

**FCC FACT SHEET\***

**Modernization of the Disaster Information Reporting System (DIRS)**

Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Order on Reconsideration – PS Docket Nos. 21-346 and 15-80;  
ET Docket No. 04-35

**Background:** DIRS is a web-based system that collects infrastructure status and service restoration information from communications service providers during and after major disasters. This information allows emergency management officials to more efficiently prioritize disaster response efforts. Cable communications, wireless, wireline, and interconnected Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) providers are required to report their infrastructure status in DIRS when it is activated. The *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* commences a thorough review of DIRS reporting and proposes changes to ensure the system is collecting information useful to disaster response without imposing unreasonable burdens on stakeholders. The *Order on Reconsideration* would grant, in part, the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions’ petition for reconsideration of the *Second Report and Order & FNPRM*—in which the Commission adopted certain rules governing DIRS activations—to clarify what the Commission expects from providers during those activations.

**What the Notice Proposes to do:**

- Provide manual filers a single streamlined, dynamic form for DIRS reporting that reduces burdens by being simpler to complete than the ten existing worksheets.
- Simplify DIRS reporting requirements by eliminating fields that do not offer significant value to public safety stakeholders, while offering limited additional voluntary fields that are tailored to the current information needs of emergency managers.
- Eliminate the requirement for mandatory DIRS filers to submit a final report after DIRS is deactivated to further reduce reporting burdens and enable providers to focus on disaster response and recovery.
- Limit DIRS reporting obligations to facilities-based providers, which will eliminate unnecessary reporting burdens for resellers and mobile virtual network operators (MVNOs).
- Examine whether to suspend NORS filing obligations during DIRS Lite activations to reduce regulatory compliance obligation during disasters.
- Promote federal and state agencies’ ability to obtain direct access to NORS and DIRS filings by reducing access requirements.

**What the Order on Reconsideration Does:**

- Confirm how providers must report outages to the Commission when they occur right before a DIRS activation.
- Maintain requirements to send outage notifications to 911 and 988 officials during DIRS activations to ensure these officials and the public can receive timely information about how to reach these critical services during a disaster.

\* This document is being released as part of a “permit-but-disclose” proceeding. Any presentations or views on the subject expressed to the Commission or its staff, including by email, must be filed in PS Docket Nos. 21-346 and 15-80 and ET Docket No. 04-35, which may be accessed via the Electronic Comment Filing System (<https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/>). Before filing, participants should familiarize themselves with the Commission’s *ex parte* rules, including the general prohibition on presentations (written and oral) on matters listed on the Sunshine Agenda, which is typically released a week prior to the Commission’s meeting. See 47 CFR § 1.1200 *et seq.*

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

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Resilient Networks	)	PS Docket No. 21-346
	)	
Amendments to Part 4 of the Commission’s Rules	)	PS Docket No. 15-80
Concerning Disruptions to Communications	)	
	)	
New Part 4 of the Commission’s Rules Concerning	)	ET Docket No. 04-35
Disruptions to Communications	)	

THIRD FURTHER NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING  
AND ORDER ON RECONSIDERATION

Adopted: [] Released: []

Comment Date: [30 days after date of publication in the Federal Register]  
Reply Comment Date: [60 days after date of publication in the Federal Register]

By the Commission:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Heading	Paragraph #
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. BACKGROUND.....	3
III. THIRD FURTHER NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING.....	9
A. Streamlining the DIRS Reporting Framework.....	10
B. Eliminating the Requirement to File DIRS Final Reports .....	18
C. Eliminating DIRS Reporting Obligations for Resellers and Mobile Virtual Network Operators.....	20
D. Extending the NORS Reporting Waiver to DIRS-Lite Activations.....	22
E. Eliminating Unnecessary Barriers to Information Sharing.....	23
F. Cost Benefit Analysis .....	26
IV. ORDER ON RECONSIDERATION .....	34
A. Clarifying the Situations in Which NORS Reporting is Waived.....	35
B. 911 and 988 Special Facility Notifications .....	37
V. PROCEDURAL MATTERS.....	39

\* This document has been circulated for tentative consideration by the Commission at its August 2025 open meeting. The issues referenced in this document and the Commission’s ultimate resolution of those issues remain under consideration and subject to change. This document does not constitute any official action by the Commission. However, the Chairman has determined that, in the interest of promoting the public’s ability to understand the nature and scope of issues under consideration, the public interest would be served by making this document publicly available. The Commission’s *ex parte* rules apply and presentations are subject to “permit-but-disclose” *ex parte* rules. See, e.g., 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.1206, 1.1200(a). Participants in this proceeding should familiarize themselves with the Commission’s *ex parte* rules, including the general prohibition on presentations (written and oral) on matters listed on the Sunshine Agenda, which is typically released a week prior to the Commission’s meeting. See 47 CFR §§ 1.1200(a), 1.1203.

## VI. ORDERING CLAUSES..... 47

APPENDIX A – Final Rules

APPENDIX B – Proposed Rules

APPENDIX C – Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

APPENDIX D – Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

APPENDIX E – List of Proposed Fields on DIRS Worksheets for Each Type of Provider

APPENDIX F – List of Commenters

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1. In this *Third Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Third Further Notice)*, we propose to modernize the Federal Communications Commission’s (Commission’s) Disaster Information Reporting System (DIRS). When disaster strikes, the public relies on communications networks to summon life-saving assistance from first responders and to contact important services such as insurance and utility companies. For nearly two decades, communications service providers have submitted information about the status of their communications infrastructure during disasters through DIRS. With today’s *Third Further Notice*, we commence a thorough review of DIRS reporting and propose changes to ensure the system is collecting information useful to disaster response without imposing unreasonable burdens on stakeholders.

2. In today’s *Order on Reconsideration*, we also grant, in part, the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions’ (ATIS’s) petition for reconsideration of the *Second Report and Order & FNPRM*—in which the Commission adopted certain rules governing DIRS activations—to clarify what the Commission expects from providers during DIRS activations. Specifically, the *Order on Reconsideration* clarifies the scope of the suspension of Network Outage Reporting System (NORS) reporting obligations during DIRS activations, thereby reducing filing burdens. We otherwise deny ATIS’s petition.

**II. BACKGROUND**

3. The Commission created DIRS in 2007 as a voluntary, web-based system to collect infrastructure status and service restoration information from communications service providers during and after major disasters. In 2024, the Commission adopted rules making reporting in DIRS mandatory for cable communications, wireless, wireline, and interconnected Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) providers.<sup>1</sup> The Commission’s Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau (Bureau) activates DIRS on its own initiative, or in coordination with state emergency management agencies, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), and the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA).<sup>2</sup> DIRS reports contain information about damaged communications infrastructure that compromises the public’s ability to access services like 911, and enable emergency management officials to identify communications facilities at risk of going offline because they are subsisting on backup power. While data submitted in DIRS is presumptively confidential,<sup>3</sup> the Bureau compiles information from filings within the DIRS database and produces publicly available communications status and restoration reports consisting of aggregated, anonymized data. NORS filing obligations are suspended during DIRS

<sup>1</sup> See *Resilient Networks; Amendments to Part 4 of the Commission’s Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications; New Part 4 of the Commission’s Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications*, PS Docket Nos. 21-346 and 15-80; ET Docket No. 04-35, *Second Report and Order and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, 39 FCC Rcd 623 (2024) (*Second Report and Order & FNPRM*); 47 CFR § 4.18.

<sup>2</sup> See U.S. Dept. of Homeland Security, Response and Recovery Federal Interagency Operational Plan at K-19 (2025), [https://www.fema.gov/sites/default/files/documents/fema\\_rd\\_response-recovery-fiop-npb-042025.pdf](https://www.fema.gov/sites/default/files/documents/fema_rd_response-recovery-fiop-npb-042025.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> See 47 CFR § 4.2.

activations.<sup>4</sup> While DIRS is generally activated only for disasters that have major effects on communications, the Bureau may activate “DIRS Lite,” an informal, voluntary process through which wireline and wireless providers may submit information about the status of major assets to the Commission by e-mail or phone.<sup>5</sup>

4. When DIRS is activated, providers that are required to submit reports must log into DIRS the day after activation (and on each subsequent day during which DIRS remains active) to complete worksheets applicable to its infrastructure.<sup>6</sup> Currently, DIRS includes ten different template worksheets for providers to report their infrastructure status, each of which requests information about (a) the provider and its facilities, (b) the operational status of those facilities, and (c) subscriber impacts:<sup>7</sup>

- *Major Equipment Worksheet.* Requires wireline, cable system, and VoIP providers to specify the operational status of their communications equipment, including whether they are operating on backup power; the number of working telephone numbers, Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) users, video users, and broadband access users served by the equipment; and how many of those users are experiencing an outage.
- *Remote Aggregation Devices Worksheet.* Requires providers to list the number of such devices—which combine network traffic from remote locations and serve many rural communities—experiencing an outage, how many working numbers are served by those devices, and how many working numbers are experiencing an outage.
- *Wireline Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) Worksheet.* Requires providers to specify the operational status of communications services they provide to PSAPs, the geographic areas and number of customers those PSAPs serve, the cause of any service degradation, and the estimated time of restoration.
- *Interoffice Facilities – Telecommunications Service Priority (TSP) Worksheet.* Requires providers to specify the number of Digital Signal 3 (DS3) lines and TSP circuits experiencing an outage.
- *Interexchange (IXC) Blocking Worksheet.* Requires providers to specify the number of calls blocked within a given period and the number of historical calls blocked in a 24-hour period.
- *Wireless Mobile Switching Center (MSC) - Signal Transfer Point (STP) Voice Worksheet.* Requires providers to specify facilities’ operational status, including whether they are operating on backup power.
- *Wireless Cell Site by County Worksheet.* Requires providers to specify the number of cell sites experiencing an outage; whether such an outage is a result of damage to the facility, an upstream transport outage, or lack of electrical power; and how many sites are operating on backup power.
- *Broadcast Worksheet.* Enables providers to specify the operational status of broadcast facilities, including whether it is experiencing a power outage.

---

<sup>4</sup> See 47 CFR § 4.18(b).

<sup>5</sup> See FCC, Standard Operating Procedures, DIRS-Lite at 1, [https://transition.fcc.gov/pshs/docs/Standard\\_Operating%20Procedures\\_DIRS-Lite.pdf](https://transition.fcc.gov/pshs/docs/Standard_Operating%20Procedures_DIRS-Lite.pdf).

<sup>6</sup> A provider must complete its DIRS reports by a time prescribed in the public notice activating DIRS. This time is often 10:00 AM ET, but the Bureau may make allowances for later reporting for disasters occurring on the West Coast or in the Pacific Ocean.

<sup>7</sup> See FCC, *Disaster Information Reporting System (DIRS) User Guide*, 15-18, 33-42 (Dec. 2023), <https://www.fcc.gov/sites/default/files/DIRS-UserGuide-122023.docx>.

- *Cable System Worksheet.* Enables providers to specify the total number of video, VoIP, cable telephone, and broadband subscribers served and the estimated number of each type of subscriber that is experiencing an outage.
- *Satellite Worksheet.* Enables providers to specify the operational status of their satellite facilities, including whether the facilities are experiencing a power outage. A provider may also specify the total number of antennas it operates, how many of those antennas are experiencing an outage, and how many temporary antennas are installed.

5. Each of these worksheets is about one page in length and includes multiple information fields for providers to complete, which vary depending on the type of facilities or equipment at issue, and generally include questions about the type of asset affected, its operational status, a general location (county or municipality), and a measure of the number of users affected. Providers that offer more than one type of service or that have multiple affected assets must submit multiple worksheets. Providers can file these worksheets via a manual filing or batch filing. Manual filing requires a provider to log into the Commission's DIRS portal and manually input line-item data for each required report. Batch filing allows a provider to use data from its internal systems to populate the tabs of a single spreadsheet file, but providers must configure their systems to export data in a format and organization that DIRS supports.<sup>8</sup>

6. Federal, state, Tribal, and territorial agencies with a "need to know" can obtain read-only access to DIRS filings (including provider-specific data) as well as filings in NORS.<sup>9</sup> Obtaining access requires an agency to submit a Participating Agency Certification Form that requires it to adhere to certain information protection provisions,<sup>10</sup> including requiring agency employees to complete initial and annual security trainings to access NORS and DIRS reports, regularly changing user account passwords, and annually recertifying to the terms of access.<sup>11</sup> Local agencies, including first responders, emergency communications centers, and other local government agencies, cannot obtain access to DIRS and NORS filings directly, and are instead reliant on derivative information sharing by agencies that obtain access.

7. In 2024, the Commission found in the *Second Report and Order* that the increasing frequency and severity of natural disasters, along with emergency management agencies' need for complete and accurate information about the status of critical infrastructure, necessitated mandatory DIRS reporting by cable communications, wireline, wireless, and interconnected VoIP service providers.<sup>12</sup> As of February 20, 2025, cable communications, wireline, wireless, and interconnected VoIP providers must "[p]rovide daily reports on their infrastructure status from the start of DIRS activation until DIRS has been deactivated" when DIRS is activated in an area where they provide service.<sup>13</sup> These providers must also submit a final report to the Commission providing "a short summary of the identity and status of [the provider's] outstanding infrastructure equipment and estimated dates by which any and all issues will be resolved" within 24 hours of DIRS deactivation.<sup>14</sup> The Commission's rules also provide that cable

---

<sup>8</sup> See FCC, *DIRS Upload API Guide* (Dec. 2023), <https://www.fcc.gov/sites/default/files/DIRS-UploadAPI-Guide-0124.docx> <https://www.fcc.gov/sites/default/files/DIRS-UserGuide-122023.docx> (*DIRS Upload API Guide*).

<sup>9</sup> See *Amendments to Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications*, PS Docket No. 15-80, Second Report and Order, 36 FCC Rcd 6136, 6153-55, paras. 58-62 (2021) (*NORS/DIRS Information Sharing Report and Order*); see also FCC, *Outage Information Sharing* (May 20, 2025), <https://www.fcc.gov/outage-information-sharing>.

<sup>10</sup> See *NORS/DIRS Information Sharing Report and Order*, 36 FCC Rcd at 6178-79, 6210-6212, para. 138, Appx. C.

<sup>11</sup> See *id.*; see also FCC, Exemplar Training Materials, <https://www.fcc.gov/file/23864/download>.

<sup>12</sup> See *Second Report and Order & FNPRM*, 39 FCC Rcd 623, at 631-33, 639, paras. 15-16, 29, 31.

<sup>13</sup> 47 CFR § 4.18(a); see also FCC, Resilient Networks; Disruptions to Communications, 90 Fed. Reg. 6839 (Jan. 21, 2025) (announcing the effective date as Feb. 20, 2025).

<sup>14</sup> 47 CFR § 4.18(a)(2).

communications, wireline, wireless, and interconnected VoIP providers that submit DIRS reports are not required to make submissions in NORS pertaining to any incidents arising during DIRS activation that are timely reported in DIRS.<sup>15</sup> Among other proposals, the accompanying *Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* proposed requiring FirstNet, an independent authority within the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) that provides a nationwide wireless broadband network for first responders, to report certain outages in NORS and to file mandatory DIRS reports.<sup>16</sup> FirstNet relies on AT&T's telecommunications network to deploy, operate, and maintain the FirstNet network.<sup>17</sup>

8. On May 10, 2024, ATIS filed a Petition for Clarification and/or Reconsideration of portions of the *Second Report and Order*.<sup>18</sup> In its petition, ATIS asks the Commission to clarify that the waiver of NORS filings during DIRS activations applies to outages that occur just prior to DIRS being activated,<sup>19</sup> to outages for which notifications or initial reports have already been filed in NORS,<sup>20</sup> to DIRS-Lite activations,<sup>21</sup> and to the Commission's Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) and 988 Suicide & Crisis Lifeline outage notification requirements.<sup>22</sup> Finally, ATIS requests that providers be required to submit final DIRS reports within 72 hours of DIRS deactivation, rather than 24 hours as currently required,<sup>23</sup> and urges the Commission "to either eliminate the requirement that . . . final [DIRS] reports include estimated resolution dates or specify that providers would not be held accountable for failing to meet estimated restoration times and for impacts that have yet to be discovered."<sup>24</sup> The Commission provided the opportunity for interested parties to file oppositions to the ATIS Petition and replies thereto.<sup>25</sup> In addition to filings from ATIS, the Commission received one opposition from the

---

<sup>15</sup> 47 CFR § 4.18(b).

<sup>16</sup> *Second Report and Order & FNPRM*, 39 FCC Rcd at 651-53, paras. 60-63 & n.138.

<sup>17</sup> See First Responder Network Authority, *FirstNet Partners with AT&T to Build Wireless Broadband Network for America's First Responders*, (Mar. 30, 2017), <https://2014-2018.firstnet.gov/news/firstnet-partners-att-build-wireless-broadband-network-americas-first-responders>.

<sup>18</sup> Petition of the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS) for Clarification and/or Reconsideration, PS Docket Nos. 21-346 and 15-80; ET Docket No. 04-35 (filed May 10, 2024), <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/105100798526151/1> (ATIS Petition).

<sup>19</sup> *Id.* at 3-4 ("It is unclear whether the waiver would apply to, for example, an [Optical Carrier 3 (OC3)] outage affecting at least 667 OC3 minutes and lasting at least 30 minutes that occurs at 11:30 AM if a DIRS activation occurs in that same activation area at noon.").

<sup>20</sup> *Id.* at 4 ("If, for example, an OC3 outage meeting the reporting threshold has occurred and subsequently DIRS is activated for that same area, it is unclear whether providers must submit further reports in NORS related to those outages.").

<sup>21</sup> *Id.*

<sup>22</sup> *Id.* citing *Ensuring the Reliability and Resiliency of the 988 Suicide & Crisis Lifeline; Amendments to Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications; Implementation of the National Suicide Hotline Improvement Act of 2018*, PS Docket Nos. 23-5 and 15-80; WC Docket No. 18-336, Report and Order, 38 FCC Rcd 6917 (2023) (amending § 4.9(a)(4), (c)(2)(iv), (e) introductory text, (e)(1)(v), (f)(4), and (g)(1)(i) of the Commission's rules).

<sup>23</sup> *Id.* at 6 citing 47 CFR § 4.9(a)(4), (c)(3)).

<sup>24</sup> *Id.*

<sup>25</sup> *Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau Announces Deadlines Regarding Petition for Reconsideration of the Resilient Networks Second Report and Order*, PS Docket Nos. 21-346 and 15-80; ET Docket No. 04-35, Public Notice, 39 FCC Rcd 6496 (PSHSB 2024).



Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials, International (APCO) and three replies from communications industry stakeholders.<sup>26</sup>

### III. THIRD FURTHER NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

9. We continue to believe that DIRS reporting has important public safety benefits,<sup>27</sup> but are cognizant of the resources that providers must commit to reporting at the same time they are responding to an ongoing disaster, including restoring service to customers. For this reason, we seek comment on ways to reduce the burdens of DIRS reporting to providers and increase its value for public safety stakeholders. Specifically, we propose to streamline reporting for providers that file in DIRS manually and eliminate fields that do not offer significant value for the purposes of disaster response and recovery. We also seek comment on collecting new information that we believe would offer significant public safety value, namely collecting infrastructure status information for public safety communication service offerings like FirstNet and collecting cell site location data for cell sites in a DIRS activation area on a voluntary basis. We further propose to exclude non-facilities-based providers from mandatory DIRS reporting, and seek comment on whether it is appropriate to extend the Commission's waiver of NORS filings to DIRS-Lite activations. Finally, to promote greater access to DIRS reports, we seek comment on changes that could be made to better facilitate NORS and DIRS information sharing so that emergency managers nationwide can more readily obtain access to this information.

#### A. Streamlining the DIRS Reporting Framework

10. *Simplifying DIRS Reporting for Manual Filers.* We propose to redesign the DIRS user interface to offer manual DIRS filers the ability to file a single, dynamic form instead of the current array of ten separate worksheets concerning different types of service and infrastructure, and seek comment on this proposal. Under the current framework, when the Bureau activates DIRS, providers must log into DIRS the day after activation (and on each subsequent day during which DIRS remains active) to complete worksheets applicable to its infrastructure. As described in Section II *supra*, each of the ten DIRS worksheets is about one page in length and includes multiple information fields for providers to complete, and providers that file manually must input line-item data for each report applicable to the services they provide—and sometimes must complete multiple versions of the same worksheet if, for instance, they have more than one type of major equipment affected by the disaster. Many of the worksheets request overlapping data, rendering the current DIRS manual reporting framework cumbersome and inefficient for manual filers. Moreover, the frequency and intensity of disasters has increased since the Commission first established DIRS in 2007,<sup>28</sup> leading to more frequent and lengthier DIRS activations.<sup>29</sup> This increase, combined with newly effective mandatory DIRS reporting obligations for cable communications, wireless, wireline and interconnected VoIP providers,<sup>30</sup> makes it appropriate for us to examine whether to simplify the DIRS reporting framework.

11. Under our proposal, rather than filling out a series of separate, overlapping worksheets, providers that log into DIRS would respond to initial questions concerning the types of services they provide in the DIRS activation area and the types of equipment and facilities affected by the disaster.

<sup>26</sup> See *infra* Appendix F (List of Commenters).

<sup>27</sup> See *Second Report and Order & FNPRM*, 39 FCC Rcd at 633, para. 17 (“While commenters argue that reporting in this context is a burden particularly for small entities, we disagree with those who surmise that mandating participation in DIRS will be *unduly* burdensome for subject providers and that the benefits of such reporting and information garnered do not outweigh the detriments, especially in the matter of preserving life and public safety.”).

<sup>28</sup> See *Second Report and Order & FNPRM*, 39 FCC Rcd at 627, para. 6.

<sup>29</sup> For instance, in 2016, there was only one DIRS activation. In 2024, there were seven DIRS activations due to multiple hurricanes and the New Mexico Wildfires. See FCC, *Past Response Efforts*, <https://www.fcc.gov/past-response-efforts> (last visited June 4, 2025).

<sup>30</sup> See 47 CFR § 4.18(a).

Based on these initial responses, each provider would be presented with questions seeking information relevant only to the services it provides, and would only be required to provide information common to multiple services and equipment types (such as the location and number of subscribers affected) once. For DIRS filers who complete the current worksheets manually, who we acknowledge represent a minority of the providers who are required to report in DIRS, this will also eliminate the need to complete multiple copies of certain worksheets if, for instance, they must report damage to multiple types of equipment or cell sites out in multiple counties. We further propose to include a “one-click” option on the consolidated worksheet for providers to indicate there is “no change” from the preceding day’s DIRS report, which would eliminate the current need for providers to complete multiple steps to report each day when their infrastructure status has not changed.<sup>31</sup> We believe these modifications may significantly simplify and reduce the time burden associated with manual DIRS data entry, while preserving the value of DIRS for the Commission and emergency management officials. We seek comment on this assessment.

12. We seek comment on how we could best implement these changes to DIRS. In Appendix E, we propose sets of fields that we tentatively believe will be most relevant to each type of provider in DIRS and that therefore would need to be completed by those providers as part of the dynamic manual form. Should changes be made to this approach to ensure that providers are completing both all the fields that are relevant to them, and only the fields that are relevant to them? Are there additional ways in which we can streamline the method by which providers report in DIRS without adversely impacting either the quality or utility of information that DIRS provides to public safety stakeholders and emergency managers?

13. *Refocusing DIRS Reporting to Collect Key Data.* We have identified several of the current DIRS worksheets and information fields that we propose to eliminate or modify because they are duplicative or may not provide information that provides significant value for emergency response. Specifically, we seek comment on whether we should take the following actions:

- Eliminate the fields from the Inter-exchange Carrier (IXC) Blocking worksheet, which does not appear to have proven useful for disaster response.
- Eliminate the Satellite worksheet, which we believe is unnecessary because no satellite service providers have ever made a DIRS filing.
- Eliminate the “Percent of Historical Capacity Available” field from the Wireless Cell Site by County worksheet, because the Commission can determine the extent to which capacity is available based on the number of cell sites reported as up or down.
- Eliminate fields from the Cable System worksheet that request both the number of cable telephone subscribers served and the number whose service is down, as these fields duplicate data that also must be reported for VoIP service.
- Eliminate fields from the Cable System and Major Equipment worksheets that request the numbers of video subscribers served and the number whose service is down, because we do not believe the availability of cable video service constitutes critical disaster-response information.
- Eliminate the “Number of Access Lines” field from the Major Equipment worksheet, which is covered in more granular questions elsewhere on the same worksheet.

---

<sup>31</sup> When a provider logs in to file a DIRS report, the information provided the day prior is already populated in the report.



- Harmonize fields on the Interoffice Facilities – TSP worksheet with NORS by requesting information about the number of Optical Carrier circuits (or their functional equivalent) affected, and eliminating the requirement to report the “number of DS3s down.”<sup>32</sup>
- Make it voluntary for providers to report the number of remote aggregation devices that are down on the Remote Aggregation Devices worksheet, which seeks information that is less crucial for emergency response than data requested elsewhere on the same worksheet.
- Make it voluntary, instead of mandatory, for providers to report the number of broadband data users served and the number of those users whose service is down, as found on the Major Equipment and Cable System worksheets (except as the Commission requires as a condition for the receipt of Universal Service Funds).<sup>33</sup>
- Instead of the current approach, under which some worksheets request both the address and latitude and longitude of affected equipment or facilities, we would request location information one of these formats (but not both) for each type of facility or equipment. We seek comment on whether this change would both reduce the number of fields in DIRS and improve the data by making it more uniform, and on whether, for each type of equipment or facility for which information is requested in DIRS, it would be more useful to request latitude and longitude or address.

14. We seek comment on whether eliminating or modifying these worksheets and fields would reduce the time burden associated with both manual and batch DIRS filing, and on whether the elimination or modification of these worksheets and fields would have a positive or negative effect on public safety or disaster recovery. For example, would eliminating fields concerning cable communications service video subscribers reduce emergency managers’ visibility into disaster impacts to people with disabilities, given the role of video-enabled alerting and notifications for people with access and functional needs? We also seek comment on additional ways we can streamline the substance of DIRS reporting for manual and batch filers to reduce filing burdens and without sacrificing the value of DIRS for emergency response and recovery.

15. Because information reported in DIRS is vital to determining where the “reparation, replacement, and restoration of communications infrastructure” is needed,<sup>34</sup> we seek to increase DIRS’s utility as a key input to disaster recovery efforts. Given the emergence of public safety communications networks and offerings such as FirstNet, Verizon Frontline,<sup>35</sup> and T-Priority,<sup>36</sup> we seek comment on whether to add fields to DIRS, as shown in Appendix E, to enable voluntary reporting on the status of public safety broadband networks during DIRS. Currently, AT&T’s, Verizon’s, and T-Mobile’s DIRS infrastructure status reports do not distinguish impacts to their respective public safety broadband networks from effects on other customers. This prevents the Commission from disseminating information to emergency management agencies about outages that may affect first responders’ ability to

---

<sup>32</sup> See, e.g., 47 CFR § 4.9(e)(1)(iii) (requiring NORS reporting when outages reach certain OC3 thresholds).

<sup>33</sup> Fixed and mobile broadband providers that are stage 2 recipients of the Uniendo a Puerto Rico Fund and Connect USVI Fund are required to report in DIRS. See 47 CFR § 54.1524.

<sup>34</sup> *Second Report and Order & FNPRM*, 39 FCC Rcd at 634-35, para. 20.

<sup>35</sup> See Verizon, *Dedicated to the Public Sector*, [https://www.verizon.com/business/solutions/public-sector/?cmp=knc:ggl:ac:ps:psao:na:8884610289\\_ds\\_cid\\_71700000115726781\\_ds\\_agid\\_58700008600462976&gclsrc=aw.ds&gad\\_source=1](https://www.verizon.com/business/solutions/public-sector/?cmp=knc:ggl:ac:ps:psao:na:8884610289_ds_cid_71700000115726781_ds_agid_58700008600462976&gclsrc=aw.ds&gad_source=1) (last visited Apr. 30, 2025) (describing Verizon Frontline service offering).

<sup>36</sup> T-Mobile, *T-Priority America’s best 5G network experience for first responders*, <https://www.t-mobile.com/business/t-priority> (last visited May 16, 2025) (describing T-Mobile’s T-Priority service offering).

communicate with one another and with PSAPs in disaster-affected areas.<sup>37</sup> First responders rely on public safety broadband networks to access key technologies that affect situational awareness, such as cameras that convey real-time or historical data; Internet-connected devices and sensors that monitor weather, traffic, environmental issues, or access to secured locations; and maps and Geographic Information Systems (GIS) that may provide the location of responders or assets, potential hazards, or relational information between personnel and assets.<sup>38</sup> Thus, FirstNet and other public safety broadband networks are a critical component of timely and effective emergency response. Any disruption to these services could literally be a matter of life or death for first responders themselves or members of the public who rely on police, fire, and emergency medical services that subscribe to these services. In view of the particularly sensitive role FirstNet and other public safety communications networks can play by enabling first responders to communicate during emergencies, we believe it appropriate to collect information during disasters on the operational status of FirstNet and similar public safety communications networks on a voluntary basis and seek comment on this approach. How would public safety stakeholders use this information if it were to be collected? We also seek comment on the burdens that collecting and reporting this information in DIRS would pose to the providers of these public safety networks, and whether these providers should report this information on a mandatory or voluntary basis.<sup>39</sup>

16. We also seek comment on whether the Commission should collect more granular information in DIRS from wireless providers on the location of cell sites that are out of service. Wireless service is an important lifeline during disasters and emergencies, including by enabling the public to receive Wireless Emergency Alerts (WEA). Currently, DIRS collects information about the county in which out-of-service cell sites are located. However, the average geographic size of a county in the United States is over 1,100 square miles,<sup>40</sup> so the county-based data DIRS collects is often insufficient to pinpoint which communities have lost wireless connectivity. Emergency managers have often requested more specific cell site location and coverage information from the Commission to help prioritize recovery efforts. To provide first responders more actionable information, we propose to revise our Wireless Cell Site by County worksheet to enable wireless providers to voluntarily provide more granular location information for cell sites in a DIRS activation area, or, alternatively, to attach geospatial data describing cell site location and coverage to their DIRS submissions. In what format(s) and level of granularity should the Commission collect this data? We seek comment on whether and how public safety officials

---

<sup>37</sup> The Commission proposed requiring FirstNet to report information about its infrastructure status in DIRS in the *Second Resilient Networks Further Notice*, which most commenters supported in view of FirstNet's role in enabling communications for first responders during disaster response and recovery. See, e.g., National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates and The Utility Reform Network Comments at 6 (stating that FirstNet's "unique purpose [is] to provide robust public safety communications and, by extension, carry some of the most life-saving information across public safety stakeholders when disasters strike."); National Regional Planning Council Comments at 2. FirstNet opposed this proposal, arguing that the information that it already provides to customers via its FirstNet Central platform is a sufficient source of near real-time operational status information. See First Responder Network Authority Comments at 3 (filed by the National Telecommunications and Information Administration). FirstNet Central, however, does not report outages within any specific required timeframe and is not accessible to non-FirstNet users.

<sup>38</sup> See FirstNet Authority, *First Responder Network Authority Roadmap* at 9-11 (2020), [https://firstnet.gov/sites/default/files/Roadmap\\_2020\\_nocompress.pdf](https://firstnet.gov/sites/default/files/Roadmap_2020_nocompress.pdf) at 13.

<sup>39</sup> In seeking comment, we seek to both refresh the record on this issue from the *Second Report and Order & FNPRM* and broaden its potential scope to include other public safety communications networks.

<sup>40</sup> See National Association of Counties, *What are counties?*, <https://www.naco.org/page/what-are-counties> (last visited June 3, 2025) (stating there are 3,143 county and county equivalents in the United States); United States Census Bureau, *Profiles*, <https://data.census.gov/profile?q=United+States+Mission+Indians&g=0100000U> (last visited June 3, 2025) (stating there are 3,532,316 square miles of land in the 50 states and District of Columbia). Using these data points, 3,532,316 square miles / 3,143 counties or equivalents means that there are each county or equivalent, on average, is approximately 1,123.87 square miles.

would use this information to support disaster response. We understand that many wireless providers already have this information and seek comment on the burden associated with providing it as part of their DIRS reports.

17. The Commission has delegated authority to the Bureau “to administer the communications disruption reporting requirements contained in part 4 of this chapter and to revise the filing system and template used for the submission of such communications disruption reports.”<sup>41</sup> We believe that this existing delegation is sufficiently broad to allow the Bureau to implement these changes to DIRS, as well as future modifications to DIRS and its fields that may be needed to ensure that the system continues to serve its crucial role in disaster response and recovery. We seek comment on this view, including whether this delegation should be amended to more clearly describe the Bureau’s administrative responsibilities.

#### **B. Eliminating the Requirement to File DIRS Final Reports**

18. We propose to eliminate the requirement for mandatory DIRS filers to submit a final report within 24 hours of DIRS deactivation and seek comment on this proposal.<sup>42</sup> Based on our experience administering the DIRS final report requirement, we tentatively conclude that final DIRS reports are not sufficiently beneficial to justify the burden they impose. We do not believe that these reports contain additional information beyond what is included in regular DIRS filings that meaningfully improves the Commission’s (or public safety officials’) situational awareness. We have found that, during the 24-hour period between DIRS’ deactivation and the deadline to submit final DIRS reports, providers do not develop significantly deeper insight into the expected repair time for their degraded facilities. Indeed, 24 hours after DIRS’ deactivation, the timeframe for the recovery of damaged assets may still depend on factors outside of the service provider’s control, such as the accessibility of the damaged area to service technicians or the availability of replacement parts. In such circumstances, providing a service restoration estimate to local emergency managers could do more harm than good by inviting reliance on an uncertain service restoration timeline. We also believe that eliminating final reports would reduce the overall DIRS reporting burden for mandatory DIRS filers and enable these providers to better focus their resources on restoration and recovery activities, rather than regulatory reporting, without adversely affecting public safety stakeholders. We seek comment on these beliefs.

19. We also seek comment on whether requiring mandatory DIRS reporting for cable communications, wireline, wireless, and interconnected VoIP providers has resulted in useful information for emergency managers and other public safety officials. For those public safety officials who have experienced DIRS activations under both voluntary and mandatory reporting regimes, are public safety officials receiving more useful and/or complete information than they did when DIRS reporting was voluntary? How are public safety officials using this information? Is it premature to make this assessment given that DIRS filing only became mandatory in February 2025 and there has only been one DIRS activation since then? If so, how much additional time do parties anticipate is needed to make an assessment? Are there additional changes to DIRS that would make it easier for providers to use and reduce the burdens associated with reporting? Are there other ways the Commission can modify or improve the reporting process to facilitate compliance with DIRS reporting obligations, e.g., how DIRS is activated, or how the Commission notifies communications service providers of DIRS activations?

---

<sup>41</sup> See 47 CFR § 0.392(i); see also 47 CFR § 4.18.

<sup>42</sup> 47 CFR § 4.18(a)(2). In its petition, ATIS asked the Commission to extend the timeframe to submit a DIRS final report following the deactivation of DIRS. ATIS Petition at 6 (observing it may not be possible to accurately determine restoration dates within a 24-hour window, particularly if resolution is contingent on factors outside a provider’s control such as “access to facilities, restoration of commercial power, and supply chain availability.”). ATIS also sought to eliminate the requirement that final DIRS reports include repair estimation dates, or alternatively, to have the Commission specify that filers would not be held accountable for failing to meet their estimated deadline. *Id.*

**C. Eliminating DIRS Reporting Obligations for Resellers and Mobile Virtual Network Operators**

20. DIRS enables the Commission to collect infrastructure status and restoration information from communications service providers during disasters and subsequent recovery efforts.<sup>43</sup> However, as currently constituted, the Commission's mandatory DIRS reporting rules also apply to communications service providers that do not own their own infrastructure or other facilities, i.e., Mobile Virtual Network Operators (MVNOs) and wireline and interconnected VoIP resellers.<sup>44</sup> As a result, these non-facilities-based providers are required to submit reports concerning infrastructure they do not own that will already be the subject of DIRS reporting by their facilities-based counterparts, creating additional burdens for them and for the underlying facilities-based providers who must relay infrastructure status to their non-facilities based partners to enable their reporting. To eliminate unnecessary burdens on MVNOs and resellers, as well as on the underlying facilities-based providers who support them, we propose to limit DIRS reporting to facilities-based providers and thereby exempt MVNOs and resellers from the obligation to file DIRS reports. We seek comment on this proposal.

21. Given the importance of wireless service in emergencies, in order to maintain situational awareness about the impact of disasters on service to customers of MVNOs, we propose to require facilities-based wireless providers to list in their initial report in DIRS which MVNOs utilize their respective networks within the DIRS activation area. In this way, providers would only need to list their MVNO information once. Further, we expect that facilities-based providers to have this information readily available, as such network use arrangements are governed by detailed agreements with the MVNOs, and seek comment on this belief. Alternatively, would requiring MVNOs to identify their underlying network provider as part of a limited DIRS filing be a more efficient and less burdensome way to collect this information? Would information about the operational status of MVNOs be valuable to federal, state, Tribal, territorial, and local stakeholders for maintaining visibility into the operational status of all wireless service providers and their subscribers? To what extent would this proposal reduce compliance burdens for non-facilities-based providers and/or their facilities-based partners? Would it be useful for the Commission to also require facilities-based wireline and VoIP providers to list in DIRS which resellers utilize their respective networks within the DIRS activation area?

