

**EXHIBIT 4**

*i-wireless Forbearance Order*

Before the  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service	)	CC Docket No. 96-45
	)	
Telecommunications Carriers Eligible for Universal Service Support	)	WC Docket No. 09-197
	)	
i-wireless, LLC Petition for Forbearance from 47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(1)(A)	)	

**ORDER**

**Adopted: June 22, 2010**

**Released: June 25, 2010**

By the Commission:

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1. In this order, we grant in part and deny in part a petition for forbearance filed by i-wireless, LLC (i-wireless), a prepaid wireless resale provider, requesting that the Commission forbear from the requirement that a carrier designated as an eligible telecommunications carrier (ETC) for purposes of federal universal service support provide services, at least in part, over its own facilities.<sup>1</sup> As a result, i-wireless may seek ETC designation to offer discounted service to qualified low-income consumers through the universal service Lifeline program. i-wireless will be subject to the same conditions that the Commission previously applied to prepaid wireless resellers TracFone Wireless, Inc. and Virgin Mobile USA, L.P. in granting similar requests. The conditions will help to ensure that, if i-wireless is granted ETC designation for the purpose of providing Lifeline service, its low-income consumers have access to 911 and enhanced 911 services and will help to protect the universal service fund against waste, fraud and abuse. However, we deny i-wireless's petition for forbearance for the purposes of participating in the Link Up program because the company has not demonstrated that granting its request satisfies the three-prong statutory test for forbearance.<sup>2</sup>

**II. BACKGROUND**

2. Congress directed the Commission to establish the universal service fund to help ensure that "[q]uality services [are] available at just, reasonable, and affordable rates" for consumers throughout the nation, "including low-income consumers."<sup>3</sup> The Commission's Lifeline program furthers this goal by reducing the price of monthly telephone service for low-income consumers, and the Commission's

<sup>1</sup> i-wireless, LLC Petition for Forbearance, CC Docket No. 96-45 (filed Apr. 1, 2009) (Forbearance Petition). On March 23, 2010, pursuant to section 10(c) of the Act, the Wireline Competition Bureau (Bureau) extended until June 30, 2010, the date on which the Forbearance Petition shall be deemed granted in the absence of a Commission decision that the petition fails to meet the standard for forbearance under section 10(a) of the Act. *i-wireless, LLC Petition for Forbearance*, CC Docket No. 96-45, Order, 25 FCC Rcd 2762 (Wireline Comp. Bur. 2010); 47 U.S.C. § 214(e).

<sup>2</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 160(a).

<sup>3</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 254(b)(3).

Link Up program furthers this goal by reducing the customary connection charge for commencing telephone service at a low-income consumer's principal place of residence.<sup>4</sup>

3. The Communications Act of 1934, as amended (the Act), provides that only an entity designated as an eligible telecommunications carrier shall be eligible for universal service high-cost and low-income support.<sup>5</sup> To become an ETC, a common carrier must offer the services supported by the federal universal service support mechanisms "either using its own facilities or a combination of its own facilities and resale of another carrier's services" to each customer in its designated service area.<sup>6</sup> Carriers designated as ETCs generally must participate in the Lifeline and Link Up programs and are reimbursed for the revenues foregone through their participation in these programs.<sup>7</sup>

4. The Commission has granted two petitions for forbearance from the facilities requirement for ETC designation in section 214(e) of the Act. In 2005, the Commission forbore from applying the facilities requirement to TracFone Wireless, Inc. (TracFone), a wireless reseller, insofar as TracFone sought ETC designation only for the purpose of receiving Lifeline support.<sup>8</sup> Similarly, in 2009, the Commission forbore from applying the facilities requirement to another wireless reseller, Virgin Mobile USA, L.P. (Virgin Mobile).<sup>9</sup> In both orders, the Commission conditioned forbearance on the carriers' meeting certain obligations upon being designated as an ETC that are tailored to the concerns arising from each carrier's lack of facilities and proposed service offering.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Through the Lifeline program, low-income consumers may receive discounts of up to \$13.50 off the monthly cost of telephone service, with the federal program reimbursing the ETC up to \$10 each month. 47 C.F.R. § 54.401(a)(2). In tribal areas, the federal program reimburses ETCs up to an additional \$25 each month. 47 C.F.R. § 54.405(a)(4). Through the Link Up program, low-income consumers may receive discounts of up to \$30 off the connection charge. 47 C.F.R. § 54.411(a)(1). In tribal areas, low-income consumers may receive up to an additional \$70 off the connection charge. 47 C.F.R. § 54.411(a)(3).

