, WC Docket No. 17-310, Order on Reconsideration, Second Report and Order, Order, and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 38 FCC Rcd 827, 855-56 (2023); *Modernization of Media Regulation Initiative; Revisions To Cable Television Rate Regulations, et al.*, MB Dockets No. 17-105 and 02-144, Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Report and Order, 33 FCC Rcd 10549, 10569-70, para. 41 (2018); *Delete, Delete, Delete et al.*, GN Docket No. 25-133, Order, DA 25-621 (CGB July 14, 2025); *Delete, Delete, Delete et al.*, GN Docket No. 25-133, Order, DA 25-613 (WCB July 11, 2025); *2014 Quadrennial Regulatory Review, et al.*, MB Docket No. 14-50, Order, 36 FCC Rcd 9354, 9355, para. 2 (MB 2021); *Amendment of Section 1.80 of the Commission's Rules; Implementing Section 2 of the Preventing Illegal Radio Abuse Through Enforcement Act (Pirate Act)*, Order, 35 FCC Rcd 14591, 14591, para. 1 (EB, OMD 2020); *Accelerating Wireless Broadband Deployment By Removing Barriers To Infrastructure Investment*, WT Docket No. 17-79, Order, 34 FCC Rcd 9366 (WTB 2019).

¹⁰ *See, e.g., Administrative Conference of the United States, Recommendation 2024-6, Public Engagement in Agency Rulemaking Under the Good Cause Exemption*, 89 Fed. Reg. 106406, 106408-09 (Dec. 30, 2024) (ACUS Public Engagement and Good Cause Recommendation) (discussing the “direct final rule” process); *Sierra Club v. EPA*, 99 F.3d 1551, 1554 & n.4 (10th Cir. 1996) (discussing the direct final rule process used by the EPA). Although the FCC is not bound by the *ACUS Public Engagement and Good Cause Recommendation* or the practices employed by other agencies, we have considered them to the extent that they provided a useful point of reference subject to tailoring appropriate to our specific circumstances.

¹¹ We thus reject claims that our actions somehow seek to evade the APA or neglect the proper importance of notice and comment. *See, e.g., Public Knowledge et al. July 17 Ex Parte Letter* at 1, 4; *TechFreedom July 17 Ex Parte Letter* at 4-7. Further, although the Commission has adopted specific rules codified in the Code of Federal Regulations related to notice-and-comment rulemaking procedures, *see* 47 CFR part 1, subpart C, there is no legal requirement that we adopt rules before employing processes permitted by the APA and the Communications Act. *See, e.g., 47 U.S.C. § 154(j)* (absent previously-specified procedural obligations to the contrary “[t]he Commission may conduct its proceedings in such manner as will best conduce to the proper dispatch of business and to the ends of justice”).

opportunity for the public to file comments—and if we conclude that significant adverse comments have been filed, the relevant rule changes would not take effect until after a full notice and comment process.¹²

6. In particular, we will publish this item adopting direct final rules in the Federal Register, and allow for comment from interested parties within 10 days of Federal Register publication.¹³ Until 10 days after Federal Register publication, this shall be a “permit-but-disclose” proceeding for purposes of our *ex parte* rules.¹⁴ Because this comment process is directed toward the discrete objective of the direct final rule process, and to avoid unwarranted delay in that process, we prohibit filings addressing the rule changes contemplated in this *Direct Final Rule* more than 10 days after Federal Register publication, absent further direction from the Commission published in the Federal Register.¹⁵ This both accords with the purpose of the comment process for direct final rules, and is similar (though not identical) to actions the Commission has taken in other contexts to provide a defined end-point for public filings to enable the Commission to focus its attention on the submissions already before it.¹⁶

7. The direct final rules will be effective 60 days after Federal Register publication. To the extent that the Commission receives comments on these direct final rules, we will evaluate whether they are significant adverse comments that warrant further procedures before changing the rules. In our assessment, we plan to be guided by ACUS’s recommendation that “[a]n agency should consider any

¹² *ACUS Public Engagement and Good Cause Recommendation*, 89 Fed. Reg. at 10609, para. 2(d).