**D. Extending the NORS Reporting Waiver to DIRS-Lite Activations**

22. In its petition, ATIS asked the Commission to clarify whether the Commission's waiver of NORS filing obligations during DIRS activations extends to activations of DIRS Lite.<sup>45</sup> DIRS Lite collects information about the status of major wireline and wireless assets, such as switches, and PSAPs, for disaster events that are less serious than those triggering DIRS activations. Instead of filers reporting in an online system as they do when DIRS is activated, DIRS Lite consists of information compiled by Commission staff in response to email and telephone requests to communications service providers.<sup>46</sup> As a result, the scope of the DIRS-Lite information collection is narrower than that of DIRS and is not available to agencies with NORS or DIRS access. We seek comment on whether the NORS reporting waiver afforded to mandatory DIRS filers should be extended to providers that share information with the

---

<sup>43</sup> See FCC, *Disaster Information Reporting System (DIRS)* (Apr. 30, 2024), <https://www.fcc.gov/general/disaster-information-reporting-system-dirs-0>.

<sup>44</sup> See 47 CFR § 4.3(a), (f), (g), (h) (defining cable communications, wireline, wireless, and interconnected VoIP providers with respect to the services they offer, without limitation to facilities ownership).

<sup>45</sup> See ATIS Petition at 4 ("ATIS NRSC further requests that the Commission clarify that its waiver of NORS applies to both DIRS and DIRS-Lite activations[ ]"); CTIA Reply at 4 (asking the Commission to "clarify that the that the NORS filing waiver applies when either DIRS or DIRS-Lite is activated[ ]"). The waiver of NORS filing obligations during DIRS activations is codified at 47 CFR § 4.18(b).

<sup>46</sup> FCC, *Standard Operating Procedures DIRS-Lite* (last visited Oct. 31, 2024), [https://transition.fcc.gov/pshs/docs/Standard\\_Operating%20Procedures\\_DIRS-Lite.pdf](https://transition.fcc.gov/pshs/docs/Standard_Operating%20Procedures_DIRS-Lite.pdf).

Commission during DIRS-Lite activations. Is the information the Commission receives in DIRS-Lite activations an appropriate substitute for NORS reporting in situations where DIRS-Lite is activated? Would public safety stakeholders have sufficient visibility into communications infrastructure status from DIRS-Lite submissions, given both the voluntary nature of DIRS-Lite activations and the fact that the Commission's NORS and DIRS information sharing regime does not extend to DIRS Lite?<sup>47</sup> Would extending the NORS waiver to DIRS-Lite activations create a gap in the Commission's outage records and data analysis, allowing providers to avoid NORS filings, which require information about the cause and scope of an outage, while submitting only information the provider chooses to include as part of a voluntary oral or emailed submission to Commission staff?

**E. Eliminating Unnecessary Barriers to Information Sharing**

23. Since direct access to NORS and DIRS filings became available on September 30, 2022, only 22 federal, state, Tribal, or territorial emergency management or public safety agencies have sought and been granted direct access. Our understanding is that several emergency management agencies have declined to participate in the Commission's NORS and DIRS information sharing program because they regard the requirements as too burdensome. As a result of this relatively low rate of adoption, we are concerned that NORS and DIRS information is being underutilized during emergencies. We seek comment on this view.

24. We seek comment on ways to simplify our information sharing requirements to make it easier for emergency management agencies to obtain direct access to NORS and DIRS filings for use in restoration and recovery efforts. For example, we seek comment on whether eliminating the following provisions of the Participating Agency Certification Form would encourage greater participation by federal and state agencies while continuing to safeguard confidential information: (1) remove provisions that simply restate the rules and associated training materials; (2) eliminate requirements that agencies annually recertify to the terms of access; (3) dispose of requirements that agencies regularly change user account passwords; and (4) remove requirements that requesting agency employees complete initial and annual security trainings to access NORS and DIRS reports.<sup>48</sup> We also seek comment on whether to loosen the restrictions on how non-confidential NORS and DIRS data can be shared and used, so that the information can be shared more broadly with local public safety agencies and government agencies with relevant equities outside the emergency-management space. If these restrictions are loosened, which sharing restrictions should be modified or eliminated and what kinds of additional uses should be allowed? We seek comment on whether these actions would further our goal of promoting more robust participation in the Commission's information sharing program, which would in turn enhance emergency response and public safety efforts.

25. The Commission could also ease access to DIRS data by making some information included in DIRS filings more widely available to the public.<sup>49</sup> We seek comment on whether there are types of information currently included in DIRS filings could be subject to public disclosure without adversely impacting national security or commercially sensitive interests. Narrowing the presumption of confidentiality for DIRS filings may allow the Commission to include more data in public DIRS reports, eliminating the need for emergency management agencies to enter into complex information-sharing agreements with the Commission while still protecting providers' most sensitive data. This approach would also increase overall transparency into the reliability of providers' networks, which will increase competition between providers. Allowing greater public access to DIRS reports could result in a variety of potential benefits, including more information for the public about the scope of outages and disaster-

---

<sup>47</sup> See 47 CFR § 4.2.

<sup>48</sup> See FCC, Exemplar Training Materials, <https://www.fcc.gov/file/23864/download>.

<sup>49</sup> Note that the Commission currently makes a compiled communication status report of certain key and non-confidential information derived from DIRS filings publicly available on its website. See FCC, Hurricane Helene Communications Status Report - Oct 19, 2024 (2024), <https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/DOC-406771A1.pdf>.

related service disruptions when they occur, so that they can fund alternative means of communications. Moreover, researchers or other groups could collate and analyze the data in DIRS reports to help identify systemic or provider-specific problems and recommend solutions. As the Commission has recognized, even limited information disclosure from outage reports can spur industry-wide collaboration to improve network reliability issues and other improvements.<sup>50</sup> Is it necessary for all of the information filed in DIRS to continue to be treated confidentially? What specific categories of information do providers view as particularly sensitive that may warrant continued confidential treatment, and what harms may arise if that information was publicly released?

#### F. Cost Benefit Analysis

26. We seek comment on whether the changes to DIRS discussed above would generate benefits for communications service providers and public safety officials that outweigh the costs. We note that, as a general matter, it is impossible to assign precise dollar values to aspects of public safety, life, and health that may be affected by changes to DIRS reporting. Nevertheless, we believe that our proposals to reduce the burdens of DIRS reporting on service providers will result in annual cost savings of approximately \$4 million, which outweighs the \$1,400 one-time cost and the \$215,000 annual recurring costs to implement these changes.<sup>51</sup> These net cost savings, along with freeing up resources to restore and maintain service, will outweigh any potential effects on public safety from the Commission no longer receiving and sharing certain types of infrastructure status information.

27. In the *Second Report and Order*, the Commission estimated that complying with mandatory DIRS reporting requirements annually would cost providers approximately \$1.6 million.<sup>52</sup> Compliance was estimated to require, on average for each county in which DIRS was activated, one administrative support person per provider with a total hourly compensation of \$33.51 to take 10 minutes to enter initial contact information, take 10 minutes per day to enter updates on its infrastructure status system status per county for 14 days, and take 10 minutes to file a final report.<sup>53</sup> The Commission applied this estimated cost to an average of 54 cable communications, wireline, interconnected VoIP, and wireless service providers that provider service per county in 339 counties, which is the average number of counties that it estimated to be affected by DIRS activations each year.<sup>54</sup> We seek comment on whether this methodology remains an appropriate starting point for identifying the cost savings that arise from the changes to DIRS that we propose today. If not, what methodology should we use to determine the costs associated with DIRS filings?

28. Using the quantitative framework from the *Second Report and Order* with updated provider counts,<sup>55</sup> we estimate the overall benefits from cost savings for providers that arise from

<sup>50</sup> See *Amendments to Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications*, PS Docket No. 15-80; Report and Order, 36 FCC Rcd 6136, 6138-39, para. 7 (2021).

<sup>51</sup> The approximate \$4 million benefit estimate includes cost savings of \$143,000 for streamlining the filing process and eliminating the final report requirement for facilities-based voice providers, \$3.9 million from eliminating DIRS reporting obligations for MVNOs and VoIP resellers, and \$700 for waiving the NORS filing requirement when DIRS LITE is activated. See *infra* paras. 28 & 31. The cost estimates include a \$1,400 one-time cost for DIRS batch filing reconfiguration, an annual cost of \$143,000 for facilities-based wireless providers to include MVNO information in DIRS filing, and an annual cost of \$72,000 for public safety broadband networks to report outages when DIRS is activated. See *infra* paras. 29 & 30.

<sup>52</sup> *Second Report and Order & FNPRM*, 39 FCC Rcd at 640-41, para. 34 & n. 84 (calculating a cost of \$1,635,668).

<sup>53</sup> *Id.* (estimating that an administrative support person with an hourly wage of \$21.90 plus a 45% cost for benefits (\$9.86/hour), multiplied by 105.5% to reflect a 5.5% inflation).

<sup>54</sup> *Id.* at 640-41, para. 34 & n. 83-84.

<sup>55</sup> Pursuant to staff estimation, at the county-level, there are on average 53 fixed voice providers, including cable communications, wireline, and VoIP providers per county. Among these, an average of 12 fixed voice providers are  
(continued....)



modifying DIRS as proposed above to be approximately \$143,000. By removing the need for providers to select from the current array of ten separate forms concerning different types of service and infrastructure, we estimate that manual filers should be able to complete their filings more quickly than they were prior to these changes. In addition, we estimate that eliminating unnecessary and duplicative fields will allow DIRS filings to be submitted more quickly. While it is difficult to precisely estimate the change in burden for providers overall due to differences in burdens that arise from differing service types, size, extent of service area, and preferred filing method, we estimate that these changes are likely to result in at least a 20% reduction in the amount of time that providers must spend on average when filing in DIRS on average. Our proposal to eliminate the requirement to file a final DIRS report further reduces this burden. Using an updated 2025 hourly compensation figure of \$35.22,<sup>56</sup> we estimate a total annual cost savings of \$143,000 for facilities-based providers.<sup>57</sup> We seek comment on our analysis.

29. We recognize that our proposal to eliminate certain data fields may cause result in service providers that use the DIRS batch filing option to incur one-time costs. In batch filing, a service provider utilizes the Commission's spreadsheet template so that multiple DIRS worksheets can be filed simultaneously.<sup>58</sup> In response to our proposed reporting field changes, a provider may need to reconfigure its systems to reorganize how it exports data, and to ensure that the data is formatted in a manner accepted by DIRS. This may involve a one-time cost of an Information Technology (IT) professional, such as a database administrator, setting up the new index. According to the BLS, a database administrator has an average hourly wage of \$51.65 per hour, which would amount to a total hourly compensation of \$75.41/hour.<sup>59</sup> Updating a provider's systems can take anywhere from a few

---

facilities-based, and 41 are non-facilities based resellers. Staff calculation, FCC, Form 477 non-public data (June 2024). We further estimate that there are an average of six facilities-based mobile wireless voice providers and 82 MVNOs per county. Staff calculation, FCC, Form 477 non-public data (June 2024) and Form 499 non-public data (Aug. 2024) (where providers with revenue reported at any time during the calendar year 2023 filed a Form 499).

<sup>56</sup> The 2025 statistics suggest a base hourly wage of \$24.12/hour. See Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), *Occupational Employment and Wage Statistics, Occupational Employment and Wages* (May 2024), <https://www.bls.gov/oes/tables.htm> (navigate to "May 2024," "National," then followed by "Office and Administrative Support Occupations (43-0000)," it states that the mean hourly wage for an office and administrative support occupation worker is \$24.12/hour in May 2024). According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, as of March 2025, civilian wages and salaries averaged \$32.92/hour and benefits averaged \$15/hour. Using these figures, benefits constitute a markup of \$15/\$32.92 ~ 46%. Taking 46% for cost of benefits (\$11.10/hour), we arrive at an hourly compensation of \$35.22/hour (\$24.12/hour + \$11.10/hour). See Press Release, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Employer Costs for Employee Compensation—March 2025* (June 13, 2025), <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/eccc.pdf> (*Benefit Markup*).

<sup>57</sup> We estimate the cost saving from streamlining DIRS reporting with a (20% cost reduction) × 1 office and administrative support worker × (\$35.22 hourly compensation) × [(10/60) hours for the initial entry + (10/60) hours for daily updates × 14 days] × 339 counties × 18 facilities-based service providers = \$107,456. We further estimate a \$35,819 cost saving from eliminating the final reporting requirement as 1 office and administrative support worker × (\$35.22 hourly compensation) × (10/60) hours for the final report entry × 339 counties × 18 facilities-based service providers = \$35,819. The aggregate cost saving is \$143,275 (= \$107,456 + \$35,819), which we round to \$143,000. See *supra* note 55 (we estimate a total of 18 facilities-based voice providers, including 12 fixed voice providers and six wireless voice providers, per county).

<sup>58</sup> *DIRS User Guide* at 44-46.

<sup>59</sup> See BLS, *Occupational Employment and Wage Statistics, Occupational Employment and Wages* (May 2024), <https://www.bls.gov/oes/tables.htm> (navigate to "May 2024," "National", then followed by "Database Administrators (15-1242)", it states that the mean hourly wage for an Database administrator is \$51.65/hour in May 2024). Taking 46% for cost of benefits (\$23.76/hour), we arrive at an hourly compensation of \$75.41/hour (= \$51.65/hour + \$23.76/hour). See *Benefit Markup*.

seconds to several hours, depending on the amount of data fields.<sup>60</sup> As detailed in Appendix E, the amount of data required for a DIRS report is relatively minimal. Accordingly, we estimate that the one-time costs would require an average of one hour in view of the amount of data being modified. This would result in an upfront cost of no more than \$1,400 if all the DIRS filers use the batch filing option,<sup>61</sup> which we believe would be significantly outweighed by the recurring cost savings described above. We seek comments on these cost estimates.

30. We estimate that by clarifying that we are excluding resellers and MVNOs from the requirements to file in DIRS will result in additional savings of \$3.9 million for those categories of providers. In the *Second Report and Order*, we did not include resellers and MVNOs in the cost calculation.<sup>62</sup> As currently constituted, the Commission's mandatory DIRS reporting rules also apply to service providers that do not own their own infrastructure, i.e., MVNOs and wireline and interconnected VoIP resellers.<sup>63</sup> To eliminate unnecessary burdens on MVNOs and resellers, we propose to limit DIRS reporting to facilities-based providers and thereby exempt MVNOs and resellers from the obligation to file DIRS reports. We estimate that the proposed exclusion of non-facilities-based providers from the DIRS filing requirement will result in an annual cost savings of \$3.9 million for these affected MVNOs and resellers. We arrived at this estimate by calculating an average of 82 MVNOs and 41 resellers providing service in each county,<sup>64</sup> and then applying the same cost methodology for DIRS filings that we use in the *Second Report and Order*.<sup>65</sup> To maintain situational awareness about the impact of disasters on service to customers of MVNOs, we propose to require facilities-based wireless providers to list in DIRS which MVNOs utilize their respective networks within the DIRS activation area. We believe the cost of requiring facilities-based wireless providers to list in DIRS which MVNOs utilize their respective networks within the DIRS activation area would be minimal because facilities-based providers should have this information readily available. Nevertheless, we conservatively estimate that the additional reporting cost should not be greater than the overall DIRS reporting burden for these wireless facilities-based providers. We estimate \$143,000 as an upper bound of such incremental costs.<sup>66</sup> We recognize that requiring information on public safety broadband networks to be included in DIRS reports may trigger additional costs. We estimate this additional filing cost will not exceed \$72,000.<sup>67</sup> We do not account for any benefits and costs arising from collecting additional voluntary information (e.g., granular

<sup>60</sup> See ServiceNow, *How to create a database index via the UI* (May 2, 2025), [https://support.servicenow.com/kb?id=kb\\_article\\_view&sysparm\\_article=KB0870445](https://support.servicenow.com/kb?id=kb_article_view&sysparm_article=KB0870445).

<sup>61</sup> We estimate the total cost to be no more than \$1,357 = 1 database administrator × \$75.41/hour × 1 hour × 18 facilities-based cable, wireline, wireless, and interconnected VoIP providers, which we round to \$1,400.

<sup>62</sup> *Second Report and Order & FNPRM*, 39 FCC Rcd at 640-41, para. 34 & n. 84 (we estimated that an average county would be supported by 54 voice providers, including facilities-based providers and VoIP resellers but omitting any MVNOs).

<sup>63</sup> See 47 CFR § 4.3(a), (f), (g), (h) (defining cable communications, wireline, wireless, and interconnected VoIP providers with respect to the services they offer, without limitation to facilities ownership).

<sup>64</sup> See *supra* note 55.

<sup>65</sup> We estimate the cost savings from exempting MVNOs and VoIP resellers from DIRS reporting is approximately \$3.9 million. We estimate the cost saving as follows: 1 office and administrative support worker × (\$35.22 hourly compensation) × [(10/60) hours for the initial entry + (10/60) hours for daily updates × 14 days + (10/60) hours for the final report entry] × 339 counties × (82 MVNOs + 41 resellers) = \$3,916,182, which we round to \$3.9 million.

<sup>66</sup> Our estimate calculates the cost as follows: (1 – 20% cost saving) × 1 office and administrative support worker × (\$35.22/hour) × [(10/60) hours for the initial entry + (10/60) hours for daily updates × 14 days] × 339 counties × 6 facilities-based wireless providers = \$143,275, which we round to \$143,000.

<sup>67</sup> (1–20% cost saving) × {1 office and administrative support worker × (\$35.22/hour) × [(10/60) hours for the initial entry + (10/60) hours for daily updates × 14 days] × 339 counties × 3 public safety broadband network providers} = \$71,637, which we round to \$72,000.

location information) because providers will only voluntarily provide such information when they deem the benefits from providing such information outweigh the costs. We seek comment on these estimates.

31. For extending the NORS suspension to DIRS Lite, we estimate the cost savings to be approximately \$70 per DIRS-Lite responder. The Commission has historically estimated that a provider requires two hours to complete all of the NORS filing requirements.<sup>68</sup> The Commission previously activated DIRS Lite for New Mexico wildfires in 2024<sup>69</sup> and for Hawaii wildfires in 2023.<sup>70</sup> Our records indicate that 10 service providers responded during each DIRS-Lite activation. In view of this information, we estimate that providers would have saved approximately \$700 per year by having their NORS filings requirements waived.<sup>71</sup> We seek comment on our analysis.