<sup>5</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 254(e). A carrier need not be an ETC to participate in the schools and libraries or rural health care universal service programs. 47 U.S.C. § 254(h)(1)(A) and (B)(ii); see *Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service*, CC Docket No. 96-45, Report and Order, 12 FCC Rcd 8776, 9015, para. 449 (1997) (*Universal Service First Report and Order*) (subsequent history omitted); *Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service*, CC Docket No. 96-46, Fourteenth Order on Reconsideration, 14 FCC Rcd 20106, 20114-15, para. 19 (1999) (*Fourteenth Order on Reconsideration*).

<sup>6</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(1); 47 C.F.R. § 54.201(d)(1). Because a carrier need not be an ETC to participate in the schools and libraries or rural health care universal service programs, a carrier need not offer service over its own facilities to receive support from those programs. See *supra* note 5.

<sup>7</sup> See 47 C.F.R. § 54.407(b)-(c). ETCs designated for the limited purpose of participating in the Lifeline program, in contrast, may only receive Lifeline support.

<sup>8</sup> *Petition of TracFone Wireless, Inc. for Forbearance from 47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(1)(A) and 47 C.F.R. § 54.201(i)*, CC Docket No. 96-45, Order, 20 FCC Rcd 15095 (2005) (*TracFone Forbearance Order*).

<sup>9</sup> *Virgin Mobile USA, L.P. Petition for Forbearance from 47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(1)(A); Petition for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the State of New York; Petition for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the Commonwealth of Virginia; Petition for Limited Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the State of North Carolina; Petition for Limited Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the State of Tennessee*, CC Docket No. 96-45, Order, 24 FCC Rcd 3381 (2009) (*Virgin Mobile Forbearance Order*).

<sup>10</sup> Specifically, each carrier must: (1) provide its Lifeline customers with 911 and enhanced 911 (E911) access regardless of activation status and availability of prepaid minutes; (2) provide its Lifeline customers with E911-compliant handsets and replace, at no additional charge to the customer, noncompliant handsets of existing customers who obtain Lifeline-supported service; (3) comply with conditions (1) and (2) as of the date it provides Lifeline service; (4) obtain a certification from each public-safety answering point (PSAP) where the carrier provides Lifeline service confirming that the carrier provides its customers with 911 and E911 access or self-certify that it does so if certain conditions are met; (5) require each customer to self-certify at time of service activation and (continued . . .)

5. *i-wireless Forbearance Petition.* Like Tracfone and Virgin Mobile, i-wireless is a non-facilities-based commercial mobile radio service (CMRS) provider (i.e., a pure wireless reseller) that provides prepaid wireless telecommunications services.<sup>11</sup> On April 1, 2009, i-wireless filed a petition seeking forbearance from the facilities requirement of section 214(e) of the Act so that it may be designated as an ETC and be eligible to receive Lifeline and Link Up low-income support.<sup>12</sup> i-wireless states that its request for forbearance satisfies the statutory requirements and is in the public interest.<sup>13</sup> Further, i-wireless agrees to abide by the conditions imposed on TracFone and Virgin Mobile as part of the Commission's decisions granting those carriers' requests to forbear from the ETC facilities requirement to allow them to receive Lifeline support only.<sup>14</sup>

### III. DISCUSSION

6. The Act requires the Commission to forbear from applying any requirement of the Act or of our regulations to a telecommunications carrier if and only if the Commission determines that: (1) enforcement of the requirement is not necessary to ensure that the charges, practices, classifications, or regulations by, for, or in connection with that telecommunications carrier are just and reasonable and are not unjustly or unreasonably discriminatory; (2) enforcement of that requirement is not necessary for