¹³ See, e.g., 47 CFR § 1.45(b) (“Oppositions to any motion, petition, or request may be filed within 10 days after the original pleading is filed.”); *id.* § 1.106(g) (“Oppositions to a petition for reconsideration shall be filed within 10 days after the petition is filed.”); *id.* § 1.1302(b) (“Any party who desires to preserve the right to appeal [a presiding officer’s ruling terminates a hearing proceeding] shall file a notice of appeal within 10 days after the ruling is released.”). Although some commenters advocate for a longer comment period such as the 30 day period reflected in ACUS’s recommendations, see, e.g., Public Knowledge *et al.* July 17 *Ex Parte* Letter at 4-5; TechFreedom July 17 *Ex Parte* Letter at 4-5 & n.15, we are not persuaded to adopt such timeframes for this particular direct final rule. Under the APA’s good cause exception, we would have been justified proceeding immediately to rule as we have in the past without providing an opportunity for comment, but have elected to employ direct final rule procedures to guide future action. An unnecessarily long comment period would simply represent an unwarranted penalty on the Commission for electing to pursue this approach. And given the discrete number of rules and rationales for repeal implicated in this order, we are not persuaded that a longer comment cycle is needed. That is particularly true where, as here, advocates for groups that might be interested in the rules at issue have shown themselves to already be well aware of the contemplated changes even before adoption of the direct final rule, let alone Federal Register publication. See, e.g., Public Knowledge *et al.* July 17 *Ex Parte* Letter at 4-5. In different circumstances in the future, such as where there is a significantly larger number of rules at issue (many or all of which require more involved analyses in support of repeal under the good cause exception), we remain able to adopt longer comment periods if warranted.

¹⁴ 47 CFR § 1.1206.

¹⁵ See 47 CFR § 1.1200(a) (“Where the public interest so requires in a particular proceeding, the Commission and its staff retain the discretion to modify the applicable *ex parte* rules by order, letter, or public notice.”). Up until that date, we find it in the public interest to continue to operate under permit-but-disclosure procedures in this regard, consistent with the status of the *In Re: Delete, Delete, Delete* proceeding more generally.

¹⁶ See, e.g., 47 CFR § 1.58 (adopting a quiet period for forbearance proceeding based on “[t]he prohibition in § 1.1203(a) on contacts with decisionmakers concerning matters listed in the Sunshine Agenda”). Although in this instance no filings will be permitted after 10 days from Federal Register publication, we create a limited carve-out that allows a petition for reconsideration of this action to be filed 30 days after Federal Register publication, consistent with the requirements of section 405(a) of the Communications Act. See 47 CFR § 1.4(b)(1) (date of “public notice” for non-notice and comment rulemaking proceedings required to be published in the Federal Register is the date of Federal Register publication); 47 U.S.C. § 405(a) (establishing a deadline of 30 days from public notice for petitions for reconsideration of actions by the Commission). In the event that a petition for reconsideration is filed, we will subsequently specifically address any comment process associated with such a petition.

comment received during direct final rulemaking to be a significant adverse comment if the comment explains why: a. The [direct final] rule would be inappropriate, including challenges to the rule's underlying premise or approach; or b. The [direct final] rule would be ineffective or unacceptable without a change.”¹⁷

8. In the event that we conclude that significant adverse comments have been filed, the Bureaus and Offices responsible for the rules subject to this *Direct Final Rule* will publish a timely withdrawal in the Federal Register so that this *Direct Final Rule* does not become effective until any appropriate additional procedures have been followed. If significant adverse comments are filed only with respect to a subset of the rule revision(s) addressed by this *Direct Final Rule*, the pertinent Bureaus and Offices will withdraw the portions of the *Direct Final Rule* that were subject to significant adverse comments. For example, if a significant adverse comment is filed regarding a single rule within a direct final rule addressing multiple rules, we will publish a withdrawal addressing only that rule.¹⁸

9. In the event that no comments are filed in response to this *Direct Final Rule*, we do not anticipate publishing a confirmation of the effective date in the Federal Register, but simply will allow the rule changes to take effect as originally specified.¹⁹ Where comments are filed, but none of the comments are significant adverse comments, where warranted by the record the pertinent Bureaus and Offices will issue a Public Notice that will briefly explain why any comments filed were not determined to be significant adverse comments.²⁰

¹⁷ *ACUS Public Engagement and Good Cause Recommendation*, 89 Fed. Reg. at 106409. The touchstone for analysis is whether a comment materially calls into question the conclusion that prior notice and comment is unnecessary under the APA, which is the predicate for use of direct final rule procedures. While we expect the formulation provided by ACUS to be a useful guide for conducting that analysis, our statutory determination of “good cause” to forgo notice and comment ultimately represents the critical issue, rather than the particular language used by ACUS.

