			Challenge Types	
Code	Challenge Type	Description	Specific Examples	Permissible rebuttals
A	Availability	The broadband service identified is not offered at the location, including a unit of a multiple dwelling unit (MDU).	Screenshot of provider webpage. A service request was refused within the last 180 days (e.g., an email or letter from a provider). Lack of suitable infrastructure (e.g., no fiber on poles). A letter or email dated within the last 365 days that a provider failed to schedule a service installation or offer an installation date within ten business days of a request. A letter or email dated within the last 365 days indicating that a provider requested more than the standard installation fee to connect this location or that a Provider quoted an amount in excess of the provider's standard installation charge to provide service at the location.	Provider shows that the location subscribes or has subscribed within the last 12 months, e.g., with a copy of a customer bill. If the evidence was a screenshot and believed to be in error, a screenshot that shows service availability. The provider submits evidence that service is now available as a standard installation, e.g., via a copy of an offer sent to the location.
s	Speed	The actual speed of the service tier falls below the unserved or underserved thresholds.	Speed test by a subscriber, showing insufficient speed and meeting the requirements for speed tests.	The provider has countervailing speed test evidence showing sufficient speed, e.g., from their own network management system, or tests initiated from a network management system but include an end-to-end measurement of latency between an IXP and CPE.
L	Latency	The round-trip latency of the broadband service exceeds 100 ms.	Speed test by a subscriber, showing excessive latency.	Provider has countervailing speed test evidence showing latency at or below 100 ms, e.g., from their own network management system or the CAF performance measurements, or tests initiated from a network management system but include an end-to-end measurement of latency between an IXP and CPE
D	Data cap	The only service plans marketed to consumers impose an unreasonable capacity allowance ("data cap") on the consumer.	Screenshot of provider webpage. Service description provided to the consumer.	The provider has terms of service showing that it does not impose an unreasonable data cap or offers another plan at the location without an unreasonable cap.
т	Technology	The technology indicated for this location is incorrect.	Manufacturer and model number of residential gateway (CPE) that demonstrates the service is delivered via a specific technology.	The provider has countervailing evidence from their network management system showing an appropriate residential gateway that matches the provided service.
В	Business service only	The location is residential, but the service offered is marketed or available only to businesses.	Screenshot of provider webpage.	Provider documentation that the service listed in the BDC is available at the location and is marketed to consumers.
E	Enforceable Commitment		Enforceable commitment by the service provider (e.g., authorization letter). In the case of Tribal Lands, the challenger must submit the requisite legally binding agreement between the relevant Tribal Government and the service provider for the location(s) at issue (see Section 6.2 above).	Documentation that the provider has defaulted on the commitment or is otherwise unable to meet the commitment (e.g., is no longer a going concern).
Р	Planned service	The challenger has knowledge that broadband will be deployed at this location by June 30, 2024, without an enforceable commitment, or a provider is building out broadband offering performance beyond the requirements of an enforceable commitment.	Construction contracts or similar evidence of ongoing deployment, along with evidence that all necessary permits have been applied for or obtained. Contracts or a similar binding agreement between the Eligible Entity and the provider committing that planned service will meet the BEAD definition and requirements of reliable and qualifying broadband even if not required by its funding source (i.e. a separate federal grant program), including the expected date deployment will be completed, which must be on or before June 30, 2024.	Documentation showing that the provider is no longer able to meet the commitment (e.g., is no longer a going concern) or that the planned deployment does not meet the required technology or performance requirements.
Ν	Not part of an enforceable commitment.	This location is in an area subject to an enforceable commitment to less than 100% of locations, and that commitment does not cover the location (See BEAD NOFO at 36, n. 52.)	Declaration by service provider subject to the enforceable commitment.	
С	Location is a CAI	The location should be classified as a CAI.	Evidence that the location falls within the definitions of CAIs set by the Eligible Entity.	Evidence that the location does not fall within the definitions of CAIs set by the Eligible Entity or is no longer in operation.
R	Location is not a CAI	The location is currently labeled as a CAI but is a residence, a non-CAI business, or is no longer in operation.	Evidence that the location does not fall within the definitions of CAIs set by the Eligible Entity or is no longer in operation.	Evidence that the location falls within the definitions of CAIs set by the Eligible Entity or is still operational.