32. We seek comment on the benefit from cost savings associated with our proposed changes to the Commission's NORS and DIRS information sharing requirements. In the past, we have estimated that each agency participating that framework would spend five hours preparing, reviewing, and submitting its initial request for NORS and DIRS access to the FCC and a similar amount of time annually to re-certify their qualifications to access NORS in every year thereafter.<sup>72</sup> These initial and annual requirements include the review of the security training materials and the submission of the certification and recertification forms, which we propose to simplify in the foregoing *Third Further Notice*.<sup>73</sup> Would the proposed changes reduce the number of hours that agencies would require to apply for NORS and DIRS access, and if so, by how much? Are there other ways in which the changes to NORS and DIRS that we propose above would reduce burdens on agencies that seek NORS and DIRS information?

33. We further seek comment on the benefits and costs associated with loosening the restrictions on how non-confidential NORS and DIRS data can be shared and used, and making more data publicly available. Commenters are encouraged to provide specific examples, suggesting guiding criteria for making confidentiality determinations when the harms of disclosure outweigh the benefits of public

---

<sup>68</sup> *Ensuring the Reliability and Resiliency of the 988 Suicide & Crisis Lifeline; Amendments to Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications; Implementation of the National Suicide Hotline Improvement Act of 2018*, PS Docket Nos. 23-5 and 15-80, WC Docket No. 18-336, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 23-7 (rel. Jan. 27, 2023) (*2023 Notice*) at 15, notes 80 and 82 (estimating that estimate that each notification would take 15 minutes to complete, each initial report would take a maximum of 45 minutes to complete, and each final report would take a maximum of one hour to complete).

<sup>69</sup> See FCC, Communications Status Report for Areas Impacted by New Mexico Wildfires - June 20, 2024 (2024), <https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/DOC-403353A1.pdf>; and FCC, Communications Status Report for Areas Impacted by New Mexico Wildfires - June 24, 2024 (2024), <https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/DOC-403416A1.pdf>. The activation lasted 5 days, with June 20 being the start of the activation of DIRS-Lite, and June 24 the last day of the activation.

<sup>70</sup> See FCC, Communications Status Report for Areas Impacted by Hawaii Wildfires - August 12, 2023 (2023), <https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/DOC-395973A1.pdf>; and FCC, Communications Status Report for Areas Impacted by Hawaii Wildfires - August 25, 2023 (2023), <https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/DOC-396351A1.pdf>. The activation lasted 14 days, with August 12 being the start of the activation of DIRS-Lite, and August 25 being the last day of the activation.

<sup>71</sup> We estimate that the task of reporting outages in NORS can be accomplished by a miscellaneous office and administrative support worker × 2 hours per provider × \$35.22 per hour × 10 providers = \$704, which we round to \$700 per year.

<sup>72</sup> See FCC, Section 4.9, Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications, 3060-0484, Supporting Statement (June 2022).

<sup>73</sup> See FCC, *Rules and Responsibilities for Accessing, Using, Sharing, and Protecting NORS and DIRS Information*, 2 (Sept. 2022), <https://www.fcc.gov/file/23864/download>.

access to these data. We particularly welcome input supported by data, legal precedent, and practical experience.

#### IV. ORDER ON RECONSIDERATION

34. In this *Order on Reconsideration*, we grant, in part, ATIS's Petition for Reconsideration and/or Clarification of the *Second Report and Order*.<sup>74</sup> The *Second Report and Order* codifies the suspension of NORS reporting requirements when filers timely report outages in DIRS while DIRS is activated.<sup>75</sup> We clarify that when any NORS filing is due prior to the first DIRS filing deadline, providers must submit that filing in NORS. Requirements to submit NORS filings with deadlines that occur after the deadline for the first DIRS filing deadline are waived so long as the outage is timely reported in DIRS.<sup>76</sup> We otherwise deny the petition. Specifically, we decline ATIS's request to clarify that the waiver of NORS reporting during DIRS activations extends to 911 and 988 special facility notifications.<sup>77</sup> We reaffirm that the final rules that the Commission adopted in the *Second Report and Order* regarding the waiver of NORS reporting during DIRS activations serve the public interest.<sup>78</sup> We dispose of the other issues raised in ATIS's petition, concerning DIRS final reports and extending the NORS reporting waiver to DIRS-Lite activations, pursuant to § 1.429(b).<sup>79</sup> These arguments were not raised in response to the *2021 Resilient Networks NPRM*, and we do not believe that consideration of ATIS's arguments on these points is required in the public interest, as necessary for us to address an issue that was not raised during the proceeding for which reconsideration is sought.<sup>80</sup> We nonetheless seek comment on these issues in the *Third Further Notice* above to more fully consider alternatives in response to the points ATIS raises.

##### A. Clarifying the Situations in Which NORS Reporting is Waived

35. We clarify our outage reporting requirements for outages that occur in the same geographic area as a DIRS activation.<sup>81</sup> In these circumstances, providers must file in NORS if the required filing will become due prior to the first DIRS filing deadline of the activation. Requirements to submit any NORS filings with deadlines that occur after the first DIRS filing deadline will be waived as long as the outages are timely reported in DIRS. If the first DIRS filing deadline occurs before the NORS notification is due, then the provider may file solely in DIRS.<sup>82</sup> This waiver does not apply to outages

---

<sup>74</sup> See Petition of the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS) for Clarification and/or Reconsideration, PS Docket Nos. 21-346 and 15-80; ET Docket No. 04-35, at 1 (filed May 10, 2024), <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/105100798526151/1> (ATIS Petition).

<sup>75</sup> *Second Report and Order & FNPRM*, 39 FCC Rcd at 638, para. 25.

<sup>76</sup> Cable communications, wireless, and wireline providers are required to file a notification, initial report, and final report in NORS. See 47 CFR § 4.9(a), (e), (f). Interconnected VoIP providers are required to file only a notification and a final report. See 47 CFR § 4.9(g).

<sup>77</sup> See ATIS Petition at 4.

<sup>78</sup> 47 CFR § 1.429(b); 1.429(l)(2).

<sup>79</sup> 47 CFR § 1.429.

<sup>80</sup> See 47 CFR § 1.429(b)(3).

<sup>81</sup> Revisions to section 4.18(b) of the Commission's rules to codify this clarification are contained in Appendix A – Final Rules.

<sup>82</sup> ATIS Petition at 4 (“If, for example, an OC3 outage meeting the reporting threshold has occurred and subsequently DIRS is activated for that same area, it is unclear whether providers must submit further reports in NORS related to those outages”); Reply Comments of T-Mobile USA, Inc., PS Docket Nos. 21-346 and 15-80; ET Docket No. 04-35, at 2 (filed July 5, 2024), <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/107052327402438/1> (T-Mobile Reply) (stating “the Commission should issue the clarification sought by ATIS that NORS filings are not required for outages that occur prior to DIRS activation but involve the same area and event”).

occurring outside of the geographic area where DIRS is activated, nor does it apply to outages with notification deadlines that occur after DIRS is deactivated. All outage impacts that are not timely reported in DIRS must still be reported in NORS. We believe the clarity we provide today will serve the public interest by confirming reporting obligations in those limited circumstances when an outage occurs, in ATIS's phrasing, "just prior to" a DIRS activation.<sup>83</sup> This clear demarcation defining when NORS reports must be filed for outages occurring "just prior" to a DIRS activation will remove any potential uncertainty among providers.<sup>84</sup> We agree with ATIS that by providing greater certainty regarding how the NORS waiver is to be applied, this waiver will be more effective at reducing filing burdens during emergencies.<sup>85</sup>

36. We deny ATIS's request to clarify that NORS filers be allowed to withdraw notifications or reports that are filed in NORS before the first DIRS filing deadline solely because DIRS has been activated in the area of the outage.<sup>86</sup> ATIS suggests that without this clarification, the Commission may receive "duplicative outage reports for the same disaster."<sup>87</sup> We find that the benefit of maintaining the NORS report on file outweighs any burden of potentially receiving duplicative reports. Maintaining the NORS report on file allows the Commission to retain a record that the provider satisfied its obligation. Additionally, allowing withdrawals solely in response to a DIRS activation would not reduce any reporting burden to communications service providers, as the effort to create and submit a NORS report would have already been expended (and withdrawing a NORS report would arguably expend additional provider resources). Further, withdrawing a NORS report would deprive the Commission of potentially useful information that is not collected in DIRS, such as the outage start time. To be clear, we do not preclude communications service providers from withdrawing NORS reports if there are other reasons in addition to the activation of DIRS that support withdrawal (e.g., the outage is determined not to meet the NORS reporting threshold). But absent some other reason justifying withdrawal in addition to a DIRS activation, we find that the public interest is best served by maintaining such NORS reports on file and therefore decline ATIS's request.

## **B. 911 and 988 Special Facility Notifications**

37. We decline ATIS's request to clarify that the NORS reporting waiver during DIRS activations applies to 911 and 988 special facility outage notification requirements because ATIS's request is both procedurally and substantively infirm.<sup>88</sup> With respect to the procedural soundness of ATIS's request for clarification, we agree with APCO that ATIS's argument is procedurally barred because ATIS failed to present it to the Commission at the appropriate juncture.<sup>89</sup> ATIS does not dispute

<sup>83</sup> ATIS Petition at 3.

<sup>84</sup> See, e.g., T-Mobile Reply at 2 (stating its belief that the *Second Report and Order* was clear on this point but noting that the ATIS Petition demonstrates that some parties lack clarity on the waiver's scope).

<sup>85</sup> See ATIS Petition at 5.

<sup>86</sup> *Id.* at 4 ("Further, for reports that have already been filed in NORS under the conditions outlined in this second scenario [where notifications or initial reports have already been filed in NORS when DIRS is activated in the same area], ATIS NRSC urges the Commission to permit providers to withdraw those NORS reports."). No other party addressed this issue.

<sup>87</sup> *Id.* at 6.

<sup>88</sup> See 47 CFR § 4.9(e)(1)(v), 4.9(h); *Ensuring the Reliability and Resiliency of the 988 Suicide & Crisis Lifeline; Amendments to Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications; Implementation of the National Suicide Hotline Improvement Act of 2018*, PS Docket Nos. 23-5 and 15-80; WC Docket No. 18-336, Report and Order, 38 FCC Rcd 6917 (2023) (*988 Outage Notification Order*).

<sup>89</sup> 47 CFR § 1.429(b)(2). See Opposition of APCO International, PS Docket Nos. 21-346 and 15-80; ET Docket No. 04-35, at 1-2 (filed June 24, 2024), <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/search/search-filings/filing/1062409969469> (APCO Opposition); *Resilient Networks; Amendments to Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to*

(continued....)



that its comments and reply in response to the *2021 Resilient Networks NPRM* failed to request that the Commission extend its proposed NORS waiver to include special facility notification requirements,<sup>90</sup> but asserts that its argument is nonetheless timely because some special facility notification requirements stem from subsequent Commission orders on 911 and 988 reporting that post-date the *2021 Resilient Networks NPRM*.<sup>91</sup> While it is true that the Commission adopted additional 911 and 988 special facility outage notification obligations following issuance of the *2021 Resilient Networks NPRM*, substantially similar 911 special facility outage notification rules have been codified in the Commission's rules for several years.<sup>92</sup> Since 2004, originating providers of cable communications, wireless, satellite communications, and wireless service have been required to notify a 911 special facility "as soon as possible" whenever an outage potentially affects that 911 special facility.<sup>93</sup> In 2013, the Commission expanded this 911 special facility notification requirement to "covered 911 service providers" and imposed more specific requirements on the timing and content of those notifications.<sup>94</sup> Thus, although the Commission took further incremental steps to refine the timing for delivery of those notifications in the November 2022 *911 Outage Notification Order* and expanded their application to the 988 context in the July 2023 *988 Outage Notification Order*, the special facility notification requirements were a longstanding component of the Commission's rules when ATIS submitted its comments and reply in response to the *2021 Resilient Networks NPRM*. ATIS therefore cannot satisfy the requirement under the rules of establishing that it did not know, and could have ascertained with ordinary diligence, its argument about waiving 911 and 988 special facility notification requirements when DIRS is activated until it filed its petition in January 2024.<sup>95</sup> We therefore decline to consider this argument on procedural grounds.

38. On alternative and independent grounds, we deny ATIS's clarification request because it raises public interest concerns that cannot be overcome by the purported benefits that ATIS claims. To justify its request, ATIS asserts that this clarification "will better satisfy the purpose of the waiver" and "reduce the burden on providers during major disasters. . . ."<sup>96</sup> APCO cites "substantive concerns" with

---

*Communications; New Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications*, PS Docket Nos. 21-346 and 15-80; ET Docket No. 04-35, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 36 FCC Rcd 14802, 14821 (2021) (*2021 Resilient Networks NPRM*).

<sup>90</sup> See ATIS Comments filed Oct. 3, 2022 and ATIS Reply filed Nov. 29, 2022 (omitting mention of the 911 special facility outage notification rule).

<sup>91</sup> Reply to Opposition of the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions, PS Docket Nos. 21-346 and 15-80; ET Docket No. 04-35, at 2 (filed July 3, 2024), <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/1070373543959/1> (ATIS Reply), referencing *Amendments to Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications; Improving 911 Reliability; New Part 4 of Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications*, PS Docket Nos. 15-80 and 13-75, ET Docket No. 04-35, Second Report and Order, 37 FCC Rcd 13847 (2022) (*911 Outage Notification Order*) and the *988 Outage Notification Order*.

<sup>92</sup> See 47 CFR § 4.9(h) (requiring Covered 911 Service Providers to notify the designated point of contact of affected 911 special facilities by telephone and by electronic means (1) within 30 minutes after discovering an outage affecting those special facilities; and (2) within two hours of the initial contact to provide additional material information); see also 47 CFR § 1.429(b)(2).

<sup>93</sup> See *New Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications*, ET Docket No. 04-35, Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 19 FCC Rcd 16830 (2004), Appendix B (*2004 Part 4 Order and FNPRM*).

<sup>94</sup> See generally *Improving 911 Reliability; Reliability and Continuity of Communications Networks, Including Broadband Technologies*, PS Docket Nos. 13-75 and 11-60, Report and Order, 28 FCC Rcd 17476, 17526-17528, paras. 139-147 (2013) (adopting rules requiring covered 911 service providers to notify PSAPs of outages within 30 minutes) (*2013 911 Outage Notification Order*).

<sup>95</sup> See 47 CFR § 1.429(b)(2).

<sup>96</sup> ATIS Petition at 5.



ATIS's request, noting that the special facility outage notifications provide "a degree of situational awareness that is qualitatively different from the information available in DIRS[]" and "are much more likely to enable PSAP/ECC personnel to recognize the impacts on their community" and take prompt responsive action.<sup>97</sup> Contrary to ATIS and CTIA's contentions that these notifications are unnecessary,<sup>98</sup> DIRS daily reports are not an adequate substitute for the outage notifications to 911 and 988 special facilities required by our rules. ATIS is incorrect when it asserts that PSAPs can access DIRS data directly pursuant to the Commission's information sharing rules with state and federal governments under section 4.2.<sup>99</sup> PSAPs generally would not qualify for such access because they are not state agencies. While we expect that PSAPs would derive value from the aggregated DIRS daily reports made publicly available during disaster events,<sup>100</sup> outage notifications made directly to PSAPs are more timely than those provided through DIRS daily reports<sup>101</sup> and provide more specific information including the identity of the service provider experiencing the outage.<sup>102</sup> Moreover, while we recognize that there is some burden in preparing and submitting these notifications,<sup>103</sup> we believe that burden is outweighed by the situational awareness these notifications will afford 911 and 988 special facilities in times of disaster when emergency services are needed most.<sup>104</sup> For example, when 911 special facilities receive notification of an outage within 30 minutes, as required under the notification rules, they are able to timely publicize alternative methods for contacting emergency services.<sup>105</sup> In contrast, DIRS reports must be submitted only once per day, and the information they contain could therefore be less up-to-date. To foster continued realization of these important public safety benefits, we deny ATIS's request for

---

<sup>97</sup> APCO Opposition at 2.

<sup>98</sup> See ATIS Reply at 4 (describing how Commission permits PSAPs to obtain access to DIRS data, which affords participating agencies with access to disaster-related outage reports, and publishes daily status reports that provide aggregated situational information, including information on PSAP outages); Reply of CTIA, PS Docket Nos. 21-346 and 15-80; ET Docket No. 04-35, at 4 (filed July 5, 2024), <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/10705071708034/1> (CTIA Reply) (noting that "PSAPs can access information on outages affecting them through the Commission's daily communications status reports publicly available on its website[]").

<sup>99</sup> See 47 CFR § 4.2.

<sup>100</sup> See Reply of ATIS, PS Docket Nos. 21-346 and 15-80; ET Docket No. 04-35, at 4 (filed July 3, 2024), <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/search/search-filings/filing/1070373543959> (ATIS Reply).

<sup>101</sup> See, e.g., 47 CFR § 4.9(h) (requiring covered 911 service providers to notify PSAPs within 30 minutes after discovery of an outage that affects a 911 special facility and to provide additional material information no later than two hours after the initial contact).

<sup>102</sup> See, e.g., 47 CFR § 4.9(h).

<sup>103</sup> See ATIS Reply at 2 (stating that the main purpose of the NORS reporting waiver would be frustrated if the notification to PSAPs are not also waived); CTIA Reply at 5 (noting burdens to providers and PSAPs to distribute and process notifications).

<sup>104</sup> See, e.g., *911 Outage Notification Order*, 37 FCC Rcd at 13865 (noting agreement "with the Maryland NG911 Commission that '[w]hen the PSAP does not get timely or complete notification of outages, they cannot effectively initiate alternate means of communication and provide access for those populations impacted by the outage.'" (citations omitted)); *988 Outage Notification Order*, 38 FCC Rcd at 6944 ("[n]otifying SAMHSA, the VA, and the 988 Lifeline administrator of the disruption of access to 988 Lifeline services will allow these parties to manage the impact of outages on their operations, quickly notify the public of the 988 service outage, and promote alternative ways for people to access 988 Lifeline services during the outage. . . . We believe that the rules we adopt today will further reduce the burden on 911 and other emergency services by promoting 988 reliability so that 988 calls go through when individuals need 988 service the most.") (citations omitted).

<sup>105</sup> See *911 Outage Notification Order*, 37 FCC Rcd at 13858 (citations omitted).

clarification and confirm that providers must continue to comply with applicable 911 and 988 outage notification requirements during DIRS activations.

## V. PROCEDURAL MATTERS

39. *Regulatory Flexibility Act.* The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, as amended (RFA),<sup>106</sup> requires that an agency prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis for notice-and-comment rulemaking proceedings, unless the agency certifies that “the rule will not, if promulgated, have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.”<sup>107</sup> Accordingly, the Commission has prepared a Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (FRFA) and Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA) concerning possible impact of the rule and policy changes contained in the *Order on Reconsideration* on small entities. The FRFA is set forth in Appendix C.