(continued from previous page) \_\_\_\_\_

annually thereafter that he or she is the head of household and receives Lifeline-supported service only from that carrier; (6) establish safeguards to prevent its customers from receiving multiple Lifeline subsidies from that carrier at the same address; (7) deal directly with the customer to certify and verify the customer's Lifeline eligibility; and (8) submit to the Wireline Competition Bureau a compliance plan outlining the measures the carrier will take to implement these conditions. *See id.* at 3386-87, 3392, paras. 12, 26; *TracFone Forbearance Order*, 20 FCC Rcd at 15098-99, 15104, paras. 6, 19; *Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service; TracFone Wireless, Inc. Petition for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the State of New York; Petition for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the State of Florida; Petition for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the Commonwealth of Virginia; Petition for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the State of Connecticut; Petition for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; Petition for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the State of Alabama; Petition for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the State of North Carolina; Petition for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the State of Tennessee; Petition for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the State of Delaware for the Limited Purpose of Offering Lifeline Service to Qualified Households; Petition for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the State of New Hampshire for the Limited Purpose of Offering Lifeline Service to Qualified Households; Petition for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for the Limited Purpose of Offering Lifeline Service to Qualified Households; Petition for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the District of Columbia for the Limited Purpose of Offering Lifeline Service to Qualified Households*, CC Docket No. 96-45, Order, 24 FCC Rcd 3375 (2009) (*TracFone Forbearance Modification Order*).

<sup>11</sup> Forbearance Petition at 2.

<sup>12</sup> *See* Forbearance Petition. On June 5, 2009, the Bureau issued a public notice seeking comment on the Forbearance Petition. *Comment Sought on i-wireless, LLC Petition for Forbearance from Eligible Telecommunications Carrier Facilities Requirement*, CC Docket No. 96-45, Public Notice, 24 FCC Rcd 7682 (Wireline Comp. Bur. 2009). Comments on the Forbearance Petition were filed by the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates (NASUCA) and the National Emergency Number Association (NENA). Reply comments were filed by NASUCA, i-wireless, and the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Pennsylvania Commission). We interpret i-wireless's petition to request forbearance not only from the statutory facilities requirement, 47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(1)(A), but also from our parallel regulatory requirements, 47 C.F.R. § 54.201(d)(1), (i). We have previously read these requirements to have the same scope and purpose as the statutory provision. *See Virgin Mobile Forbearance Order*, 24 FCC Rcd at 3386-87 n.41.

<sup>13</sup> Forbearance Petition at 8-13.

<sup>14</sup> Forbearance Petition at 13; *TracFone Forbearance Order*, 20 FCC Rcd at 15098-99, 15104, paras. 6, 19; *Virgin Mobile Forbearance Order*, 24 FCC Rcd 3386-87, 3392, paras. 12, 26.

the protection of consumers; and (3) forbearance from applying that requirement is consistent with the public interest.<sup>15</sup> As in the *TracFone Forbearance Order* and the *Virgin Mobile Forbearance Order*, we examine the facilities requirement from which i-wireless seeks forbearance in light of the statutory goal of providing low-income consumers with access to telecommunications services and in light of the specific programs in which i-wireless seeks to participate. Because our prior orders have laid the path for examining forbearance requests in the context of the Lifeline program, we first evaluate i-wireless's petition in that context. We then turn to the new issue of whether i-wireless has demonstrated that the statutory requirements for forbearance are met in the context of the Link Up program.

#### A. Forbearance for Lifeline

7. In this section, we evaluate whether i-wireless has met the three-prong statutory test for forbearance to receive Lifeline support. For the reasons provided below, we conditionally grant the request of i-wireless for forbearance from the facilities requirement of section 214(e) for the purpose of seeking ETC designation to provide Lifeline support only.

