Mr. Silverman, Executive Vice President and Chief Legal Officer, and the undersigned met with Amy Bender, Legal Advisor to Commissioner Michael O’Rielly, to discuss the Fact Sheet in the Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”) inmate calling services (“ICS”) proceeding.1

The meeting covered:

- the apparent decision to reduce all rates to levels that are not supported by the record cost data, will not ensure fair compensation for ICS providers, and do not reflect the

---

FCC’s well-established position that any effective new ICS policy must address ICS rates, ancillary charges, and site commissions to achieve a market-based result;\(^2\)

- GTL’s earlier meetings with Commissioner Mignon L. Clyburn, General Counsel Jonathan Sallet, and members of their staff regarding the FCC’s jurisdiction on the matters under review in the ICS proceeding, as well as on GTL’s discussions with other stakeholders;

- how the FCC’s abandonment of a market-based approach to ICS radically will reduce or eliminate the availability of security features and GTL’s ability to offer new technologies, which leaves inmates with a simple “box on the wall” and directly conflicts with the FCC’s legislative mandates;\(^3\)

- the employment and other business decisions the company may be forced to take if the proposals in the Fact Sheet are adopted;

- how smaller facilities in rural communities may lose ICS altogether because they will be too expensive to serve under the Fact Sheet proposed rates; and

- how the cost-based rates reflected in the Fact Sheet are a reversal of the FCC’s statements in the Second ICS FNPRM and to the D.C. Circuit that the FCC was proposing a market-based approach to ICS rates, which “could moot or significantly alter the scope of the petitioners’ challenges in [the] case to the FCC’s transitional reforms” adopted in the ICS Order and First FNPRM.\(^4\)

Pursuant to Section 1.1206(b) of the FCC’s rules, a copy of this notice is being filed in the appropriate docket.

---


\(^3\) See, e.g., 47 U.S.C. § 157(a) (“It shall be the policy of the United States to encourage the provision of new technologies and services to the public.”); 47 U.S.C. § 230(a), (b) (noting the benefits of Internet and interactive computer services and establishing it as “the policy of the United States . . . to promote the continued development of the Internet and other interactive computer services and other interactive media”); 47 U.S.C. § 254(b)(2) (stating the FCC shall base its policies on the principle that “[a]ccess to advanced telecommunications and information services should be provided in all regions of the Nation”); 47 U.S.C. § 1301, 1302 (finding that “deployment and adoption of broadband technology is vital” and stating the FCC “shall encourage the deployment on a reasonable and timely basis of advanced telecommunications capability to all Americans”).

\(^4\) Second ICS FNPRM ¶¶ 6, 47-48 (abandoning the “cost-based approach” from the ICS Order and First FNPRM and “moving to a market-based approach to encourage competition,” which will “reduce rates to just and reasonable levels” and ensure fair ICS compensation); Securus Technologies, Inc. v. FCC, No. 13-1280, Uncontested Motion of the Federal Communications Commission to Hold Case in Abeyance at 3, 4 (filed Dec. 10, 2014) (stating it was now asking “‘about a more market-based approach,’ with permanent rate caps as a ‘backstop’”); see also Small Refiner Lead Phase-Down Task Force v. EPA, 705 F.2d 506, 549 (D.C. Cir. 1983 (“Agency notice must describe the range of alternatives being considered with reasonable specificity.”)).
Please contact me if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Chérie R. Kiser

Chérie R. Kiser
Counsel for Global Tel*Link Corporation

cc (via e-mail): Amy Bender