40. The Commission has also prepared an Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA) concerning potential rule and policy changes contained in the *Third Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*. The IRFA is set forth in Appendix C. The Commission invites the general public, in particular small businesses, to comment on the IRFA. Comments must be filed by the deadlines for comments on the *Third Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* indicated on the first page of this document and must have a separate and distinct heading designating them as responses to the IRFA.

41. *Paperwork Reduction Act.* This *Third Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* may contain revised information collection requirements. The Commission, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burdens, invites the general public and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to comment on the information collection requirements contained in this document, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13. In addition, pursuant to the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2002, Public Law 107-198, see 44 U.S.C. § 3506(c)(4), we seek specific comment on how we might further reduce the information collection burden for small business concern with fewer than 25 employees.

42. *Providing Accountability Through Transparency Act.* Consistent with the Providing Accountability Through Transparency Act, Public Law 118-9, a summary of the *Third Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* will be available on <https://www.fcc.gov/proposed-rulemakings>.

43. *Ex Parte Rules – Permit-But-Disclose.* The proceeding this *Third Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* initiates shall be treated as a “permit-but-disclose” proceeding in accordance with the Commission’s *ex parte* rules.<sup>108</sup> Persons making *ex parte* presentations must file a copy of any written presentation or a memorandum summarizing any oral presentation within two business days after the presentation (unless a different deadline applicable to the Sunshine period applies). Persons making oral *ex parte* presentations are reminded that memoranda summarizing the presentation must (1) list all persons attending or otherwise participating in the meeting at which the *ex parte* presentation was made, and (2) summarize all data presented and arguments made during the presentation. If the presentation consisted in whole or in part of the presentation of data or arguments already reflected in the presenter’s written comments, memoranda or other filings in the proceeding, the presenter may provide citations to such data or arguments in his or her prior comments, memoranda, or other filings (specifying the relevant page and/or paragraph numbers where such data or arguments can be found) in lieu of summarizing them in the memorandum. Documents shown or given to Commission staff during *ex parte* meetings are deemed to be written *ex parte* presentations and must be filed consistent with rule 1.1206(b). In proceedings governed by rule 1.49(f) or for which the Commission has made available a method of electronic filing, written *ex parte* presentations and memoranda summarizing oral *ex parte* presentations,

<sup>106</sup> 5 U.S.C. §§ 601 *et seq.*, as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement and Fairness Act (SBREFA), Pub. L. No. 104-121, 110 Stat. 847 (1996).

<sup>107</sup> 5 U.S.C. § 605(b).

<sup>108</sup> 47 CFR § 1.1200 *et seq.*

and all attachments thereto, must be filed through the electronic comment filing system available for that proceeding, and must be filed in their native format (e.g., .doc, .xml, .ppt, searchable .pdf). Participants in this proceeding should familiarize themselves with the Commission's *ex parte* rules.

44. *Filing Requirements—Comments and Replies.* Pursuant to sections 1.415 and 1.419 of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR §§ 1.415, 1.419, interested parties may file comments and reply comments on or before the dates indicated on the first page of this document.

- *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.**
  - 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 Commission'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 courier deliveries (any deliveries not by the U.S. Postal Service) 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.

45. *Materials in Accessible Formats.* 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](mailto:fcc504@fcc.gov) or call the Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau at 202-418-0530 (voice).

46. *Additional Information.* For further information regarding the *Order on Reconsideration*, contact Jeanne Stockman, Attorney Advisor, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau at (202) 418-7830 or [Jeanne.Stockman@fcc.gov](mailto:Jeanne.Stockman@fcc.gov) or James Zigouris, Attorney Advisor, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau at (202) 418-0697 or [James.Zigouris@fcc.gov](mailto:James.Zigouris@fcc.gov).

## VI. ORDERING CLAUSES

47. ACCORDINGLY IT IS ORDERED that, pursuant to the authority contained in sections 1, 4, 201, 214, 218, 251, 301, 303(b), 303(g), 303(j), 303(r), 307, 309, 316, 332, and 403, of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154, 201, 214, 218, 251, 301, 303(b), 303(g), 303(j), 303(r), 307, 309, 316, 332, 403, sections 2, 3(b), and 6-7 of the Wireless Communications and Public Safety Act of 1999, 47 U.S.C. §§ 615 note, 615, 615a-1, 615b; and section 1.429 of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR 1.429, that this *Third Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Order on Reconsideration* in PS Docket Nos. 21-346 and 15-80 and ET Docket No. 04-35 IS ADOPTED and the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions' Petition for Clarification and/or Reconsideration IS GRANTED AS DISCUSSED HEREIN AND OTHERWISE DENIED.

48. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Commission's Office of the Secretary SHALL SEND a copy of this *Third Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, including the Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis and the Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the U.S. Small Business Administration.

49. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this *Order on Reconsideration* SHALL BE EFFECTIVE upon publication in the *Federal Register*.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Marlene H. Dortch  
Secretary

**APPENDIX A****Final Rules**

For the reasons discussed in the document above, the Federal Communications Commission amends 47 CFR part 4 as follows:

**PART 4 – DISRUPTIONS TO COMMUNICATIONS**

1. The authority citation for part 4 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 47 U.S.C. 34-39, 151, 154, 155, 157, 201, 251, 307, 316, 615a-1, 1302(a), and 1302(b); 5 U.S.C. 301, and Executive Order no. 10530.

2. Amend § 4.18 by revising paragraph (b) to read as follows:

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) Facilities-based cable communications, wireline communications, wireless service, and interconnected VoIP providers who provide a DIRS report pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section are not required to make submissions in the Network Outage Reporting System (NORS) under this chapter pertaining to any outage that occurs in an area in which the Commission has activated DIRS, as long as the first daily DIRS report for the activation is due before the NORS submission under section 4.9 of this chapter would be due for the outage, and the outage is timely reported in DIRS. Subject providers shall be notified that DIRS is activated and deactivated pursuant to Public Notice from the Commission and/or the Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau.

**APPENDIX B****Proposed Rules**

For the reasons discussed in the document above, the Federal Communications Commission proposes to amend 47 CFR part 4 as follows:

**PART 4 – DISRUPTIONS TO COMMUNICATIONS**

1. The authority citation for part 4 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 47 U.S.C. 34-39, 151, 154, 155, 157, 201, 251, 307, 316, 615a-1, 1302(a), and 1302(b); 5 U.S.C. 301, and Executive Order no. 10530.

2. Amend § 4.18 by revising paragraph (a) to read as follows:

(a) Facilities-based cable communications, wireline communications, wireless service, and interconnected VoIP providers shall submit daily reports on their infrastructure status in the Disaster Information Reporting System (DIRS) when the Commission activates DIRS in geographic areas in which they provide service, even when their reportable infrastructure has not changed compared to the prior day. Facilities-based providers shall include in their reports the following information about areas in which the Commission has activated DIRS:

(1) Cable communications providers shall submit information concerning the type, power status, location, and identifying information of any major equipment that is down.

(2) Wireline communications providers shall submit information concerning the type, power status, location, and identifying information of any major equipment that is down; the quantity of working telephone numbers for which the provider provides service, and the quantity of such numbers that are without service; the name, service area, and number of customers served by any Public Safety Answering Point (PSAPs) for which the provider provides service; the number of Optical Carrier 3 (OC3) circuits or their equivalents that are down; and the location, identifying information, and quantity of working numbers served by any remote aggregation device, and the quantity of such numbers that are without service.

(3) Wireless service providers shall submit information concerning the type, power status, location, and identifying information of any major equipment that is down; the number and location of cell sites that are down or on backup power, and the cause of any cell site outages; and the identity of any Mobile Virtual Network Operators (MVNOs) that rely on the wireless service provider's network in the area.

(4) Interconnected VoIP providers shall submit information concerning the type, power status, location, and identifying information of any major equipment that is down; the number of interconnected VoIP service subscribers without service; and the number of OC3 circuits or their equivalents that are down.

\* This document has been circulated for tentative consideration by the Commission at its August 2025 open meeting. The issues referenced in this document and the Commission's ultimate resolution of those issues remain under consideration and subject to change. This document does not constitute any official action by the Commission. However, the Chairman has determined that, in the interest of promoting the public's ability to understand the nature and scope of issues under consideration, the public interest would be served by making this document publicly available. The Commission's *ex parte* rules apply and presentations are subject to "permit-but-disclose" *ex parte* rules. See, e.g., 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.1206, 1.1200(a). Participants in this proceeding should familiarize themselves with the Commission's *ex parte* rules, including the general prohibition on presentations (written and oral) on matters listed on the Sunshine Agenda, which is typically released a week prior to the Commission's meeting. See 47 CFR §§ 1.1200(a), 1.1203.



(5) Facilities-based cable communications, wireline communications, and interconnected VoIP providers that are stage 2 recipients of the Uniendo a Puerto Rico Fund and Connect USVI Fund shall also submit information concerning the quantity of broadband Internet access service subscribers for whom the provider provides service, and the quantity of such subscribers who are without service.

\* \* \* \* \*

## APPENDIX C

## Final Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis

1. As required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, as amended (RFA),<sup>1</sup> the Federal Communications Commission (Commission) incorporated an Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA) in the *2021 Resilient Networks Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM)*, released in October 2021, and in the *Second Report and Order & Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Second Report and Order & FNPRM)*, released in January 2024.<sup>2</sup> The Commission sought written public comment on the proposals in the *2021 Resilient Networks NPRM* and the *Second Report and Order & FNPRM*, including comment on the IRFAs. No comments were filed addressing the IRFAs. This Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (FRFA) conforms to the RFA, and it (or summaries thereof) will be published in the Federal Register.<sup>3</sup>

**A. Need for, and Objectives of, the Order on Reconsideration**

2. In today's *Order on Reconsideration (Order)*, the Commission addresses the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions' (ATIS's) petition for reconsideration of the *Second Report and Order & FNPRM* clarifying how the waiver of Network Outage Reporting System (NORS) reports will apply during Disaster Information Reporting System (DIRS) activations when outages occur in the same geographic area as a DIRS activation,<sup>4</sup> to outages for which notifications or initial reports have already been filed in NORS,<sup>5</sup> and to the Commission's Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) and 988 Suicide & Crisis Lifeline notification requirements.<sup>6</sup> We clarify that when any NORS filing is due prior to the first DIRS filing deadline, providers must submit that filing in NORS. Requirements to submit NORS filings with deadlines that occur after the deadline for the first DIRS filing deadline are waived so long as

<sup>1</sup> 5 U.S.C. §§ 601 *et seq.*, as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement and Fairness Act (SBREFA), Pub. L. No. 104-121, 110 Stat. 847 (1996).

<sup>2</sup> *Amendments to Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications; New Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications*, PS Docket Nos. 21-346 and 15-80; ET Docket No. 04-35, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 36 FCC Rcd 14802, 14821-14840, Appendix (2021) (*2021 Resilient Networks NPRM*); *Resilient Networks; Amendments to Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications; New Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications*, PS Docket Nos. 21-346 and 15-80; ET Docket No. 04-35, Second Report and Order and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 39 FCC Rcd 623, 692-701, Appx. C (2024) (*Second Report and Order & FNPRM*).

<sup>3</sup> 5 U.S.C. § 604.

<sup>4</sup> ATIS Petition at 3-4 ("It is unclear whether the waiver would apply to, for example, an OC3 outage affecting at least 667 OC3 minutes and lasting at least 30 minutes that occurs at 11:30 AM if a DIRS activation occurs in that same activation area at noon.").

<sup>5</sup> ATIS Petition at 4 ("If, for example, an OC3 outage meeting the reporting threshold has occurred

and subsequently DIRS is activated for that same area, it is unclear whether providers must submit further reports in NORS related to those outages.").

<sup>6</sup> ATIS Petition at 4 (citing *Ensuring the Reliability and Resiliency of the 988 Suicide & Crisis Lifeline; Amendments to Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications; Implementation of the National Suicide Hotline Improvement Act of 2018*, PS Docket Nos. 23-5 and 15-80; WC Docket No. 18-336, Report and Order, 38 FCC Rcd 6917 (2023) (amending § 4.9(a)(4), (c)(2)(iv), (e) introductory text, (e)(1)(v), (f)(4), and (g)(1)(i) of the Commission's rules).

the outage is timely reported in DIRS.<sup>7</sup> The Commission believes this clarity will serve the public interest by providing certainty to service providers regarding their outage reporting obligations.

3. We decline to extend the NORS reporting waiver to the Commission's PSAP and 988 Suicide & Crisis Lifeline notification requirements for procedural and substantive reasons. We find this request for clarification is beyond the scope of the *Second Report and Order & FNPRM* because neither the *2021 Resilient Networks NPRM* nor the *Second Report and Order & FNPRM* contemplated waiving these notifications,<sup>8</sup> and because granting this relief would be contrary to the public interest as it would deprive public safety stakeholders of timely information about service outages.<sup>9</sup>

4. In the *Third Further Notice* accompanying the *Order on Reconsideration*, the Commission seeks comment on the remaining issues raised in the underlying petition for reconsideration. Specifically, we seek comment on whether the NORS filing waiver should apply to DIRS-Lite activations and whether DIRS final reporting obligations should be eliminated. These issues will be addressed based on the record from the *Third Further Notice*.

**B. Summary of Significant Issues Raised by Public Comments in Response to the IRFA**

5. No comments were filed addressing the impact of the proposed rules on small entities.

**C. Response to Comments by the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration**

6. Pursuant to the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010, which amended the RFA,<sup>10</sup> the Commission is required to respond to any comments filed by the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration (SBA), and provide a detailed statement of any change made to the proposed rules as a result of those comments.<sup>11</sup> The Chief Counsel did not file any comments in response to the proposed rules in this proceeding.

**D. Description and Estimate of the Number of Small Entities to Which the Rules Will Apply**

7. The RFA directs agencies to provide a description of and, where feasible, an estimate of, the number of small entities that may be affected by the rules, adopted herein.<sup>12</sup> The RFA generally defines the term "small entity" as having the same meaning as the terms "small business," "small organization," and "small governmental jurisdiction."<sup>13</sup> In addition, the term "small business" has the same meaning as the term "small business concern" under the Small Business Act.<sup>14</sup> A "small business

<sup>7</sup> Cable communications, wireless, and wireline providers are required to file a notification, initial report, and final report in NORS. See 47 CFR § 4.9(a), (e), (f). Interconnected VoIP providers are required to file only a notification and a final report. See 47 CFR § 4.9(g).

<sup>8</sup> See Opposition of APCO International, PS Docket Nos. 21-346 and 15-80; ET Docket No. 04-35, at 1-2 (filed June 24, 2024), <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/search/search-filings/filing/1062409969469> (APCO Opposition); *Resilient Networks; Amendments to Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications; New Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications*, PS Docket Nos. 21-346 and 15-80; ET Docket No. 04-35, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 36 FCC Rcd 14802 (2021) (*Resilient Networks NPRM*).

<sup>9</sup> 47 CFR § 1.429(b).

<sup>10</sup> Small Business Jobs Act of 2010, Pub. L. No. 111-240, 124 Stat. 2504 (2010).

<sup>11</sup> 5 U.S.C. § 604(a)(3).

<sup>12</sup> *Id.* § 604(a)(4).

<sup>13</sup> *Id.* § 601(6).

<sup>14</sup> 5 U.S.C. § 601(3) (incorporating by reference the definition of "small-business concern" in the Small Business Act, 15 U.S.C. § 632). Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 601(3), the statutory definition of a small business applies "unless an

(continued....)

concern” is one which: (1) is independently owned and operated; (2) is not dominant in its field of operation; and (3) satisfies any additional criteria established by the SBA.<sup>15</sup>

8. *Small Businesses, Small Organizations, Small Governmental Jurisdictions.* Our actions, over time, may affect small entities that are not easily categorized at present. We therefore describe three broad groups of small entities that could be directly affected by our actions.<sup>16</sup> First, while there are industry specific size standards for small businesses that are used in the regulatory flexibility analysis, in general, a small business is an independent business having fewer than 500 employees.<sup>17</sup> These types of small businesses represent 99.9% of all businesses in the United States, which translates to 34.75 million businesses.<sup>18</sup> Next, “small organizations” are not-for-profit enterprises that are independently owned and operated and not dominant their field.<sup>19</sup> While we do not have data regarding the number of non-profits that meet that criteria, over 99 percent of nonprofits have fewer than 500 employees.<sup>20</sup> Finally, “small governmental jurisdictions” are defined as cities, counties, towns, townships, villages, school districts, or special districts with populations of less than fifty thousand.<sup>21</sup> Based on the 2022 U.S. Census of Governments data, we estimate that at least 48,724 out of 90,835 local government jurisdictions have a population of less than 50,000.<sup>22</sup>

9. The actions taken in the *Order on Reconsideration* will apply to small entities in the industries identified in the chart below by their six-digit North American Industry Classification System<sup>23</sup> codes and corresponding SBA size standard.<sup>24</sup>

---

agency, after consultation with the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration and after opportunity for public comment, establishes one or more definitions of such term which are appropriate to the activities of the agency and publishes such definition(s) in the Federal Register.”

<sup>15</sup> 15 U.S.C. § 632.

<sup>16</sup> 5 U.S.C. § 601(3)-(6).

<sup>17</sup> See SBA, Office of Advocacy, *Frequently Asked Questions About Small Business* (July 23, 2024), [https://advocacy.sba.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/Frequently-Asked-Questions-About-Small-Business\\_2024-508.pdf](https://advocacy.sba.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/Frequently-Asked-Questions-About-Small-Business_2024-508.pdf).

<sup>18</sup> *Id.*

<sup>19</sup> 5 U.S.C. § 601(4).

<sup>20</sup> See SBA, Office of Advocacy, *Small Business Facts, Spotlight on Nonprofits* (July 2019), <https://advocacy.sba.gov/2019/07/25/small-business-facts-spotlight-on-nonprofits/>.

<sup>21</sup> 5 U.S.C. § 601(5).

<sup>22</sup> See U.S. Census Bureau, 2022 Census of Governments –Organization, <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/2022/econ/gus/2022-governments.html>, tables 1-11.

<sup>23</sup> The North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) is the standard used by Federal statistical agencies in classifying business establishments for the purpose of collecting, analyzing, and publishing statistical data related to the U.S. business economy. See [www.census.gov/NAICS](http://www.census.gov/NAICS) for further details regarding the NAICS codes identified in this chart.

<sup>24</sup> The size standards in this chart are set forth in 13 CFR 121.201 by NAICS code.