8. *Just and Reasonable.* As an initial matter, we note that a provision or regulation is "necessary" if there is a strong connection between the requirement and regulatory goal.<sup>16</sup> Section 10(a)(1) of the Act requires that we consider whether enforcement of the facilities-based requirement of section 214(e) for a pure wireless reseller that seeks ETC designation for Lifeline support only is necessary to ensure that the charges, practices, classifications or regulations are just and reasonable and not unjustly or unreasonably discriminatory.<sup>17</sup>

9. As the Commission found in the *TracFone Forbearance Order* and the *Virgin Mobile Forbearance Order*, we conclude that the section 214(e) facilities requirement is not necessary to ensure that i-wireless's charges, practices, and classifications are just and reasonable and not unjustly or unreasonably discriminatory where it is providing Lifeline service only.<sup>18</sup> As a reseller, i-wireless is by definition subject to competition. We expect that i-wireless's Lifeline offerings will compete, at a minimum, with the Lifeline offerings of the incumbent wireline carrier in a given geographic area, and potentially, depending on the states where i-wireless seeks ETC designation, with the offerings of TracFone and Virgin Mobile.<sup>19</sup> We also expect that this competition will spur innovation amongst carriers in their Lifeline offerings, expanding the choice of Lifeline products for eligible consumers. For these reasons, we find that the first prong of section 10(a) is met. In the limited context of Lifeline support, the facilities requirement is not necessary to ensure that i-wireless's charges, practices, and classifications are just and reasonable.

10. *Consumer Protection.* Section 10(a)(2) requires that we consider whether enforcement of the facilities-based requirement of section 214(e) for a pure wireless reseller that seeks ETC designation only for Lifeline support is necessary for the protection of consumers. As in the cases of TracFone and Virgin Mobile, we find that imposing the facilities requirement on i-wireless is not necessary for the protection of consumers so long as the carrier complies with the obligations described below. Specifically, we conclude that forbearance from this provision will benefit consumers. Indeed, if i-wireless is ultimately granted limited ETC status, it would be offering Lifeline-eligible consumers an additional choice of providers for accessing telecommunications services. The prepaid feature may be an

<sup>15</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 160(a)-(b). In making a public interest determination, section 10(b) requires the Commission to consider whether forbearance will promote competitive market conditions.

<sup>16</sup> See *CTIA v. FCC*, 330 F.3d 502, 512 (D.C. Cir. 2003).

<sup>17</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 160(a)(1); 47 U.S.C. § 214(e).

<sup>18</sup> See *TracFone Forbearance Order*, 20 FCC Rcd at 15100, para. 12; *Virgin Mobile Forbearance Order*, 24 FCC Rcd at 3389, para. 20.

<sup>19</sup> See 47 C.F.R. § 54.405(a) (requiring ETCs to offer Lifeline service).

attractive alternative for such consumers who need the mobility, security, and convenience of a wireless phone, but who are concerned about usage charges or long-term contracts.

11. Given the importance of public safety and in light of the fact that a Lifeline ETC is generally a low-income customer's only connection to the public switched telephone network, however, we condition this grant of forbearance on i-wireless's compliance with certain obligations upon being designated as an ETC, consistent with the public safety obligations previously imposed on TracFone and Virgin Mobile.<sup>20</sup> Specifically, our forbearance is conditioned on i-wireless:

- (1) providing its Lifeline customers with 911 and enhanced 911 (E911) access regardless of activation status and availability of prepaid minutes;
- (2) providing its Lifeline customers with E911-compliant handsets and replacing, at no additional charge to the customer, noncompliant handsets of existing customers who obtain Lifeline-supported service;
- (3) complying with conditions (1) and (2) as of the date it provides Lifeline service; and
- (4) obtaining a certification from each PSAP where the carrier seeks to provide Lifeline service confirming that the carrier provides its customers with 911 and E911 access or self-certifying that it does so if certain conditions are met.