¹⁸ We disagree with any suggestion that the Commission may not evaluate what procedural path to take after a particular rule change has been withdrawn. See, e.g., Public Knowledge *et al.* July 17 *Ex Parte* Letter at 4. It would be an unwarranted deterrent to the use of direct final rule procedures if, after withdrawing a rule change that was subject to a significant adverse comment, the agency was precluded from relying on procedures that otherwise would have been available but for its initial direct final rule—including not only notice and comment rulemaking, but potentially other procedures such as a new direct final rule, an interim final rule, or some other approach.

¹⁹ We reject calls to delay the effective date of the rule changes here simply because the Commission does not plan to publish a confirmation notice that rule changes will take effect as contemplated by the *Direct Final Rule*. See, e.g., Public Knowledge *et al.* July 17 *Ex Parte* Letter at 4. ACUS recommends merely that agencies “consider” a longer effective date where no confirmation notice is published if the agency needs to ensure it has adequate time to withdraw the rule in the event it receives significant adverse comments. *ACUS Public Engagement and Good Cause Recommendation*, 89 Fed. Reg. at 106409, § 5. Thus, the additional time is for the benefit of the agency, not the public. Particularly where we are repealing rules—and thus no regulated entities will be required to come into compliance with new duties—on grounds like those relied upon here, we are not persuaded by generic requests for additional time that a lengthier effective date actually is needed.

²⁰ Although the Public Notice is a document in a non-notice and comment rulemaking proceeding, nothing in that document is required to be published in the Federal Register by the Administrative Procedure Act given that the Public Notice is not itself adopting new or modified rules. As a result, the Commission also need not publish the Public Notice in the Federal Register to establish the date of “public notice” for the Public Notice under section 1.4(b)(1) of the rules—which is limited to documents in rulemaking proceedings “required by the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 552, 553, to be published in the Federal Register,” 47 CFR § 1.4(b)(1)—and instead the date of public notice of these Public Notices will be the release date. See 47 CFR § 1.4(b)(4). Although some commenters suggest that the failure to publish this Public Notice in the Federal Register stands in contrast to what ACUS recommends, see, e.g., Public Knowledge *et al.* July 17 *Ex Parte* Letter at 4, the ACUS recommendation does not contemplate such an explanation being issued at all—let alone one published in the Federal Register. Indeed, the ACUS recommendation recognizes even publication of a confirmation notice in the Federal Register—let alone an associated explanation—as optional. *ACUS Public Engagement and Good Cause Recommendation*, 89

(continued....)

10. Although the Commission has a history of seeking to eliminate outdated, inappropriate, or otherwise unwarranted regulations, including by actions on delegated authority,²¹ we elect to take this step at the full Commission level. While we intend to use direct final rule procedures at the full Commission level, in recognition of past actions on delegated authority to adopt or repeal some rules without notice and comment, we take this opportunity to reaffirm that all Bureaus and Offices may continue to take such actions in situations that are exempt from the APA's notice-and-comment requirements, consistent with such actions by Bureaus and Offices historically.²² To ensure uniformity in this regard and to address what, by historical happenstance, has resulted in varied formulations throughout our rules, we take this opportunity to standardize the delegated authority of Bureaus and Offices to act without notice and comment on matters that fall within the APA's good cause exception and otherwise do not involve new or novel issues.²³ While rule changes adopted via direct final rule procedures are premised on the APA's good cause exception from notice and comment, our action clarifying and unifying the wording of delegations of authority to Bureaus and Offices also relies on a distinct exception from notice and comment under the APA—namely, the notice and comment exception for rules of “agency organization, procedure, or practice.”²⁴

(Continued from previous page)

Fed. Reg. at 106409, § 5. We thus are not persuaded that it would serve the public interest—including the efficiency goals of this proceeding—to voluntarily elect to publish such Public Notices in the Federal Register.

²¹ See, e.g., *supra* note 9; *Elimination of Obligation To File Broadcast Mid-Term Report (Form 397) Under Section 73.2080(f)(2), Modernization of Media Regulation Initiative*, Report and Order, MB Dockets No. 18-23 and 17-105, 34 FCC Rcd 668 (2019); *Modernizing Common Carrier Rules*, WC Docket No. 15-33, Report and Order, 32 FCC Rcd 7132, 7132, para. 2 (2017); *Accelerating Wireline Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment*, WC Docket No. 17-84, Order, DA 25-252, para. 1 (WCB Mar. 20, 2025) (taking action “consistent with the Commission’s goal of eliminating unnecessary and burdensome regulations”); see also *Delete, Delete, Delete Public Notice*.