Regulated Industry	NAICS Code	SBA Size Standard	Total Firms <sup>25</sup>	Small Firms <sup>26</sup>	% Small Firms in Industry
All Other Telecommunications <sup>27</sup>	517810	\$40 million	1,079	1,039	96.29
Media Streaming Distribution Services, Social Networks, and Other Media Networks and Content Providers <sup>28</sup>	516210	\$47 million	6,417	5,710	88.98
Radio Stations <sup>29</sup>	516110	\$47 million	2,893	2,837	98.06
Satellite Telecommunications	517410	\$47 million	275	242	88.00
Telecommunications Resellers <sup>30</sup>	517121	1500 Employees	1,386	1,375	99.21
Television Broadcasting <sup>31</sup>	516120	\$47 million	744	657	88.31
Wired Telecommunications Carriers <sup>32</sup>	517111	1,500 employees	3,054	2,964	97.05
Wireless Telecommunications Carriers (except Satellite) <sup>33 34</sup>	517112	1,500 employees	2,893	2,837	98.06

<sup>25</sup> See U.S. Census Bureau, *2017 Economic Census of the United States, Employment Size of Firms for the U.S.: 2017*, Table ID: EC1700SIZEEMPFI, and *2017 Economic Census of the United States, Selected Sectors: Sales, Value of Shipments, or Revenue Size of Firms for the U.S.: 2017*, Table ID: EC1700SIZEREVFI.

<sup>26</sup> *Id.*

<sup>27</sup> Affected Entities in this industry include Internet Service Providers (Non-Broadband).

<sup>28</sup> This industry description and NAICS code were added by the U.S. Census Bureau in 2022. Affected Entities in this industry include Cable System Operators (Telecom Act Standard) and Cable Companies and Systems (Rate Regulation).

<sup>29</sup> Affected Entities in this industry include Broadcast Auxiliary Services (BAS) Remote Pickup (RPU) Licensees (Radio Stations).

<sup>30</sup> Affected Entities in this industry include Local Resellers, and Toll Resellers.

<sup>31</sup> Affected Entities in this industry include Broadcast Auxiliary Services (BAS) Remote Pickup (RPU) Licensees (TV Stations).

<sup>32</sup> Affected Entities in this industry include Competitive Local Exchange Carriers (CLECs), Direct Broadcast Satellite (DBS) Service, Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers (Incumbent LECs), Interexchange Carriers (IXCs), Local Exchange Carriers (LECs), Operator Service Providers (OSPs), and Wired Broadband Internet Access Service Providers.

<sup>33</sup> Affected Entities in this industry include Specialized Mobile Radio Licenses, Wireless Broadband Internet Access Service Providers, Wireless Telephony and 3650–3700 MHz Band Licenses.

<sup>34</sup> Affected Entities in this industry that also have a Commission small business size standard involving eligibility for bidding credits and installment payments in the auction of licenses codified in the Commission's rules include: 1670–1675 MHz Services (47 CFR § 27.906(a)); Broadband Personal Communications Service (47 CFR § 24.720(b)); Cellular Radiotelephone Service (47 CFR § 22.223(b)(1)); Lower 700 MHz Band Licenses (47 CFR § 27.702(a)(1)-(3)); Upper 700 MHz Band Licenses and 700 MHz Guard Band Licenses (See 47 CFR § 27.502(a)); Air-Ground Radiotelephone Service (47 CFR § 22.223(b)(1)); Advanced Wireless Services (AWS-1-AWS-4) (47 CFR §§ 27.1002, 27.1102, 27.1104, 27.1106); Fixed Microwave Services (47 CFR §§ 101.538(a)(1)-(3)), 101.1112(b)-(d), 101.1319(a)(1)-(2), and 101.1429(a)(1)-(3)); Local Multipoint Distribution Service (47 CFR § 101.1112(b)-(c)); Broadband Radio Service (47 CFR § 27.1218(a)); Educational Broadband Service (47 CFR § 27.1218(a)) and Wireless Communications Services (47 CFR §§ 27.201 – 27.1601).

10. Based on currently available U.S. Census Bureau data regarding the estimated number of small firms in each identified industry, we conclude that the adopted rules will impact a substantial number of small entities. Where available, we provide additional information regarding the number of potentially affected entities in the above identified industries, and information other affected entities, as follows.

2024 Universal Service Monitoring Report Telecommunications Service Provider Data <sup>35</sup> (Data as of December 2023)	SBA Size Standard (1500 Employees)		
Affected Entity	Total # FCC Form 499A Filers	Small Firms	% Small Entities
Competitive Local Exchange Carriers (CLECs)	3,729	3,576	95.90
Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers (Incumbent LECs)	1,175	917	78.04
Local Exchange Carriers (LECs).	4,904	4,493	91.62
Wired Telecommunications Carriers	4,682	4,276	91.33
Interexchange Carriers (IXCs)	113	95	84.07
Operator Service Providers (OSPs).	22	22	100
Local Resellers	222	217	97.75
Toll Resellers	411	398	96.84
Telecommunications Resellers	633	615	97.16
Wireless Telecommunications Carriers (except Satellite)	585	498	85.13
Specialized Mobile Radio Licenses	81	81	100.00
Wireless Telephony	326	247	75.77

11. *Wired Broadband Internet Access Service Providers (Wired ISPs).*<sup>36</sup> According to Commission data on Internet access services as of June 30, 2024, nationwide there were approximately 2,204 providers of connections over 200 kbps in at least one direction using various wireline technologies.<sup>37</sup> The Commission does not collect data on the number of employees for providers of these

<sup>35</sup> Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, Universal Service Monitoring Report at 26, Table 1.12 (2024), <https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/DOC-408848A1.pdf>.

<sup>36</sup> Formerly included in the scope of the Internet Service Providers (Broadband), Wired Telecommunications Carriers and All Other Telecommunications small entity industry descriptions.

<sup>37</sup> See Federal Communications Commission, Internet Access Services: Status as of June 30, 2024 at 40, Fig. 41 (*IAS Status 2024*), Industry Analysis Division, Office of Economics & Analytics (May 2025), <https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/DOC-411463A1.pdf>. As of June 30, 2024, FCC Form 477 classifies all  
(continued....)



services, therefore, at this time we are not able to estimate the number of providers that would qualify as small under the SBA's small business size standard. However, in light of the general data on fixed technology service providers in the Commission's *2024 Communications Marketplace Report*,<sup>38</sup> we believe that the majority of wireline Internet access service providers can be considered small entities.

12. *Wireless Broadband Internet Access Service Providers (Wireless ISPs or WISPs)*.<sup>39</sup> According to Commission data on Internet access services as of June 30, 2024, nationwide there were approximately 1,157 fixed wireless and 52 mobile wireless providers of connections over 200 kbps in at least one direction.<sup>40</sup> The Commission does not collect data on the number of employees for providers of these services, therefore, we are not able to estimate the number of providers that would qualify as small. However, based on data in the Commission's *2024 Communications Marketplace Report* on the small number of large mobile wireless nationwide and regional facilities-based providers, the dozens of small regional facilities-based providers and the number of wireless mobile virtual network providers in general,<sup>41</sup> as well as on terrestrial fixed wireless broadband providers in general,<sup>42</sup> we believe that the majority of wireless Internet access service providers can be considered small entities.

13. *Cable Companies and Systems (Rate Regulation)*. The Commission has developed its own small business size standard for the purpose of cable rate regulation. Under the Commission's rules, a "small cable company" is one serving 400,000 or fewer subscribers nationwide.<sup>43</sup> Based on industry data, there are about 420 cable companies in the U.S.<sup>44</sup> Of these, only seven have more than 400,000 subscribers.<sup>45</sup> In addition, under the Commission's rules, a "small system" is a cable system serving 15,000 or fewer subscribers.<sup>46</sup> Based on industry data, there are about 4,139 cable systems (headends) in the U.S.<sup>47</sup> Of these, about 639 have more than 15,000 subscribers.<sup>48</sup> Accordingly, the Commission estimates that the majority of cable system operators are small under this size standard.

14. *Cable System Operators (Telecom Act Standard)*. The Communications Act of 1934, as amended, contains a size standard for a "small cable operator," which is "a cable operator that, directly or through an affiliate, serves in the aggregate fewer than one percent of all subscribers in the United States and is not affiliated with any entity or entities whose gross annual revenues in the aggregate exceed

---

fixed wired connections into three mutually exclusive technology categories: (1) Copper Wire, (2) Coaxial Cable (hybrid fiber-coaxial), and (3) Optical Carrier (fiber to the premises).

<sup>38</sup> See *Communications Marketplace Report*, GN Docket No. 24-119, FCC 24-136 at 6, paras. 12-13-27, Figs. II.A.1-3. (2024) (*2024 Communications Marketplace Report*).

<sup>39</sup> Formerly included in the scope of the Internet Service Providers (Broadband), Wireless Telecommunications Carriers (except Satellite) and All Other Telecommunications small entity industry descriptions.

<sup>40</sup> See *IAS Status 2024*, Fig. 41.

<sup>41</sup> See *2024 Communications Marketplace Report*, at 45 paras. 56-58.

<sup>42</sup> *Id.* at 11, para. 18.

<sup>43</sup> 47 CFR § 76.901(d).

<sup>44</sup> S&P Global Market Intelligence, S&P Capital IQ Pro, U.S. MediaCensus, *Operator Subscribers by Geography* (last visited May 26, 2022).

<sup>45</sup> S&P Global Market Intelligence, S&P Capital IQ Pro, *Top Cable MSOs 12/21Q* (last visited May 26, 2022); S&P Global Market Intelligence, *Multichannel Video Subscriptions*, Top 10 (April 2022).

<sup>46</sup> 47 CFR § 76.901(c).

<sup>47</sup> S&P Global Market Intelligence, S&P Capital IQ Pro, U.S. MediaCensus, *Operator Subscribers by Geography* (last visited May 26, 2022).

<sup>48</sup> S&P Global Market Intelligence, S&P Capital IQ Pro, *Top Cable MSOs 12/21Q* (last visited May 26, 2022).

\$250,000,000.”<sup>49</sup> For purposes of the Telecom Act Standard, the Commission determined that a cable system operator that serves fewer than 498,000 subscribers, either directly or through affiliates, will meet the definition of a small cable operator.<sup>50</sup> Based on industry data, only six cable system operators have more than 498,000 subscribers.<sup>51</sup> Accordingly, the Commission estimates that the majority of cable system operators are small under this size standard.

15. *Direct Broadcast Satellite (DBS) Service.* According to Commission data, only two entities provide DBS service - DIRECTV (owned by AT&T) and DISH Network, which require a great deal of capital for operation.<sup>52</sup> DIRECTV and DISH Network both exceed the SBA size standard for classification as a small business.

Broadcast Entities	SBA Size Standard (\$47 Million)		
Affected Entity	# Commercial Licensed <sup>53 54</sup>	Small Firms <sup>55</sup>	% Small Entities
Radio Stations (AM & FM)	10,988	10,987	99.99
Television Stations	1,384	1,307	94.44

#### E. Description of Economic Impact and Projected Reporting, Recordkeeping, and Other Compliance Requirements for Small Entities

16. The RFA directs agencies to describe the economic impact of proposed rules on small entities, as well as projected reporting, recordkeeping and other compliance requirements, including an estimate of the classes of small entities which will be subject to the requirements and the type of professional skills necessary for preparation of the report or record.<sup>56</sup>

17. The requirements in the *Order on Reconsideration* will not impose new or modified reporting, recordkeeping and/or other compliance obligations on small entities. The *Order on Reconsideration* clarifies the timing of outage reports and situations in which NORS reporting is waived. Providing a clear demarcation defining when NORS reports must be filed for outages occurring “just

<sup>49</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 543(m)(2).

<sup>50</sup> *FCC Announces Updated Subscriber Threshold for the Definition of Small Cable Operator*, Public Notice, DA 23-906 (MB 2023) (2023 Subscriber Threshold PN). In this Public Notice, the Commission determined that there were approximately 49.8 million cable subscribers in the United States at that time using the most reliable source publicly available. *Id.* This threshold will remain in effect until the Commission issues a superseding Public Notice. See 47 CFR § 76.901(e)(1).

<sup>51</sup> S&P Global Market Intelligence, S&P Capital IQ Pro, *Top Cable MSOs 06/23Q* (last visited Sept. 27, 2023); S&P Global Market Intelligence, *Multichannel Video Subscriptions, Top 10* (April 2022).

<sup>52</sup> See *Annual Assessment of the Status of Competition in the Market for the Delivery of Video Programming, Eighteenth Report*, Table III.A.5, 32 FCC Rcd 568, 595 (Jan. 17, 2017).

<sup>53</sup> *Broadcast Station Totals as of March 31, 2025*, Public Notice, DA 25-296 (rel. Apr. 4, 2025) (*April 2025 Broadcast Station Totals PN*), <https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/DA-25-296A1.pdf>.

<sup>54</sup> *Id.* There were also 4,634 licensed noncommercial (NCE) FM radio stations, 1,976 low power FM (LPFM) stations, 8,891 FM translators and boosters, 383 licensed noncommercial educational (NCE) television stations, 383 Class A TV stations, 1,786 LPTV stations and 3,099 TV translator stations.

<sup>55</sup> In 2023, according to Commission staff review of the BIA Kelsey Inc. Media Access Pro Television Database (BIA) on April 4, 2025.

<sup>56</sup> 5 U.S.C. § 604(a)(5).

prior” to a DIRS activation will remove any potential filing requirements uncertainty for small and other providers. Further, the certainty provided by the Commission's clarification of how the NORS waiver is to be applied should reduce filing burdens during emergencies for small and other providers. The *Order on Reconsideration* will not impose additional obligations or expenditure of resources on small businesses, and our clarifications should not require small entities to hire professionals.

**F. Discussion of Steps Taken to Minimize the Significant Economic Impact on Small Entities, and Significant Alternatives Considered**

18. The RFA requires an agency to provide, “a description of the steps the agency has taken to minimize the significant economic impact on small entities...including a statement of the factual, policy, and legal reasons for selecting the alternative adopted in the final rule and why each one of the other significant alternatives to the rule considered by the agency which affect the impact on small entities was rejected.”<sup>57</sup>

19. The Commission in the *Order on Reconsideration* considered and denied ATIS’s request for clarification that NORS filers be allowed to withdraw notifications or reports that are filed in NORS before the first DIRS filing deadline solely because DIRS has been activated in the area of the outage. Instead, we find any burden of potentially receiving duplicative reports as argued by ATIS, is outweighed by the public interest of maintaining these NORS reports on file. Allowing small and other providers to withdraw reports in response to a DIRS activation would not reduce any reporting burden for providers, and could arguably require small and other providers to expend additional resources since they would have created and filed a NORS report. Moreover, allowing NORS reports to be withdrawn would deprive the Commission of potentially useful information that is not collected in DIRS, such as the outage start time. The Commission therefore determined that the public interest is best served by maintaining such NORS reports on file.

20. We also considered and denied ATIS’s request to clarify that the NORS reporting waiver applies to 911 and 988 special facility outage notification requirements, and confirm that small and other providers must continue to comply with applicable 911 and 988 outage notification requirements during DIRS activations. As an initial matter, DIRS daily reports do not provide an adequate substitute for the outage notifications to 911 and 988 special facilities required by Commission rules. Moreover, ATIS’ claims that Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) can access DIRS data directly pursuant to the Commission’s information sharing rules with state and federal governments under section 4.2 are incorrect.<sup>58</sup> PSAPs generally would not qualify for such access because they are not state agencies. PSAPs can derive value from the aggregated DIRS daily reports made publicly available during disaster events,<sup>59</sup> however outage notifications made directly to PSAPs are more timely than those provided through DIRS daily reports,<sup>60</sup> and provide more specific information such as the identity of the service provider experiencing the outage.<sup>61</sup> The Commission recognizes that small and other providers may incur some burden in preparing these notifications,<sup>62</sup> we believe however that the burden is outweighed by the

---

<sup>57</sup> *Id.* § 604(a)(6).

<sup>58</sup> *See* 47 CFR § 4.2.

<sup>59</sup> *See* Reply of ATIS, PS Docket Nos. 21-346 and 15-80; ET Docket No. 04-35, at 4 (filed July 3, 2024), <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/search/search-filings/filing/1070373543959> (ATIS Reply).

<sup>60</sup> *See, e.g.*, 47 CFR § 4.9(h) (requiring covered 911 service providers to notify PSAPs within 30 minutes after discovery of an outage that affects a 911 special facility and to provide additional material information no later than two hours after the initial contact).

<sup>61</sup> *See, e.g.*, 47 CFR § 4.9(h).

<sup>62</sup> *See* ATIS Reply at 2 (stating that the main purpose of the NORS reporting waiver would be frustrated if the notification to PSAPs are not also waived); CTIA Reply at 5 (noting burdens to providers and PSAPs to distribute and process notifications).

situational awareness these notifications will provide 911 and 988 special facilities in times of disaster when emergency services are needed most.<sup>63</sup>

**G. Report to Congress**

21. The Commission will send a copy of the *Third Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Order on Reconsideration*, including this Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, in a report to Congress pursuant to the Congressional Review Act.<sup>64</sup> In addition, the Commission will send a copy of the *Third Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Order on Reconsideration*, including this Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the SBA, and will publish a copy of the *Third Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Order on Reconsideration*, and this Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (or summaries thereof) in the Federal Register.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> See, e.g., *911 Outage Notification Order*, 37 FCC Rcd at 13865 (noting agreement “with the Maryland NG911 Commission that “[w]hen the PSAP does not get timely or complete notification of outages, they cannot effectively initiate alternate means of communication and provide access for those populations impacted by the outage.” (citations omitted)); *988 Outage Notification Order*, 38 FCC Rcd at 6944 (“[n]otifying SAMHSA, the VA, and the 988 Lifeline administrator of the disruption of access to 988 Lifeline services will allow these parties to manage the impact of outages on their operations, quickly notify the public of the 988 service outage, and promote alternative ways for people to access 988 Lifeline services during the outage. . . . We believe that the rules we adopt today will further reduce the burden on 911 and other emergency services by promoting 988 reliability so that 988 calls go through when individuals need 988 service the most.”)(citations omitted).

<sup>64</sup> 5 U.S.C. § 801(a)(1)(A).

<sup>65</sup> 5 U.S.C. § 604(b).

## APPENDIX D

## Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

1. As required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, as amended (RFA),<sup>1</sup> the Federal Communications Commission (Commission) has prepared this Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA) of the policies and rules proposed in the *Third Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Third Further Notice)* assessing the possible significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The Commission requests written public comments are requested on this IRFA. Comments must be identified as responses to the IRFA and must be filed by the deadlines for comments specified on the first page of the *Third Further Notice*. The Commission will send a copy of the *Third Further Notice*, including this IRFA, to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration (SBA).<sup>2</sup> In addition, the *Third Further Notice* and IRFA (or summaries thereof) will be published in the Federal Register.<sup>3</sup>

**A. Need for, and Objectives of, the Proposed Rules**

2. In the *Second Report and Order & FNPRM* preceding the *Third Further Notice*, the Commission adopted rules requiring cable communications, wireless, wireline and interconnected VoIP providers to report network outages in the Commission's Disaster Information Reporting System (DIRS) when it is activated, suspended Network Outage Reporting System (NORS) reporting obligations when DIRS reporting was in effect, and mandated a final report within 24 hours of the deactivation of DIRS for reporting providers.