12. The Commission has an obligation to promote "safety of life and property" and to "encourage and facilitate the prompt deployment throughout the United States of a seamless, ubiquitous, and reliable end-to-end infrastructure" for public safety.<sup>21</sup> The provision of 911 and E911 services is critical to our nation's ability to respond to a host of crises, and this Commission has a longstanding and continuing commitment to a nationwide communications system that promotes the safety and welfare of all Americans, including Lifeline customers.<sup>22</sup> As we have held previously, we believe these obligations are necessary to ensure that the Lifeline customers of these wireless resellers have meaningful access to emergency services.<sup>23</sup>

13. Consistent with the obligations we have placed on TracFone and Virgin Mobile, these obligations apply in any state in which i-wireless becomes an ETC and plans to serve any customers without using its own facilities. Additionally, i-wireless must furnish to the Commission upon request copies of all certifications required by the fourth obligation.<sup>24</sup> Furthermore, if i-wireless seeks to use the self-certification option, it may do so only after complying with the following procedures. *First*, i-wireless must request certification from the PSAP and notify the PSAP that the carrier may self-certify compliance if the PSAP has neither provided certification nor made an affirmative finding that the carrier does not provide its customers with access to 911 and E911 service within the PSAP's service area within 90 days of the request. This evaluation period commences upon proper notification.<sup>25</sup> The evaluation

---

<sup>20</sup> See *TracFone Forbearance Order*, 20 FCC Rcd at 15101-02, paras. 15-16; *Virgin Mobile Forbearance Order*, 24 FCC Rcd at 3390-91, paras. 21-23.

<sup>21</sup> *Applications of Nextel Communications, Inc. and Sprint Corporation For Consent to Transfer Control of Licenses and Authorizations*, WT Docket No. 05-63, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 20 FCC Rcd 13967, 14020, para. 144 (2005).

<sup>22</sup> *Id.*

<sup>23</sup> See *TracFone Forbearance Order*, 20 FCC Rcd at 15101-02, paras. 15-16; *Virgin Mobile Forbearance Order*, 24 FCC Rcd at 3390-91, para. 21-23.

<sup>24</sup> See *Virgin Mobile ETC Designation Order*, 24 FCC Rcd at 3390, para. 22.

<sup>25</sup> *Id.* at 3390-91, para. 22. Consistent with the *Virgin Mobile Forbearance Order*, in providing notice that it may self-certify, i-wireless must provide a PSAP with all of the information and/or equipment requested by the PSAP in analyzing i-wireless's ability to provide 911 and E911 to its customers.

period is tolled whenever a PSAP reasonably requests information or equipment to evaluate the carrier's request until the carrier responds with that information or equipment.<sup>26</sup> If a PSAP determines that the carrier will not offer its Lifeline customers appropriate access to emergency services or has concerns regarding the carrier's ability and if the PSAP notifies the carrier of its concerns during the evaluation period, the evaluation period is extended by an additional 90 days and the carrier may not self-certify compliance until it has addressed the PSAP's concerns.<sup>27</sup> *Second*, before self-certifying, the carrier must obtain from its underlying carrier in that area certification that the underlying carrier routes emergency calls from the carrier's customers to the PSAP in the same manner that it routes emergency calls from its own customers.<sup>28</sup> *Third*, the carrier must provide the PSAP with a copy of the relevant self-certifications at the time it is effective.<sup>29</sup> *Fourth*, if a PSAP finds that i-wireless does not provide its customers with 911 and E911 access after the carrier has self-certified that it does, the carrier must notify the Commission of this finding upon receiving notice and must explain how it plans to meet the PSAP's concerns and provide Lifeline customers with appropriate 911 and E911 access.<sup>30</sup>

14. Accordingly, we find that, subject to the 911 and E911 conditions and the self-certification and other conditions set out above, and consistent with the Commission's grant of forbearance to TracFone and Virgin Mobile, the ETC facilities-based requirement is not necessary for consumer protection with respect to i-wireless's receipt of Lifeline support only. We therefore conclude that the second element of section 10(a) is satisfied.