²² *Util. Solid Waste Activities Grp. v. EPA*, 236 F.3d at 755; see Public Knowledge *et al.* July 17 *Ex Parte* Letter at 2 (stating that bureaus should act when this standard is met). Consistent with longstanding Commission rules, the Bureaus and Offices will not have delegated authority to act on any “new or novel” issues.

²³ Compare, e.g., 47 CFR § 0.361(a) (using one set of wording in circumscribing the scope of rule changes that can be adopted by CGB on delegated authority) with, e.g., 47 CFR § 0.331(d) (using a different set of wording in circumscribing the scope of rule changes that can be adopted by WTB on delegated authority).

²⁴ 5 U.S.C. § 553(b)(A). Delegation of authority to Bureaus and Offices bears simply on who within the agency will be acting, and not on issues of substance—thus fitting comfortably within the APA’s notice and comment exception for rules of “agency organization, procedure, or practice.” See, e.g., *Mendoza v. Perez*, 754 F.3d 1002, 1023 (D.C. Cir. 2014) (“Procedural rules ‘do not themselves alter the rights or interests of parties, although [they] may alter the manner in which the parties present themselves or their viewpoints to the agency.’”) (citations omitted). The Commission often has delegated authority under the APA exception for rules of agency organization, practice, and procedure, and our action here is no different. See, e.g., *Establishing the Digital Opportunity Data Collection; Modernizing the FCC Form 477 Data Program*, WC Dockets No. 19-195 and 11-10, Order, 37 FCC Rcd 14957, 14962-63, para.14 & n.39 (2022); *Amendment of Parts 0 and 1 of the Commission’s Rules Regarding Delegations of Authority To Act On Applications For Review*, GN Docket No. 21-16, Order, 36 FCC Rcd 731, 733, para. 6 (2021); *Establishment of the Office of Economics and Analytics*, MD Docket No. 18-3, Order, 33 FCC Rcd 1539, 1540, para. 6 (2018); *Amendment of Part 90 of the Commission’s Rules To Facilitate Future Development of SMR Systems In the 800 MHz Frequency Band, et al.*, PR Docket No. 93-144, Memorandum Opinion and Order on Remand, 14 FCC Rcd 17556, 17594-95, para. 80 (1999); *Amendment of Part 0 of the Commission’s Rules With Respect To Delegations of Authority In Forfeiture Proceedings*, Order, 7 FCC Rcd 2650, 2650, para. 3 (1992); *Amendment of Part 0 of the Commission’s Rules et al.*, 57 FCC 2d 1122, 1123, para. 4 (1976); see also, e.g., *Amendment of Certain of the Commission’s Part 1 Rules Of Practice and Procedure and Part 0 Rules of Commission Organization*, GC Docket No. 10-44, Report and Order, 26 FCC Rcd 1594, 1594-95, para. 1 n.1 (2011) (Although the FCC used notice-and-comment rulemaking procedures in that instance, “[b]ecause the Part 1 and Part 0 rules are procedural and organizational in nature, notice and comment are not required under the Administrative Procedure Act. See 5 U.S.C. § 553(b)(A) (notice and comment rulemaking requirements do not apply to rules of agency organization,

(continued....)

11. Finally, in specifying the mechanics of the direct final rule process as it will be used by the full Commission, we again rely on the notice and comment exception for rules of “agency organization, procedure, or practice.”²⁵ Although we do not foreclose the possibility of adopting codified rules governing direct final rule procedures in the future,²⁶ we believe that whether any new procedures are needed to “best conduce to the proper dispatch of business and to the ends of justice”²⁷ most effectively can be discerned based on practical Commission experience, rather than speculation. In the meantime, the use of direct final rule procedures as established by this *Direct Final Rule* will provide a useful tool to proceed with repealing outdated or unwarranted rules where prior notice and comment is unnecessary under the APA.

III. PROCEDURAL MATTERS

A. Paperwork Reduction Act

12. This document does not contain new or modified information collections subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), 44 U.S.C. §§ 3501-3521. In addition, therefore, it does not contain any new or modified information collection burden for small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees, pursuant to the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2002, 44 U.S.C. § 3506(c)(4).