3. The *Third Further Notice* explores the benefits of reducing burdens faced by small and other service providers and government agencies so that they can dedicate more resources to restoring and maintaining service during a disaster. The *Third Further Notice* also seeks comment on collecting new information that we believe would offer significant public safety value, namely collecting infrastructure status information for public safety communications service offerings like FirstNet, and collecting cell site location data for downed cell sites on a voluntary basis. Our proposals not only reduce burdens from the mandated reporting requirements of the *Second Report and Order*, but also burdens that arise from the Commission's sharing information contained within the outage reports. In the *Third Further Notice* we seek comment on various proposed changes to DIRS, including changes:

- To redesign the DIRS user interface to streamline reporting for service providers who enter information in DIRS manually so these filers can submit information more efficiently;
- To eliminate fields and reports that are not core to public safety disaster response and recovery needs to reduce the information collection burden for manual and batch DIRS filers;
- To eliminate DIRS final reports for mandated DIRS filers;
- To exempt non-facilities-based providers from requirements to report in DIRS and proposing ways to still maintain visibility to impacts to Mobile Virtual Network Operators (MVNO) subscribers;
- To extend the Commission's waiver of NORS filings during DIRS activations to DIRS-Lite activation;

---

<sup>1</sup> 5 U.S.C. §§ 601 *et seq.*, as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement and Fairness Act (SBREFA), Pub. L. No. 104-121, 110 Stat. 847 (1996).

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* § 603(a).

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*

- To reduce burdens associated with sharing NORS/DIRS reports so agencies can more readily obtain access to this information; and
- To narrow the presumption that all information within DIRS reports should be afforded confidential treatment.

4. The Commission believes the proposals in the *Third Further Notice* strike the appropriate balance of reducing regulatory burdens for providers while insuring we collect necessary and relevant information when disasters occur.

## **B. Legal Basis**

5. The proposed action is authorized pursuant to sections 1, 4(i), 4(j), 4(n), 201, 214, 218, 251(e)(3), 301, 303(b), 303(g), 303(j), 303(r), 307, 309, 316, 332, and 403 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i)-(j) & (n), 201, 214, 218, 251(e)(3), 301, 303(b), 303(g), 303(j), 303(r), 307, 309(a), 309(j), 316, 332, 403; sections 2, 3(b), and 6-7 of the Wireless Communications and Public Safety Act of 1999, 47 U.S.C. §§ 615 note, 615, 615a-1, and 615b.

## **C. Description and Estimate of the Number of Small Entities to Which the Proposed Rules Will Apply**

6. The RFA directs agencies to provide a description of and, where feasible, and estimate of the number of small entities that may be affected by the proposed rules, if adopted.<sup>4</sup> The RFA generally defines the term “small entity” as having the same meaning as the terms “small business,” “small organization,” and “small governmental jurisdiction.”<sup>5</sup> In addition, the term “small business” has the same meaning as the term “small business concern” under the Small Business Act.<sup>6</sup> A “small business concern” is one which: (1) is independently owned and operated; (2) is not dominant in its field of operation; and (3) satisfies any additional criteria established by the SBA.<sup>7</sup>

7. *Small Businesses, Small Organizations, Small Governmental Jurisdictions.* Our actions, over time, may affect small entities that are not easily categorized at present. We therefore describe three broad groups of small entities that could be directly affected by our actions.<sup>8</sup> First, while there are industry specific size standards for small businesses that are used in the regulatory flexibility analysis, in general, a small business is an independent business having fewer than 500 employees.<sup>9</sup> These types of small businesses represent 99.9% of all businesses in the United States, which translates to 34.75 million businesses.<sup>10</sup> Next, “small organizations” are not-for-profit enterprises that are independently owned and

---

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* § 603(b)(3).

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* § 601(6).

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* § 601(3) (incorporating by reference the definition of “small-business concern” in the Small Business Act, 15 U.S.C. § 632). Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 601(3), the statutory definition of a small business applies “unless an agency, after consultation with the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration and after opportunity for public comment, establishes one or more definitions of such term which are appropriate to the activities of the agency and publishes such definition(s) in the Federal Register.”

<sup>7</sup> 15 U.S.C. § 632.

<sup>8</sup> 5 U.S.C. § 601(3)-(6).

<sup>9</sup> See SBA, Office of Advocacy, *Frequently Asked Questions About Small Business* (July 23, 2024), [https://advocacy.sba.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/Frequently-Asked-Questions-About-Small-Business\\_2024-508.pdf](https://advocacy.sba.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/Frequently-Asked-Questions-About-Small-Business_2024-508.pdf).

<sup>10</sup> *Id.*

operated and not dominant their field.<sup>11</sup> While we do not have data regarding the number of non-profits that meet that criteria, over 99 percent of nonprofits have fewer than 500 employees.<sup>12</sup> Finally, “small governmental jurisdictions” are defined as cities, counties, towns, townships, villages, school districts, or special districts with populations of less than fifty thousand.<sup>13</sup> Based on the 2022 U.S. Census of Governments data, we estimate that at least 48,724 out of 90,835 local government jurisdictions have a population of less than 50,000.<sup>14</sup>

8. The rules proposed in the *Third Further Notice* if adopted will apply to small entities in the industries identified in the chart below by their six-digit North American Industry Classification System<sup>15</sup> codes and corresponding SBA size standard.<sup>16</sup>

Regulated Industry	NAICS Code	SBA Size Standard	Total Firms <sup>17</sup>	Small Firms <sup>18</sup>	% Small Firms in Industry
All Other Telecommunications <sup>19</sup>	517810	\$40 million	1,079	1,039	96.29
Media Streaming Distribution Services, Social Networks, and Other Media Networks and Content Providers <sup>20</sup>	516210	\$47 million	6,417	5,710	88.98
Radio Stations <sup>21</sup>	516110	\$47 million	2,893	2,837	98.06
Satellite Telecommunications	517410	\$47 million	275	242	88.00
Telecommunications Resellers <sup>22</sup>	517121	1500 Employees	1,386	1,375	99.21

<sup>11</sup> 5 U.S.C. § 601(4).

<sup>12</sup> See SBA, Office of Advocacy, *Small Business Facts, Spotlight on Nonprofits* (July 2019), <https://advocacy.sba.gov/2019/07/25/small-business-facts-spotlight-on-nonprofits/>.

<sup>13</sup> 5 U.S.C. § 601(5).

<sup>14</sup> See U.S. Census Bureau, 2022 Census of Governments –Organization, <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/2022/econ/gus/2022-governments.html>, tables 1-11.

<sup>15</sup> The North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) is the standard used by Federal statistical agencies in classifying business establishments for the purpose of collecting, analyzing, and publishing statistical data related to the U.S. business economy. See [www.census.gov/NAICS](http://www.census.gov/NAICS) for further details regarding the NAICS codes identified in this chart.

<sup>16</sup> The size standards in this chart are set forth in 13 CFR 121.201 by NAICS code.

<sup>17</sup> See U.S. Census Bureau, *2017 Economic Census of the United States, Employment Size of Firms for the U.S.: 2017*, Table ID: EC1700SIZEEMPfirm, and *2017 Economic Census of the United States, Selected Sectors: Sales, Value of Shipments, or Revenue Size of Firms for the U.S.: 2017*, Table ID: EC1700SIZEREVfirm.

<sup>18</sup> *Id.*

<sup>19</sup> Affected Entities in this industry include Internet Service Providers (Non-Broadband).

<sup>20</sup> This industry description and NAICS code were added by the U.S. Census Bureau in 2022. Affected Entities in this industry include Cable System Operators (Telecom Act Standard) and Cable Companies and Systems (Rate Regulation).

<sup>21</sup> Affected Entities in this industry include Broadcast Auxiliary Services (BAS) Remote Pickup (RPU) Licensees (Radio Stations).

<sup>22</sup> Affected Entities in this industry include Local Resellers, and Toll Resellers.



Regulated Industry	NAICS Code	SBA Size Standard	Total Firms <sup>17</sup>	Small Firms <sup>18</sup>	% Small Firms in Industry
Television Broadcasting <sup>23</sup>	516120	\$47 million	744	657	88.31
Wired Telecommunications Carriers <sup>24</sup>	517111	1,500 employees	3,054	2,964	97.05
Wireless Telecommunications Carriers (except Satellite) <sup>25 26</sup>	517112	1,500 employees	2,893	2,837	98.06

9. Based on currently available U.S. Census data regarding the estimated number of small firms in each identified industry, we conclude that the adopted rules will impact a substantial number of small entities. Where available, we provide additional information regarding the number of potentially affected entities in the above identified industries, and information for other affected entities.

2024 Universal Service Monitoring Report Telecommunications Service Provider Data <sup>27</sup> (Data as of December 2023)	SBA Size Standard (1500 Employees)		
	Affected Entity	Total # FCC Form 499A Filers	% Small Entities
	Competitive Local Exchange Carriers (CLECs)	3,729	95.90
	Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers (Incumbent LECs)	1,175	78.04
	Local Exchange Carriers (LECs).	4,904	91.62
	Wired Telecommunications Carriers	4,682	91.33
	Interexchange Carriers (IXCs)	113	84.07
	Local Resellers	222	97.75

<sup>23</sup> Affected Entities in this industry include Broadcast Auxiliary Services (BAS) Remote Pickup (RPU) Licensees (TV Stations).

<sup>24</sup> Affected Entities in this industry include Competitive Local Exchange Carriers (CLECs), Direct Broadcast Satellite (DBS) Service, Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers (Incumbent LECs), Interexchange Carriers (IXCs), Local Exchange Carriers (LECs), and Wired Broadband Internet Access Service Providers.

<sup>25</sup> Affected Entities in this industry include Wireless Broadband Internet Access Service Providers, and Wireless Telephony.

<sup>26</sup> Affected Entities in this industry that also have a Commission small business size standard involving eligibility for bidding credits and installment payments in the auction of licenses codified in the Commission's rules include: Cellular Radiotelephone Service (47 CFR § 22.223(b)(1)) and Wireless Communications Services (47 CFR §§ 27.201 – 27.1601).

<sup>27</sup> Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, Universal Service Monitoring Report at 26, Table 1.12 (2024), <https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/DOC-408848A1.pdf>.

2024 Universal Service Monitoring Report Telecommunications Service Provider Data <sup>27</sup>  (Data as of December 2023)	SBA Size Standard (1500 Employees)		
Affected Entity	Total # FCC Form 499A Filers	Small Firms	% Small Entities
Toll Resellers	411	398	96.84
Telecommunications Resellers	633	615	97.16
Wireless Telecommunications Carriers (except Satellite)	585	498	85.13
Wireless Telephony	326	247	75.77

10. *Wired Broadband Internet Access Service Providers (Wired ISPs).*<sup>28</sup> According to Commission data on Internet access services as of June 30, 2024, nationwide there were approximately 2,204 providers of connections over 200 kbps in at least one direction using various wireline technologies.<sup>29</sup> The Commission does not collect data on the number of employees for providers of these services, therefore, at this time we are not able to estimate the number of providers that would qualify as small under the SBA's small business size standard. However, in light of the general data on fixed technology service providers in the Commission's *2024 Communications Marketplace Report*,<sup>30</sup> we believe that the majority of wireline Internet access service providers can be considered small entities.

11. *Wireless Broadband Internet Access Service Providers (Wireless ISPs or WISPs).*<sup>31</sup> According to Commission data on Internet access services as of June 30, 2024, nationwide there were approximately 1,157 fixed wireless and 52 mobile wireless providers of connections over 200 kbps in at least one direction.<sup>32</sup> The Commission does not collect data on the number of employees for providers of these services, therefore, we are not able to estimate the number of providers that would qualify as small. However, based on data in the Commission's *2024 Communications Marketplace Report* on the small number of large mobile wireless nationwide and regional facilities-based providers, the dozens of small regional facilities-based providers and the number of wireless mobile virtual network providers in

<sup>28</sup> Formerly included in the scope of the Internet Service Providers (Broadband), Wired Telecommunications Carriers and All Other Telecommunications small entity industry descriptions.

<sup>29</sup> See Federal Communications Commission, Internet Access Services: Status as of June 30, 2024 at 40, Fig. 41 (*IAS Status 2024*), Industry Analysis Division, Office of Economics & Analytics (May 2025). As of June 30, 2022, FCC Form 477 classifies all fixed wired connections into three mutually exclusive technology categories: (1) Copper Wire, (2) Coaxial Cable (hybrid fiber-coaxial), and (3) Optical Carrier (fiber to the premises). The report can be accessed at <https://www.fcc.gov/economics-analytics/industry-analysis-division/iad-data-statistical-reports..>

<sup>30</sup> See *Communications Marketplace Report*, GN Docket No. 24-119, FCC 24-136 at 6, paras. 12-13-27, Figs. II.A.1-3. (2024) (*2024 Communications Marketplace Report*)

<sup>31</sup> Formerly included in the scope of the Internet Service Providers (Broadband), Wireless Telecommunications Carriers (except Satellite) and All Other Telecommunications small entity industry descriptions.

<sup>32</sup> See *IAS Status 2024*, Fig. 41.

general,<sup>33</sup> as well as on terrestrial fixed wireless broadband providers in general,<sup>34</sup> we believe that the majority of wireless Internet access service providers can be considered small entities.

12. *Cable Companies and Systems (Rate Regulation)*. The Commission has developed its own small business size standard for the purpose of cable rate regulation. Under the Commission's rules, a "small cable company" is one serving 400,000 or fewer subscribers nationwide.<sup>35</sup> Based on industry data, there are about 420 cable companies in the U.S.<sup>36</sup> Of these, only seven have more than 400,000 subscribers.<sup>37</sup> In addition, under the Commission's rules, a "small system" is a cable system serving 15,000 or fewer subscribers.<sup>38</sup> Based on industry data, there are about 4,139 cable systems (headends) in the U.S.<sup>39</sup> Of these, about 639 have more than 15,000 subscribers.<sup>40</sup> Accordingly, the Commission estimates that the majority of cable system operators are small under this size standard.

13. *Cable System Operators (Telecom Act Standard)*. The Communications Act of 1934, as amended, contains a size standard for a "small cable operator," which is "a cable operator that, directly or through an affiliate, serves in the aggregate fewer than one percent of all subscribers in the United States and is not affiliated with any entity or entities whose gross annual revenues in the aggregate exceed \$250,000,000."<sup>41</sup> For purposes of the Telecom Act Standard, the Commission determined that a cable system operator that serves fewer than 498,000 subscribers, either directly or through affiliates, will meet the definition of a small cable operator.<sup>42</sup> Based on industry data, only six cable system operators have more than 498,000 subscribers.<sup>43</sup> Accordingly, the Commission estimates that the majority of cable system operators are small under this size standard.

14. *Direct Broadcast Satellite (DBS) Service*. According to Commission data, only two entities provide DBS service - DIRECTV (owned by AT&T) and DISH Network, which require a great

---

<sup>33</sup> See *Communications Marketplace Report*, GN Docket No. 24-119, FCC 24-136 at 45 paras. 56-58. (2024) (2024 *Communications Marketplace Report*).

<sup>34</sup> *Id.* at 11, para. 18.

<sup>35</sup> 47 CFR § 76.901(d).

<sup>36</sup> S&P Global Market Intelligence, S&P Capital IQ Pro, U.S. MediaCensus, *Operator Subscribers by Geography* (last visited May 26, 2022).

<sup>37</sup> S&P Global Market Intelligence, S&P Capital IQ Pro, *Top Cable MSOs 12/21Q* (last visited May 26, 2022); S&P Global Market Intelligence, *Multichannel Video Subscriptions*, Top 10 (April 2022).

<sup>38</sup> 47 CFR § 76.901(c).

<sup>39</sup> S&P Global Market Intelligence, S&P Capital IQ Pro, U.S. MediaCensus, *Operator Subscribers by Geography* (last visited May 26, 2022).

<sup>40</sup> S&P Global Market Intelligence, S&P Capital IQ Pro, *Top Cable MSOs 12/21Q* (last visited May 26, 2022).

<sup>41</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 543(m)(2).

<sup>42</sup> *FCC Announces Updated Subscriber Threshold for the Definition of Small Cable Operator*, Public Notice, DA 23-906 (MB 2023) (2023 *Subscriber Threshold PN*). In this Public Notice, the Commission determined that there were approximately 49.8 million cable subscribers in the United States at that time using the most reliable source publicly available. *Id.* This threshold will remain in effect until the Commission issues a superseding Public Notice. See 47 CFR § 76.901(e)(1).

<sup>43</sup> S&P Global Market Intelligence, S&P Capital IQ Pro, *Top Cable MSOs 06/23Q* (last visited Sept. 27, 2023); S&P Global Market Intelligence, *Multichannel Video Subscriptions*, Top 10 (April 2022).

deal of capital for operation.<sup>44</sup> DIRECTV and DISH Network both exceed the SBA size standard for classification as a small business.

Broadcast Entity Data	SBA Size Standard (\$47 Million)		
Affected Entity	# Commercial Licensed <sup>45 46</sup>	Small Firms <sup>47</sup>	% Small Entities
Radio Stations (AM & FM)	10,988	10,987	99.99
Television Stations	1,384	1,307	94.44

#### **D. Description of Economic Impact and Projected Reporting, Recordkeeping, and Other Compliance Requirements for Small Entities**

15. The RFA directs agencies to describe the economic impact of proposed rules on small entities, as well as projected reporting, recordkeeping and other compliance requirements, including an estimate of the classes of small entities which will be subject to the requirements and the type of professional skills necessary for preparation of the report or record.<sup>48</sup>

16. The proposed requirements in the *Third Further Notice* if adopted, will impose new or modified reporting, recordkeeping and/or other compliance obligations on small entities which should simplify and reduce regulatory reporting and filing requirements. Specifically, the Commission proposes exempting non-facilities-based providers from mandatory DIRS reporting and eliminating the DIRS Final Report. Our proposed redesign of the DIRS user interface would allow manual DIRS filers to utilize a single dynamic form instead of completing a series of separate forms, and overlapping worksheets, present small and other providers only with questions relevant to the services they provide, and only require information common to multiple services and equipment types to be provided once. If adopted, small and other entities would incur administrative cost savings from the reduction in DIRS filing time. We also propose collecting infrastructure status information for public safety communication service offerings like FirstNet and collecting cell site location data for downed cell sites on a voluntary basis.