15. *Public Interest.* Section 10(a)(3) requires that we consider whether enforcement of the facilities-based requirement of section 214(e) for a pure wireless reseller that seeks ETC designation for Lifeline support only is in the public interest. In evaluating whether forbearance is in the public interest, we follow the path we laid out in the *TracFone Forbearance Order* and the *Virgin Mobile Forbearance Order*. We note first that the Commission's traditional concern with a carrier doubling its recovery by reselling facilities that are already supported by the high-cost fund does not apply in the low-income context.<sup>31</sup> We also note that Lifeline support is designed to reduce the monthly cost of telecommunications service for qualifying low-income consumers and is directly reflected in the price that the low-income customer pays.<sup>32</sup> Requiring a Lifeline provider to own the facilities it uses to offer service does not necessarily further the statutory goal of the low-income program.<sup>33</sup> In accordance with our forbearance grants to TracFone and Virgin Mobile, we find that the public interest is served by forbearing from the facilities requirement in section 214(e) to allow i-wireless to receive Lifeline support.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> *Id.* at 3391, para. 22.

<sup>27</sup> *Id.* at 3390 n.67.

<sup>28</sup> *Id.* at 3391, para. 22. Like other certifications, the carrier is required to retain these underlying carrier certifications and provide them to the Commission upon request.

<sup>29</sup> *Id.*

<sup>30</sup> *Id.*

<sup>31</sup> See *TracFone Forbearance Order*, 20 FCC Rcd at 15100-01, para. 12; *Virgin Mobile Forbearance Order*, 24 FCC Rcd at 3389, para. 18.

<sup>32</sup> 47 C.F.R. §§ 54.401, 54.504.

<sup>33</sup> See *TracFone Forbearance Order*, 20 FCC Rcd at 15104-05, para. 23; *Virgin Mobile Forbearance Order*, 24 FCC Rcd at 3393, para. 29.

<sup>34</sup> See *Virgin Mobile Forbearance Order*, 24 FCC Rcd at 3392-93, para. 27 ("[W]e do not believe that similar requests will have a detrimental impact on the fund. We note that to the extent any similarly situated prepaid wireless reseller seeks forbearance from these requirements for the purpose of providing only Lifeline support, it (continued . . .)

16. Continued growth of the universal service fund has highlighted in recent years the importance of the Commission's continued commitment to fight waste, fraud, and abuse. Accordingly, in addition to the consumer protection conditions outlined above and consistent with obligations imposed on TracFone and Virgin Mobile, we find that it is necessary to require i-wireless to assume additional obligations designed to protect against waste, fraud, and abuse.<sup>35</sup> Specifically, we condition our forbearance from the facilities requirement on i-wireless:

- (5) requiring each customer to self-certify at time of service activation and annually thereafter that he or she is the head of household and receives Lifeline-supported service only from that carrier;
- (6) establishing safeguards to prevent its customers from receiving multiple Lifeline subsidies from that carrier at the same address;
- (7) dealing directly with the customer to certify and verify the customer's Lifeline eligibility; and
- (8) submitting to the Wireline Competition Bureau a compliance plan outlining the measures the carrier will take to implement the obligations contained in this order within 30 days of the effective date of this order.

17. As we have held previously, we believe these obligations are necessary safeguards to help deter waste, fraud, and abuse.<sup>36</sup> These obligations apply in any state in which i-wireless becomes an ETC and plans to serve any customers without using its own facilities. Consistent with the obligations we have placed on TracFone and Virgin Mobile, we require i-wireless to clearly state the penalties for perjury on the self-certification form it uses to comply with the fifth obligation and to monitor compliance of its customers' self-certifications by retaining those self-certifications and providing them, as well as documentation of how the carrier obtained the certification, to the Commission upon request.<sup>37</sup>

18. We disagree with parties that argue that we should condition our forbearance on i-wireless complying with additional obligations, such as offering a particular usage package or complying with state-level 911 and E911 obligations.<sup>38</sup> We believe it is appropriate to leave those assessments to whichever commissions will rule on i-wireless's petitions for designation as an ETC. A state commission is generally in a better position than we to assess whether a particular offering will benefit that state's low-income consumers and to determine whether it is necessary to condition ETC designation on compliance with state-level 911 and E911 obligations.<sup>39</sup> We therefore encourage parties arguing for

(continued from previous page) \_\_\_\_\_  
will be expected to comply with all the conditions we imposed upon TracFone, which Virgin Mobile has agreed to do.”).