B. Congressional Review Act

13. The Commission has determined, and the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget concurs, that this rule is “non-major” under the Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. § 804(2). The Commission will send a copy of this Direct Final Rule to Congress and the Government Accountability Office pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 801(a)(1)(A).

C. Filing Requirements

14. Interested parties may file comments on or before the date indicated on the first page of this document. Comments may be filed using the Commission’s Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS).

- Electronic Filers: Comments may be filed electronically using the Internet by accessing the ECFS: <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/>.
- Paper Filers: Parties who choose to file by paper must file an original and one copy of each filing.
 - Filings can be sent by hand or messenger delivery, by commercial courier, or by the U.S. Postal Service. **All filings must be addressed to the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission.**

(Continued from previous page) _____

procedure, or practice). Accordingly, any subsequent changes to these rules may be effected without the full public proceeding we have chosen to conduct in this instance.”); *Guardian Fed. Sav. & Loan. Ass’n v. Fed. Sav. & Loan Ins. Corp.*, 589 F.2d 658, 666 (D.C. Cir. 1978) (delegation of authority was procedural rule not subject to APA notice and comment requirements). In clarifying and affirming the delegated authority as historically used by Bureaus and Offices to adopt rule changes exempt from prior notice and comment under the APA, we find nothing that would cause the delegations at issue here to constitute substantive rules.

²⁵ 5 U.S.C. § 553(b)(A). The procedures to be followed in direct final rulemaking bear simply on how parties will interact with the agency, and not on any substantive duties or obligations. This fits comfortably within the APA’s notice and comment exception for rules of “agency organization, procedure, or practice.” See, e.g., *Mendoza v. Perez*, 754 F.3d at 1023 (D.C. Cir. 2014).

²⁶ See, e.g., TechFreedom July 17 *Ex Parte* Letter.

²⁷ 47 U.S.C. § 154(j).

- Hand-delivered or messenger-delivered paper filings for the Commission’s Secretary are accepted between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. by the FCC’s mailing contractor at 9050 Junction Drive, Annapolis Junction, MD 20701. All hand deliveries must be held together with rubber bands or fasteners. Any envelopes and boxes must be disposed of before entering the building.
- Commercial overnight mail (other than U.S. Postal Service Express Mail and Priority Mail) must be sent to 9050 Junction Drive, Annapolis Junction, MD 20701.
- Filings sent by U.S. Postal Service First-Class Mail, Priority Mail, and Priority Mail Express must be sent to 45 L Street, NE, Washington, DC 20554.
- People with Disabilities. To request materials in accessible formats for people with disabilities (braille, large print, electronic files, audio format), send an e-mail to fcc504@fcc.gov or call the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at (202) 418-0530.

D. Additional Information

15. For additional information, contact Marcus Maher of the Office of General Counsel at Marcus.Maher@fcc.gov or (202) 418-2339.

IV. ORDERING CLAUSES

16. Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that, pursuant to sections 4(i), 4(j), 201(b), and 303(r) of the Communications Act, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), (j), 201(b), 303(r), this *Direct Final Rule* **IS ADOPTED**. Except as specified in paragraphs 17 and 18, this *Direct Final Rule* shall be effective upon Federal Register publication of the rule changes set forth in Appendix A, which also shall serve as the date of public notice of that action.²⁸

17. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the amendments of the Commission’s rules as set forth in Appendix A shall be effective 60 days after Federal Register publication. In the event that significant adverse comments are filed, we direct the Bureaus and Offices responsible for the rules subject to this *Direct Final Rule* to publish a timely document in the Federal Register withdrawing the rule so that the rule change does not become effective until any additional procedures have been followed. In the event that significant adverse comments are filed with respect to only a subset of the rule revisions, we direct the Bureau or Office responsible for such rule revision to publish a timely document in the Federal Register withdrawing only such rule so that the rule change does not become effective until any additional procedures have been followed.

18. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the amendments of the Commission’s rules as set forth in Appendix B shall be effective upon Federal Register publication of the specified amendments to the Part 0 rules,²⁹ which also shall serve as the date of public notice of that action.

19. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Office of the Managing Director, Performance Program Management, **SHALL SEND** a copy of this *Direct Final Rule* in a report to be sent to Congress and the Government Accountability Office pursuant to the Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. § 801(a)(1)(A).

