

Commission relied upon sections 201(b) and 254, among other sections, for authority to require USF recipients to remove and replace covered equipment. Do those sections provide the Commission with authority to encourage and incentivize development and deployment of Open RAN and virtualized networks? If so, should the Commission rely upon these sections to do so? Commenters should explain in detail why or why not they believe we have authority to act, if the Commission chooses to do so.

E. Costs and Benefits of Open RAN Deployment

We seek comment on the likely costs and benefits of Open RAN deployment for mobile network operators. The Office of Economics and Analytics plans to undertake an economic study that would evaluate the likely benefits and costs of Open RAN deployment. In particular, we ask that commenters provide information and data that quantify both the potential costs and benefits of Open RAN deployment, and we seek comment on the issues that should be studied and likely promising methodologies to carry out such studies. For example, to what extent will mobile network operators benefit from open interfaces and standards? How would the Commission's actions impact the development of Open RAN and related technologies in comparison to what industry participants currently expect? Specifically, are there any obstacles preventing the industry from optimally investing in the Open RAN technologies that could be eliminated by Commission actions? Are there any spillover social benefits arising from the Open RAN deployment not internalized by the wireless network industry in its investment decisions? For example, does one firm's investment in the Open RAN system result in any spillover benefits to other Open RAN component vendors network operators, consumers, or public safety without such benefiting entities paying for the cost of development either directly or indirectly? We ask commenters to quantify the potential spillover social benefits that may be lost if the Open RAN development and deployment decisions are made by the wireless network firms, without Commission action.

We seek comment on the relative and absolute costs of Open RAN deployment and interoperability. How do the costs of Open RAN equipment compare with the costs of equipment from proprietary equipment manufacturers? How do the operating expenses of an Open RAN network compare to those of a

proprietary network? Are there any costs to using multiple equipment vendors in constructing networks, such as the costs of network design and integration? If so, we ask commenters to provide information on the magnitude of these costs, and the underlying methodology for quantifying these costs. We also seek information on how interoperability between the various equipment vendors can be ensured. In particular, does it require specific integration platforms or institutions to monitor and coordinate the development and maintenance of standards and integration of the Open RAN technologies? If such institutions exist, are there Commission rules that would affect their operations? If such institutions do not exist, what are the associated costs to set up and maintain such platforms and institutions? Further, we seek information on Open RAN performance compared to existing networks or potential alternative technologies, and how the cost of deployment and relative benefits of performance differ. Do such differences depend on market characteristics such as whether areas are sparsely or densely populated or whether expanding geographic coverage or expanding capacity in a fixed geography is the more important consideration? To the extent that performance differs, we ask commenters to quantify the effect of those performance differences on consumers.

In addition, we seek comment on the likely costs and benefits of Open RAN for the broader economy. Could adopting Open RAN reduce the probability of security breaches compared with existing and alternative technologies? What are the economic costs of these breaches, including costs associated with breach prevention, that may vary across Open RAN and other technologies? How much additional consumer value and utilization of services would there be once networks implement Open RAN? How much would consumers value reduction in security risk from Open RAN deployment? How much would consumers value improvement in speed, additional capacity, or improvements in use cases such as drone operation? We seek comment on the costs of addressing security concerns raised elsewhere in this document.

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene Dortch,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2021-06430 Filed 3-26-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[OMB 3060-1282; FRS 17590]

Information Collection Approved by the Office of Management and Budget

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has received Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval for the following public information collection pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. An agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number, and no person is required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number. Comments concerning the accuracy of the burden estimates and any suggestions for reducing the burden should be directed to the person listed below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Kerry Murray, Satellite Division, International Bureau, at (202) 418-0734, or email: Kerry.Murray@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Control No.: 3060-1282.

OMB Approval Date: March 16, 2021.

Expiration Date: March 31, 2024.

Title: Telemetry, Tracking and Command Earth Station Operators.

Form No.: N/A.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit entities.

Number of Respondents: 4 respondents; 4 responses.

Estimated Time per Response: 12 hours.

Frequency of Response: On occasion reporting requirement and Third-party disclosure requirement.

Obligation to Respond: Required to obtain or retain benefits. The Commission has statutory authority for the information collection requirements under 47 U.S.C. 151, 152, 154(i), 154(j), 155(c), 201, 302, 303, 304, 307(e), 309, and 316.

Total Annual Burden: 48 hours.

Total Annual Cost: \$2,200.

Privacy Impact Assessment: No impact(s).

Nature and Extent of Confidentiality: There is no need for confidentiality pertaining to the information collection requirements in this collection.