<sup>35</sup> See *TracFone Forbearance Order*, 20 FCC Rcd at 15103-04, 15105, paras. 18, 25; *Virgin Mobile Forbearance Order*, 24 FCC Rcd at 3392, para. 25.

<sup>36</sup> These obligations are in addition to, and do not supplant, the certification and verification eligibility already required by our rules for federal default states and any similar state rules for the non-federal default states. See, e.g., 47 C.F.R. § 54.410. On May 4, 2010, the Commission asked the Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service to review the Commission's eligibility, verification, and outreach rules for the Lifeline and Link Up universal service programs. See *Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service; Lifeline and Link Up*, CC Docket No. 96-45, WC Docket No. 03-109, Order, 25 FCC Rcd 5079 (2010).

<sup>37</sup> See *TracFone Forbearance Order*, 20 FCC Rcd at 15103-04, 15105, paras. 18, 25; *Virgin Mobile Forbearance Order*, 24 FCC Rcd at 3392, para. 25 & n.74.

<sup>38</sup> See, e.g., NASUCA Comments at 4-5 (arguing that forbearance is inappropriate unless i-wireless explains how it will apply the Lifeline discount to its plans); NENA Comments at 1-2 (arguing that carriers seeking forbearance should commit to complying with state-level 911 and E911 obligations as a condition of forbearance).

<sup>39</sup> Of course, if a state commission does not have jurisdiction to designate i-wireless as a limited-purpose ETC, we will consider i-wireless's application as well as whether any additional obligations are necessary for that particular designation to be in the public interest. See 47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(6).

additional obligations to redirect their arguments to ETC designation proceedings rather than this proceeding.

19. Similarly, we are not persuaded by comments regarding the impact on the size of the universal service fund and the associated contribution obligation if we grant the forbearance petition.<sup>40</sup> Granting forbearance here would allow i-wireless to compete with TracFone and Virgin Mobile (as well as other ETCs) for the existing pool of low-income customers, and the size of that pool is determined by Lifeline program eligibility requirements, not by the number of providers competing for those customers. The additional choice and service options of another wireless reseller offering a service for low-income consumers represents a significant benefit for consumers and is in the public interest. A new entrant should incent existing wireless reseller ETCs to offer better service and terms to their customers, which provides additional evidence that forbearance in the context of the Lifeline program outweighs the potential costs.<sup>41</sup>

20. In conclusion, we find that conditionally granting i-wireless forbearance for purposes of seeking ETC designation to participate in the Lifeline program only will further the statutory goal of providing low-income subscribers access to telecommunications and emergency services, while protecting the universal service fund against waste, fraud, and abuse.<sup>42</sup> To the extent, however, that our predictive judgment proves incorrect and these conditions prove to be inadequate safeguards, parties may file appropriate petitions with the Commission and we have the option of reconsidering this forbearance ruling.<sup>43</sup>

#### **B. Forbearance for Link Up**

21. We decline to grant the request of i-wireless for forbearance from the facilities requirement for the purpose of seeking ETC designation to receive Link Up support.<sup>44</sup> Petitioners seeking forbearance bear the burden of proof and must show that each of the statutory elements of forbearance is met.<sup>45</sup> i-wireless has not done so in the context of the Link Up program. Specifically, i-wireless does not

---

<sup>40</sup> See Pennsylvania Commission Reply at 5–6.

<sup>41</sup> For example, Virgin Mobile (the second wireless reseller to receive forbearance) has recently increased the number of minutes it offers to low-income consumers through its Lifeline product to attract more customers. Compare, e.g., Pennsylvania Commission Reply, CC Docket No. 96-45, at 6 n.16 (filed July 20, 2009) (noting that Virgin Mobile planned to offer 120 free prepaid minutes to Lifeline customers), with Virgin Mobile Petition for Limited Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the State of Alabama, WC Docket No. 09-197, at 8 (filed Jan. 15, 2010) (noting that Virgin Mobile plans to offer 200 free prepaid minutes to its Lifeline customers).