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

²⁸ Pursuant to Executive Order 14215, 90 Fed. Reg. 10447 (Feb. 20, 2025), this regulatory action has been determined to be not significant under Executive Order 12866, 58 Fed. Reg. 68708 (Dec. 28, 1993).

²⁹ Because changes to our rules governing delegations of authority involve agency organization, procedure, or practice rather than “a substantive rule,” they are not subject to the default requirement that they take effect on or after 30 days after Federal Register publication. 5 U.S.C. § 553(d).

Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary

APPENDIX A**Direct Final Rules**

For the reasons set forth above, the Federal Communications Commission amends parts 1, 24, 63, 64, and 79 of Title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations as follows:

PART 1 – PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

1. The authority citation for part 1 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 47 U.S.C. chs. 2, 5, 9, 13; 28 U.S.C. 2461 note; 47 U.S.C. 1754, unless otherwise noted.

Subpart E – Complaints, Applications, Tariffs, and Reports Involving Common Carriers

2. Remove and reserve § 1.789.

§ 1.789 [Removed and Reserved]**PART 24 – PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES**

3. The authority citation for part 24 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 47 U.S.C. 154, 301, 302a, 303, 309 and 332.

Subpart E – Broadband PCS

4. Remove the undesignated center heading before § 24.239, and remove and reserve §§ 24.239 through 24.253.

§§ 24.239 through 24.253 [Removed and Reserved]**PART 63 – EXTENSION OF LINES, NEW LINES, AND DISCONTINUANCE, REDUCTION, OUTAGE AND IMPAIRMENT OF SERVICE BY COMMON CARRIERS; AND GRANTS OF RECOGNIZED PRIVATE OPERATING AGENCY STATUS**

7. The authority citation for part 63 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 47 U.S.C. 151, 154(i), 154(j), 160, 201-205, 214, 218, 403, 571, unless otherwise noted.

8. Remove and reserve § 63.65.

§ 63.65 [Removed and Reserved]**PART 79 – ACCESSIBILITY OF VIDEO PROGRAMMING**

11. The authority citation for part 79 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 47 U.S.C. 151, 152(a), 154(i), 303, 307, 309, 310, 330, 544a, 613, 617.

Subpart B – Apparatus

10. Remove and reserve § 79.101.

§ 79.101 [Removed and Reserved]

APPENDIX B**Final Rules**

For the reasons set forth above, the Federal Communications Commission amends part 0 of Title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations as follows:

PART 0 – COMMISSION ORGANIZATION

1. The authority citation for part 0 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 47 U.S.C. 151, 154(i), 154(j), 155, 225, 409, and 1754, unless otherwise noted.

Subpart B – Delegations of Authority

2. Amend § 0.231 to add paragraph (m) to read as follows:

§ 0.231 Authority delegated.

* * * * *

(m) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Managing Director is delegated authority to adopt changes to rules the Office of Managing Director administers where the rule changes are exempt from prior notice and comment under the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 553(b), and where the action on delegated authority is not new or novel.

3. Amend § 0.241 to add paragraph (n) to read as follows:

§ 0.241 Authority delegated.

* * * * *

(n) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Chief of the Office of Engineering and Technology is delegated authority to adopt changes to rules the Office of Engineering and Technology administers where the rule changes are exempt from prior notice and comment under the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 553(b), and where the action on delegated authority is not new or novel.

4. Amend § 0.251 to add paragraph (k) to read as follows:

§ 0.251 Authority delegated.

* * * * *

(k) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the General Counsel is delegated authority to adopt changes to rules the Office of General Counsel administers where the rule changes are exempt from prior notice and comment under the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 553(b), and where the action on delegated authority is not new or novel.

5. Amend § 0.261 to add paragraph (c) to read as follows:

§ 0.261 Authority delegated.

* * * * *

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Chief of the Space Bureau is delegated authority to adopt changes to rules the Space Bureau administers where the rule changes are exempt from prior notice and comment under the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 553(b), and where the action on delegated authority is not new or novel.

6. Amend § 0.271 to add paragraph (j) to read as follows:

§ 0.271 Authority delegated.

* * * * *

(j) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Chief of the Office of Economics and Analytics is delegated authority to adopt changes to rules the Office of Economics and Analytics administers where the rule changes are exempt from prior notice and comment under the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 553(b), and where the action on delegated authority is not new or novel.

7. Amend § 0.283 to add paragraph (e) to read as follows:

§ 0.283 Authority delegated.