17. To simplify some worksheet completion requirements, the Commission proposes eliminating for manual and batch DIRS filers: fields from the Inter-exchange Carrier (IXC) Blocking worksheet; the entire Satellite worksheet; the “Percent of Historical Capacity Available” field from the Wireless Cell Site by County worksheet; fields from the Cable System and Major Equipment worksheets that request the numbers of video subscribers served and the number whose service is down; the “Number of Access Lines” field from the Major Equipment worksheet; and the requirement to report the “number of DS3s down.” We also propose making it voluntary for small and other providers to report the number of remote aggregation devices that are down on the Remote Aggregation Devices worksheet. Finally, we

<sup>44</sup> See *Annual Assessment of the Status of Competition in the Market for the Delivery of Video Programming, Eighteenth Report*, Table III.A.5, 32 FCC Rcd 568, 595 (Jan. 17, 2017).

<sup>45</sup> *Broadcast Station Totals as of March 31, 2025*, Public Notice, DA 25-296 (rel. Apr. 4, 2025) (*April 2025 Broadcast Station Totals PN*), <https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/DA-25-296A1.pdf>.

<sup>46</sup> *Id.* There were also 4,634 licensed noncommercial (NCE) FM radio stations, 1,976 low power FM (LPFM) stations, 8,891 FM translators and boosters, 383 licensed noncommercial educational (NCE) television stations, 383 Class A TV stations, 1,786 LPTV stations and 3,099 TV translator stations.

<sup>47</sup> In 2023, according to Commission staff review of the BIA Kelsey Inc. Media Access Pro Television Database (BIA) on April 4, 2025.

<sup>48</sup> 5 U.S.C. § 603(b)(4).

propose easing requirements for NORS and DIRS information sharing. These changes, as well as the redesign of the DIRS user interface on which we seek comment, may further reduce costs associated with DIRS reporting obligations for small and other service providers.

18. The estimated compliance cost in the *Second Report and Order*, for small and other entities to comply with mandatory DIRS reporting requirements was approximately \$1.6 million.<sup>49</sup> Based on the framework the Commission used in the *Second Report and Order*, the Commission estimates the overall cost savings that small and other providers may realize from the proposed DIRS modifications in the *Third Report and Order* to be approximately \$107,456.<sup>50</sup> The simplification of the DIRS reporting requirement for small and other manual filers eliminating completion of ten separate forms concerning different types of service and infrastructure, and eliminating unnecessary and duplicative fields will allow DIRS filings to be completed and submitted more quickly. The Commission also estimates that these proposed changes are likely to result in at least a 20% reduction in the amount of time that small and other providers must spend on average when filing in DIRS. It is difficult to precisely estimate the change in burden for providers overall however, due to differences in burdens that arise from differing service types, size, extent of service area, and preferred filing method. Additionally, we estimate our proposal to eliminate the requirement to file a final DIRS report using an updated 2025 hourly wage figure of \$35.22,<sup>51</sup> will result in total annual cost savings of \$35,819 for providers.<sup>52</sup>

19. Cost savings will also result from our proposal in the *Third Report and Order* to remove the requirement for resellers and MVNOs to file in DIRS. By calculating an average of 82 MVNOs provide service in each county,<sup>53</sup> and then applying the cost methodology for DIRS filings discussed

---

<sup>49</sup> *Second Report and Order & FNPRM*, 39 FCC Rcd at 640-41, para. 34 & n. 84 (calculating a cost of \$1,635,668).

<sup>50</sup> We estimate the cost saving from streamlining DIRS reporting with a (20% cost reduction) × 1 office and administrative support worker × (\$35.22 hourly compensation) × [(10/60) hours for the initial entry + (10/60) hours for daily updates × 14 days] × 339 counties × 18 facilities-based service providers = \$107,456. See *infra* note [[53]] (we estimate a total of 18 facilities-based voice providers, including 12 fixed voice providers and six wireless voice providers, per county).

<sup>51</sup> The 2025 statistics suggest a base hourly wage of \$24.12/hour. See Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), *Occupational Employment and Wage Statistics, Occupational Employment and Wages* (May 2024), <https://www.bls.gov/oes/tables.htm> (navigate to “May 2024”, “National”, then followed by “Office and Administrative Support Occupations (43-0000)”, it states that the mean hourly wage for an office and administrative support occupation worker is \$24.12/hour in May 2024). According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, as of March 2025, civilian wages and salaries averaged \$32.92/hour and benefits averaged \$15/hour. Using these figures, benefits constitute a markup of \$15/\$32.92 ~ 46%. Taking 46% for cost of benefits (\$11.10/hour), we arrive at an hourly compensation of \$35.22/hour (\$24.12/hour + \$11.10/hour). See Press Release, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employer Costs for Employee Compensation—March 2025 (June 13, 2025), <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/ecec.pdf> (*Benefit Markup*).

<sup>52</sup> We further estimate a \$35,819 cost saving from eliminating the final reporting requirement as 1 office and administrative support worker × (\$35.22 hourly compensation) × (10/60) hours for the final report entry × 339 counties × 18 facilities-based service providers = \$35,819. The aggregate cost saving is \$143,275 (= \$107,456 + \$35,819), which we round to \$143,000.

<sup>53</sup> Pursuant to staff estimation, at the county-level, there are on average 53 fixed voice providers, including cable communications, wireline, and VoIP providers per county. Among these, an average of 12 fixed voice providers are facilities-based, and 41 are non-facilities-based resellers. Staff calculation, FCC, Form 477 non-public data (June 2024). We further estimate that there are an average of six facilities-based mobile wireless voice providers and 82 MVNOs per county. Staff calculation, FCC, Form 477 non-public data (June 2024) and Form 499 non-public data (Aug. 2024) (where providers with revenue reported at any time during the calendar year 2023 filed a Form 499).

above, the Commission estimates resellers and MVNOs would realize cost savings of \$3.9 million.<sup>54</sup> Additionally, we estimate the cost savings of approximately \$50 per DIRS-Lite responder for extending the NORS suspension to DIRS Lite. Based on the New Mexico wildfires in 2024<sup>55</sup> and the Hawaii wildfires in 2023,<sup>56</sup> where the Commission activated DIRS Lite our records indicate that 10 service providers responded during each DIRS-Lite activation. As a result, the Commission estimates that providers would have saved approximately \$700 by having their NORS filings requirements waived.<sup>57</sup>

20. While the majority of the Commission's proposals in the *Third Report and Order* will result in cost saving for small and other providers, the Commission is aware that our proposal to eliminate certain data fields may result in small and other providers that use the DIRS batch filing option to incur a one-time cost for an Information Technology (IT) professional, such as a database administrator. DIRS batch filers use a Commission spreadsheet template so that multiple DIRS worksheets can be filed simultaneously. The proposed reporting field changes may require an IT professional to reconfigure a provider's systems to reorganize how it exports data, and to ensure that the data is formatted in a manner accepted by DIRS. Small entities therefore may have to hire an IT professional to the extent they do not already have one. Based on the limited amount of data required for a DIRS report, the Commission estimates that the one-time cost would be approximately \$90 per DIRS batch filer based on an average of one hour of work,<sup>58</sup> which we believe would be significantly outweighed by the recurring cost savings of our other proposal in *Third Further Notice*. We also recognize that requiring information on public safety broadband networks to be included in DIRS reports may trigger additional costs. We estimate this additional filing cost will not exceed \$72,000.<sup>59</sup>

21. The *Third Further Notice* seeks comment on a number of aspects relating to our proposals for reducing burdens for service providers during a disaster. We expect the comments we receive in response to the *Third Further Notice* to include information which should help the Commission

<sup>54</sup> We estimate the cost savings from exempting MVNOs and VoIP resellers from DIRS reporting is approximately \$3.9 million. We estimate the cost saving as follows: 1 office and administrative support worker × (\$35.22 hourly compensation) × [(10/60) hours for the initial entry + (10/60) hours for daily updates × 14 days + (10/60) hours for the final report entry] × 339 counties × (82 MVNOs + 41 resellers) = \$3,916,182, which we round to \$3.9 million.

<sup>55</sup> See FCC, Communications Status Report for Areas Impacted by New Mexico Wildfires - June 20, 2024 (2024), <https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/DOC-403353A1.pdf>; and FCC, Communications Status Report for Areas Impacted by New Mexico Wildfires - June 24, 2024 (2024), <https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/DOC-403416A1.pdf>. The activation lasted 5 days, with June 20 being the start of the activation of DIRS-Lite, and June 24 the last day of the activation.

<sup>56</sup> See FCC, Communications Status Report for Areas Impacted by Hawaii Wildfires - August 12, 2023 (2023), <https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/DOC-395973A1.pdf>; and FCC, Communications Status Report for Areas Impacted by Hawaii Wildfires - August 25, 2023 (2023), <https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/DOC-396351A1.pdf>. The activation lasted 14 days, with August 12 being the start of the activation of DIRS-Lite, and August 25 being the last day of the activation.

<sup>57</sup> We estimate that the task of reporting outages in NORS can be accomplished by a miscellaneous office and administrative support worker × 2 hours per provider × \$35.22 per hour × 10 providers = \$704, which we round to \$700 per year.

<sup>58</sup> See BLS, *Occupational Outlook Handbook, Database Administrators and Architects*, <https://www.bls.gov/ooh/computer-and-information-technology/database-administrators.htm> (last visited June 10, 2025). Taking 45% for cost of benefits (\$26.63/hr), we arrive at a total hourly compensation of \$85.81/hr (\$59.18/hr + \$26.63/hr).

<sup>59</sup> (1–20% cost saving) × {1 office and administrative support worker × (\$35.22/hour) × [(10/60) hours for the initial entry + (10/60) hours for daily updates × 14 days] × 339 counties × 3 public safety broadband network providers} = \$71,637, which we round to \$72,000.



further identify, and evaluate relevant issues and burdens for small entities, including compliance costs, before adopting final rules.

**E. Discussion of Significant Alternatives Considered That Minimize the Significant Economic Impact on Small Entities**

22. The RFA directs agencies to provide a description of any significant alternatives to the proposed rules that would accomplish the stated objectives of applicable statutes, and minimize any significant economic impact on small entities.<sup>60</sup> The discussion is required to include alternatives such as: “(1) the establishment of differing compliance or reporting requirements or timetables that take into account the resources available to small entities; (2) the clarification, consolidation, or simplification of compliance and reporting requirements under the rule for such small entities; (3) the use of performance rather than design standards; and (4) an exemption from coverage of the rule, or any part thereof, for such small entities.”<sup>61</sup>

23. The Commission's proposals in the *Third Further Notice* reflect the significant alternatives we considered to reduce the burdens of DIRS reporting and minimize the economic impact for small and other providers. While we continue believe the benefits of DIRS reporting for purposes of disaster response and recovery outweighs its burdens, the Commission is mindful that DIRS reporting requires providers to allocate resources to reporting while they are simultaneously responding to an ongoing disaster. We consider several alternatives in the *Third Further Notice* that seek to give small and other providers maximum flexibility and reduce potential costs of compliance with our various proposals, and seek comment on other means to reduce DIRS reporting burdens.

24. The Commission considers streamlining the DIRS reporting framework by simplifying DIRS reporting for manual filers with our proposal to offer service providers that file manual reports a single dynamic form for reporting, instead of selecting from an array of ten separate forms concerning different types of service and infrastructure. The reduction in DIRS report preparation and submission time should reduce costs substantially for small entities. We estimate substantial cost savings of approximately \$4 million for providers.<sup>62</sup> The Commission's consideration of streamlining also includes refocusing DIRS reporting to collect key data by proposing to eliminate and/or modify duplicative worksheets and/or data fields which should also create substantial savings for small and other service providers due to the reduced the amount of data that will need to be collected and reported. We note that while eliminating certain fields and forms will allow for cost savings over time, batch DIRS filers will have initial upfront costs before they can enjoy cost savings. This is because batch DIRS filers use the Commission's spreadsheet to report their data, which may require adjustments to a service provider's systems to ensure proper formatting for acceptance of the data by the Commission's spreadsheet. We also recognize, however, that there will be cost savings over time, along with reduced burdens of DIRS

---

<sup>60</sup> *Id.* § 603(c).

<sup>61</sup> *Id.* § 603(c)(1)-(4).

<sup>62</sup> The approximate \$4 million benefit estimate includes cost savings of \$143,000 for streamlining the filing process and eliminating the final report requirement for facilities-based voice providers, \$3.9 million from eliminating DIRS reporting obligations for MVNOs and VoIP resellers, and \$700 for waiving the NORS filing requirement when DIRS LITE is activated. *See supra* paras. 18-19. The cost estimates include a \$1,400 one-time cost for DIRS batch filing reconfiguration, an annual cost of \$143,000 for facilities-based wireless providers to include MVNO information in DIRS filing, and an annual cost of \$72,000 for public safety broadband networks to report outages when DIRS is activated. *See supra* para. 20.

reporting. Nevertheless, the Commission seeks comment on ways to minimize burdens on batch DIRS filers while ensuring the fulfillment of the stated public safety purposes.

25. We also consider the elimination of certain DIRS filing and reporting obligations to reduce burdens for small and other service providers. The Commission proposes to discontinue the requirement that DRS filers submit a final report within 24 hours of DIRS deactivation, since we have concluded that final DIRS reports are not sufficiently beneficial to justify the burden they impose. Our proposal to modify reporting obligations for resellers and MVNOs will also reduce costs for small entities. With this proposal, the Commission recognizes that certain small and other service providers do not own the infrastructure they are required to report on. In the alternative, we propose to require the facilities-based wireless providers to list in DIRS the resellers and MVNOs that utilize their networks within the DIRS activation area. This will allow the Commission to continue to receive infrastructure status information, while reducing the costs for small and other providers that are resellers and MVNOs.

26. Whether the Commission's waiver of NORS filing obligations during DIRS activations should be extended to activations of DIRS Lite is another matter we consider in the *Third Further Notice* with the potential to reduce regulatory burdens for providers. The DIRS-Lite information collection occurs for disaster events that are less serious than those triggering DIRS activations, is narrower in scope than DIRS reporting, and consists of information compiled by Commission staff in response to email and telephone requests to service providers. The extension of the waiver of NORS filing obligations to activations of DIRS Lite would reduce reporting by small and other providers that voluntarily share information with the Commission during DIRS Lite activations.

27. We expect to consider the economic impact more fully on small entities following our review of comments filed in response to the *Third Further Notice* and this IFRA. The Commission's evaluation of this information will shape the final alternatives it considers to minimize any significant economic impact that may occur on small entities, the final conclusions it reaches and any final rules it promulgates in this proceeding.

**F. Federal Rules that May Duplicate, Overlap, or Conflict with the Proposed Rules**

28. None.

**APPENDIX E****List of Proposed Fields on DIRS Worksheets for Each Type of Provider**Broadcast Providers:

- Voluntary Information:
  - Call Sign
  - FAC ID
  - Broadcast Status
  - Power Status
  - Impacted Equipment Location Information (Latitude/Longitude or Street Address/City/State/Zip)
  - Generator Availability
  - Fuel Status (Volume Capacity and Hours)

Cable Communications Providers:

- Required Information:
  - Physical System Identifier (PSID)
  - Type of Major Equipment Down
  - Power Status
  - Common Language Location Identifier (CLLI) Code for the Equipment
  - Impacted Equipment Location Information (Latitude/Longitude or Street Address/City/State/Zip)
  - Number of OC3s or Functional Equivalents Down
  - For Filers Required to Report Broadband Status:
    - Number of Broadband Access Subscribers Served
    - Estimated Number of Broadband Access Subscribers Down
- Voluntary Information:
  - Generator Availability
  - For Filers Not Required to Report Broadband Status:
    - Number of Broadband Access Subscribers Served
    - Estimated Number of Broadband Access Subscribers Down

Interconnected VoIP Providers:

- Required Information:
  - Type of Major Equipment Down
  - Power Status
  - Common Language Location Identifier (CLLI) Code for the Equipment
  - Impacted Equipment Location Information (Latitude/Longitude or Street Address/City/State/Zip)
  - Number of Interconnected VoIP Subscribers Served
  - Estimated Number of Interconnected VoIP Subscribers Down by County or Municipality
  - Number of OC3s or Functional Equivalents Down
  - For Filers Required to Report Broadband Status:

- Number of Broadband Access Subscribers Estimated Number of Broadband Access Subscribers Down
- Voluntary Information:
  - Generator Availability
  - For Filers Not Required to Report Broadband Status:
    - Number of Broadband Access Subscribers Served
    - Estimated Number of Broadband Access Subscribers Down

#### Wireless Providers:

- Required Information:
  - Type of Major Equipment Down
  - Power Status
  - Common Language Location Identifier (CLLI) Code for the Equipment
  - Cell Sites Down by County
  - Cell Sites Out Due to Cell Site Damage by County
  - Cell Sites Out Due to Transport by County
  - Cell Sites Out Due to No Power at Cell Site by County
  - Cell Sites on Backup Power by County
  - Mobile Virtual Network Operators (MVNOs) Supported
  - Equipment Address Information (Latitude/Longitude or Street Address/City/State/Zip)
- Voluntary Information:
  - Generator Availability
  - Location and Coverage of Down Cell Sites (geospatial file)
  - Public Safety Communications Network Status
    - Type of Major Equipment Down
    - Number of Public-Safety Customers Served
    - Estimated Number of Public Safety Customers Down by County and Municipality
    - Location and Coverage of Deployable Mobile Assets (geospatial file)

#### Wireline Providers:

- Required Information:
  - Type of Major Equipment Down
  - Power Status
  - Common Language Location Identifier (CLLI) Code for the Equipment
  - Number of Working Numbers Served
  - Number of Working Numbers Down
  - Impacted Equipment Location Information (Latitude/Longitude or Street Address/City/State/Zip)
  - Number of OC3s or Functional Equivalents Down
  - For Filers Required to Report Broadband Status:
    - Number of Broadband Access Subscribers Served
    - Estimated Number of Broadband Access Subscribers Down
  - For Public Safety Answering Point (PSAPs) Served

- PSAP Name
  - Area Served by PSAP (e.g., County)
  - Number of Customers Served by PSAP
  - Zip Code
- For Remote Aggregation Devices Down
  - CLLI of Switch/Geographic Area
  - Number of Working Numbers Served
  - Number of Working Numbers Down
- Voluntary Information:
  - Generator Availability
  - For PSAPs Served
    - PSAP Status
    - Reason PSAP is Out or Rerouted
    - Restoral Time (Projected or Actual)
    - Location Information (Address/City)
  - Number of Remote Aggregation Devices Down by CLLI or State
  - Number of Telecommunications Service Priority (TSP) Circuits Down by State
  - For Filers Not Required to Report Broadband Status:
    - Number of Broadband Access Subscribers Served
    - Estimated Number of Broadband Access Subscribers Down

**APPENDIX F**  
**List of Commenters**

**Petitions for Reconsideration to the *Second Report and Order & FNPRM*:**

Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS)

**Oppositions to ATIS's Petition for Reconsideration:**

Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials-International, Inc. (APCO)

**Replies to Oppositions:**

ATIS

CTIA

T-Mobile USA, Inc.

USTelecom—The Broadband Association