<sup>42</sup> i-wireless has committed to complying with all the obligations imposed on TracFone and Virgin Mobile as conditions of forbearance. See Forbearance Petition at 13.

<sup>43</sup> See *Petition for Forbearance of the Verizon Telephone Companies Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 160(c)*, WC Docket No. 01-338, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 19 FCC Rcd 21496, 21508–09, para. 26 & n.85 (2004); see also *Petition of SBC Communications Inc. for Forbearance from Structural Separations Requirements of Section 272 of the Communications Act of 1934, As Amended, and Request for Relief to Provide International Directory Assistance Services*, CC Docket No. 97-172, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 19 FCC Rcd 5211, 5223–24, para. 19 & n.66 (2004); *Cellnet Communications, Inc. v. FCC*, 149 F.3d 429, 442 (6th Cir. 1998).

<sup>44</sup> See Forbearance Petition at 8–14.

<sup>45</sup> See, e.g., *Petition to Establish Procedural Requirements to Govern Proceedings for Forbearance under Section 10 of the Communications Act of 1934, As Amended*, WC Docket No. 07-267, Report and Order, 24 FCC Rcd 9543, 9554–55, para. 20 (2009) (“We now state explicitly that the burden of proof is on forbearance petitioners at the outset and throughout the proceeding.”); *Petitions of Qwest Corporation for Forbearance Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 160(c) in the Denver, Minneapolis-St. Paul, Phoenix, and Seattle Metropolitan Statistical Areas*, WC Docket No. 07-97, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 23 FCC Rcd 11729, 11750, 11754–58, paras. 28, 36, 39 (2008) (noting that Qwest had failed to meet its burden of persuasion regarding sufficiency of market share).

address in its petition the differences between the Lifeline and Link Up programs, nor does the company explain how the obligations conditional to Lifeline participation would apply in the context of Link Up. Moreover, i-wireless does not explain how the public interest would be served by forbearing from the facilities requirement in this context.<sup>46</sup> General references to the statutory goal of ensuring that low-income consumers have access to telecommunications services do not suffice to replace a particularized argument regarding the facts and policy surrounding the facilities requirement and the Link Up program.<sup>47</sup> We thus conclude that i-wireless has failed to meet its burden to show that forbearing from the facilities requirement in the context of the Link Up program is in the public interest.<sup>48</sup>

#### IV. ORDERING CLAUSES

22. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that, pursuant to the authority contained in sections 4(i), 4(j), 10, 214, and 254 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), 154(j), 214, 254, the petition for forbearance filed by i-wireless Telecom, LLC IS GRANTED IN PART to the extent discussed herein and conditioned on fulfillment of the obligations set forth in this order and otherwise DENIED.

23. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to the authority contained in sections 4(i), 4(j), 10, 214, and 254 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), 154(j), 214, 254, we forbear from applying sections 54.201(d)(1) and 54.201(i) of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. § 54.201(d)(1), (i), to i-wireless Telecom, LLC to the extent discussed herein and conditioned on fulfillment of the obligations set forth in this order.

24. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to section 1.103(a) of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. § 1.103(a), this order SHALL BE effective upon release.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Marlene H. Dortch  
Secretary

---

<sup>46</sup> See Forbearance Petition at 8-14 (discussing Link Up only in the context of its discussion of Lifeline).

<sup>47</sup> See *Amendment of the Commission's Rules Concerning Maritime Communications*, PR Docket No. 92-257, Third Report and Order and Memorandum Opinion and Order, 13 FCC Rcd 19853, 19879-80, para. 55 (1998) ("MariTEL's request cannot be granted because it is too vague, both as to the specific provisions from which we should forbear from enforcing, and as to why forbearance would be in the public interest.").

<sup>48</sup> Because we find that i-wireless has not met its burden of proof on the third statutory element, we do not examine whether it did so on the first or second elements.