* * * * *

(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Chief of the Media Bureau is delegated authority to adopt changes to rules the Media Bureau administers where the rule changes are exempt from prior notice and comment under the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 553(b), and where the action on delegated authority is not new or novel.

8. Amend § 0.291 to add paragraph (j) to read as follows:

§ 0.291 Authority delegated.

* * * * *

(j) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Chief of the Wireline Competition Bureau is delegated authority to adopt changes to rules the Wireline Competition Bureau administers where the rule changes are exempt from prior notice and comment under the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 553(b), and where the action on delegated authority is not new or novel.

9. Amend § 0.311 to add paragraph (c) to read as follows:

§ 0.311 Authority delegated.

* * * * *

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Chief of the Enforcement Bureau is delegated authority to adopt changes to rules the Enforcement Bureau administers where the rule changes are exempt from prior notice and comment under the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 553(b), and where the action on delegated authority is not new or novel.

10. Amend § 0.331 to add paragraph (k) to read as follows:

§ 0.331 Authority delegated.

* * * * *

(k) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Chief of the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau is delegated authority to adopt changes to rules the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau administers where the rule changes are exempt from prior notice and comment under the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 553(b), and where the action on delegated authority is not new or novel.

11. Add an undesignated center heading above § 0.351 to read as follows:

Office of International Affairs

12. Amend § 0.351 to add paragraph (c) to read as follows:

§ 0.351 Authority delegated.

* * * * *

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Chief of the Office of International Affairs is delegated authority to adopt changes to rules the Office of International Affairs administers where the rule changes are exempt from prior notice and comment under the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 553(b), and where the action on delegated authority is not new or novel.

13. Amend § 0.361 to add paragraph (d) to read as follows:

§ 0.361 Authority delegated.

* * * * *

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Chief of the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau is delegated authority to adopt changes to rules the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau administers where the rule changes are exempt from prior notice and comment under the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 553(b), and where the action on delegated authority is not new or novel.

14. Amend § 0.371 to add paragraph (i) to read as follows:

§ 0.371 Authority delegated.

* * * * *

(i) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Director of the Office of Communications Business Opportunities is delegated authority to adopt changes to rules the Office of Communications Business Opportunities administers where the rule changes are exempt from prior notice and comment under the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 553(b), and where the action on delegated authority is not new or novel.

15. Amend § 0.391 to add paragraph (j) to read as follows:

§ 0.391 Authority delegated.

* * * * *

(j) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Director of the Office of Workplace Diversity is delegated authority to adopt changes to rules the Office of Workplace Diversity administers where the rule changes are exempt from prior notice and comment under the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 553(b), and where the action on delegated authority is not new or novel.

16. Amend § 0.392 to add paragraph (l) to read as follows:

§ 0.392 Authority delegated.

* * * * *

(l) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Chief of the Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau is delegated authority to adopt changes to rules the Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau administers where the rule changes are exempt from prior notice and comment under the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 553(b), and where the action on delegated authority is not new or novel.

**STATEMENT OF
CHAIRMAN BRENDAN CARR**

Re: *Delete, Delete, Delete*, Direct Final Rule, GN Docket No. 25-133 (July 24, 2025).

When I announced my Build America Agenda, I said that outdated and unnecessary regulations from Washington often derail efforts to build high-speed networks and infrastructure across the country. That is why delivering on the agenda's core objectives will require implementing smart policies while carrying out a massive deregulation initiative.

We are doing so through our *In Re: Delete, Delete, Delete* proceeding—the largest deregulatory effort in FCC history.

Today, we are taking the next step in this important process by taking rules off the books that regulate telegraph services, rabbit-ear broadcast receivers, and telephone booths—technologies that were considered outdated decades ago.

We are acting under our authority through the Administrative Procedure Act. In the spirit of efficiency, this law gives the Commission the authority to fast track the elimination of rules that inarguably fail to serve the public interest. Using this authority, the Commission can forgo the usual prior notice and public comment period before repealing the rules for these bygone regulations.

Today's action will remove 11 outdated and useless rule provisions—covering at least 39 regulatory burdens, 7,194 words, and 16 pages. Say goodbye to restrictions on phone booth closures, captioning on analog TV receivers, auction obligations that lapsed 20 years ago, and references to long-repealed telegraph rules.

The public will have the opportunity to provide input on today's action, but absent any significant adverse comments, the rules identified in this item will be repealed.