Needs and Uses: On March 3, 2020, the Commission released a Report and Order and Order of Proposed Modification titled, "In the Matter of Expanding Flexible Use of the 3.7 to 4.2

GHz,” GN Docket Number 18–122 (FCC 20–22). This rulemaking, which is under the purview of the Commission’s Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, is hereinafter referred to as the 3.7 GHz Report and Order.

The Commission believes that C-band spectrum for terrestrial wireless uses will play a significant role in bringing next-generation services like 5G to the American public and assuring American leadership in the 5G ecosystem. The agency took action to make this valuable spectrum resource available for new terrestrial wireless uses as quickly as possible, while also preserving the continued operation of existing Fixed Satellite Services (FSS) available during and after the transition.

In the 3.7 GHz Report and Order, the Commission concluded that a public auction of the lower 280 megahertz of the C-band will best carry out our goals, and the agency will add a mobile allocation to the 3.7–4.0 GHz band so that next-generation services such as 5G can use the band. Relying on the Emerging Technologies framework, the Commission adopted a process to relocate FSS operations into the upper 200 megahertz of the band, while fully reimbursing existing operators for the costs of this relocation and offering accelerated relocation payments to encourage a speedy transition. The Commission also adopted service and technical rules for overlay licensees in the 280 megahertz of spectrum designated for transition to flexible use.

Among other information collection requirements in the 3.7 GHz Report and Order, the Commission has adopted several requirements, described in the text, related to the protection of TT&C earth stations and coordination with 3.7 GHz Service licensees. In a section of the 3.7 GHz Report and Order titled “Adjacent Channel Protection Criteria” the Commission sets out the following requirements:

Pursuant to paragraph 388 of the 3.7 GHz Report and Order, the Commission requires that the TT&C operators make available certain pertinent technical information about their systems upon request by licensees in the 3.7 GHz Service to ensure the protection of TT&C operations. In addition, paragraph 389 of the 3.7 GHz Report and Order includes the requirement that, in the event of a claim by a TT&C earth station operating in 4.0–4.2 GHz of harmful interference by a 3.7 GHz operator, the earth station operator must demonstrate that that have installed a filter that complies with the mask requirement prescribed by the Commission. This requirement will facilitate an efficient and safe transition by requiring earth

station operators to demonstrate their compliance with the mask requirements, thereby minimizing the risk of interference.

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene Dortch,

Secretary, Office of the Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2021–06334 Filed 3–26–21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[OMB 3060–XXXX; FRS 17781]

Information Collection Being Reviewed by the Federal Communications Commission

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: As part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burdens, and as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), the Federal Communications Commission (FCC or Commission) invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the following information collections. Comments are requested concerning: Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information shall have practical utility; the accuracy of the Commission’s burden estimate; ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology; and ways to further reduce the information collection burden on small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees. The FCC may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number. No person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information subject to the PRA that does not display a valid OMB control number.

DATES: Written PRA comments should be submitted on or before May 28, 2021. If you anticipate that you will be submitting comments but find it difficult to do so within the period of time allowed by this notice, you should advise the contact listed below as soon as possible.

ADDRESSES: Direct all PRA comments to Cathy Williams, FCC, via email to PRA@fcc.gov and to Cathy.Williams@fcc.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information about the information collection, contact Cathy Williams at (202) 418–2918.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Control Number: 3060–XXXX.

Title: Legacy High-Cost Support Recipient Initial Report of Current Service Offerings.

Form Number: N/A.

Type of Review: New information collection.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit entities, not-for-profit institutions, and state, local or tribal governments.

Number of Respondents and Responses: Up to 110 respondents and 110 responses.

Estimated Time per Response: 16 hours.

Frequency of Response: One-time reporting requirement.

Obligation to Respond: Required to obtain or retain benefits. Statutory authority for this information collection is contained in 47 U.S.C. 154, 254 and 303(r).

Total Annual Burden: 1,760 hours.

Total Annual Cost: No cost.

Nature and Extent of Confidentiality: Most of the information collected under this collection will be made publicly available. However, in recognition of the fact that a carrier may consider the infrastructure information required to be submitted as part of its initial report to be sensitive, such infrastructure information will be treated as presumptively confidential by the Commission and the Universal Service Administrative Company (USAC) and withheld from public inspection, although USAC will provide these data to the Commission and the relevant state, territory, and Tribal governmental entities that have jurisdiction over a particular service area, as applicable. To the extent that a respondent seeks to have other information collected in response to this information collection withheld from public inspection, the respondent may request confidential treatment pursuant to 47 CFR 0.459 of the Commission’s rules.

Privacy Act Impact Assessment: No impact(s).

Needs and Uses: A request for approval of this new information collection will be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) after this 60-day comment period in order to obtain the full three-year clearance from OMB.

On November 18, 2011, the Commission released the *USF/ICC*