Thank you Adam Candeub, Michael Janson, David Konczal, Marcus Maher, Christopher Santini and Chin Yoo from the Office of General Counsel for their hard work on this item.

**DISSENTING STATEMENT OF
COMMISSIONER ANNA M. GOMEZ**

Re: *Delete, Delete, Delete*, Direct Final Rule, GN Docket No. 25-133 (July 24, 2025).

I am the first to acknowledge that over time the Commission's rules need to be cleaned up and I commend the Chair for using Commission resources to identify such rules. That said, process matters. The direct final rule process could potentially serve a role with the right procedures and guardrails in place.

To that end, I told the Chairman that I could support initiating a proceeding to look at how a direct final rule process could be used going forward and including a notice of proposed rulemaking proposing to eliminate the rules the draft order purports to eliminate today. That offer was declined.

Accordingly, I cannot support the establishment of procedures to erase rules that have been adopted pursuant to notice and comment without seeking public comment on appropriate processes and guardrails. Notably, this order does not limit the direct final rule process to elimination of rules that are objectively obsolete with a clear definition of how that will be applied, asserting instead authority to remove rules that are "outdated or unwarranted."

While the order points to recommendations from the Administrative Conference of the United States, which has identified circumstances where good cause could exist to issue direct final rules consistent with the Administrative Procedure Act, it fails to meaningfully analyze or cabin the types of rules that could be eliminated through this process and then dismisses without explanation the minimum timeframe for public comment the Administrative Conference specifically recommended.³⁰

In defense of the abbreviated timeframe, the order points to Commission rules where 10-day time limits are imposed. In each of those examples, however, interested stakeholders will have had actual notice the proceedings were ongoing and prior opportunities to comment. Those circumstances do not exist here and notably absent from the order is any explanation of why time is of the essence. I have to wonder, if these rules are so obsolete, what difference would providing 30-days-notice make?

One thing that is clear in this order is the intent to meet an arbitrary rule reduction quota. Eleven rule provisions, 39 regulatory burdens, 7,194 words, and 16 pages. Those sound like big numbers intended to impress. But what happens when they make a mistake? What happens when a rule that actually matters is removed from the CFR? What we cannot do is allow the meeting of an arbitrary numerical goal to be more important than doing our job.

The way we do things matters. The Administrative Procedure Act exists to protect the public interest in government actions through the use of fair procedures consistent with due process. The fact that the process adopted today effectively evades review by an informed public is a feature, not a bug. All the handwringing about the need to move at lightning speed to eliminate rules that have no impact because they are taking up multiple pages in the CFR makes no sense.

I appreciate that the public comments to the draft order reflected concerns from across the ideological spectrum and that the Chairman implemented changes to address some of those concerns. But the comments and responsiveness demonstrate my point. Public comment matters and stakeholders need sufficient opportunity to raise issues we regulators may not have thought of. We should have sought comment on standards to be applied, appropriate guardrails and comment periods.

I dissent.

³⁰ *ACUS Public Engagement and Good Cause Recommendation*, 89 Fed. Reg. at 106409.

**STATEMENT OF
COMMISSIONER OLIVIA TRUSTY**

Re: *Delete, Delete, Delete*, Direct Final Rule, GN Docket No. 25-133 (July 24, 2025).

Today, the Commission takes the next step in the “Delete, Delete, Delete” initiative, a focused effort to reduce regulatory red tape, unleash innovation, and advance prosperity by identifying and eliminating outdated and obsolete rules that no longer serve the public interest.

As technology has evolved and consumer behavior has shifted, many legacy regulations remain on the FCC’s books long after their relevance has faded. This morning, we target some of the most obsolete provisions, including rules tied to expired deadlines, repealed telegraph regulations, and long outdated technologies like closed captioning requirements for analog television receivers. We’re also eliminating rules tied to market realities that no longer exist, such as those related to telephone booths.

The Order uses the streamlined “direct final rule” process to efficiently repeal outdated provisions that are both insignificant in nature and impact, and inconsequential to the industry and the public, while still allowing for timely public input. By clearing away regulatory clutter, the Commission can focus more sharply on today’s priorities: expanding access to high-speed connectivity for all Americans and restoring U.S. leadership in next-generation communications technologies.

I want to thank the dedicated staff across our Offices and Bureaus for their comprehensive review of the Commission’s rules. I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues to ensure our regulations are modern, focused, and serve the best interests of American businesses and consumers.