A. Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review

This action is exempt from review under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), because it establishes or modifies a pesticide tolerance or a tolerance exemption under FFDCA section 408 in response to a petition submitted to the Agency. The Office of Management and Budget has exempted these types of actions from review under Executive Order 12866.

B. Executive Order 14192: Unleashing Prosperity Through Deregulation

Executive Order 14192 (90 FR 9065, February 6, 2025) does not apply because actions that establish a tolerance under FFDCA section 408 are exempted from review under Executive Order 12866.

C. Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)

This action does not impose an information collection burden under the PRA 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.,* because it does not contain any information collection activities.

D. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA)

Since tolerance actions that are established on the basis of a petition under FFDCA section 408(d), such as the tolerances in this final rule, do not require the issuance of a proposed rule, the requirements of the RFA, 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.,* do not apply to this action.

E. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA)

This action does not contain an unfunded mandate of $100 million or more (in 1995 dollars and adjusted annually for inflation) as described in UMRA, 2 U.S.C. 1531–1538, and does not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. The action imposes no enforceable duty on any state, local or tribal governments or on the private sector.

F. Executive Order 13132: Federalism

This action does not have federalism implications as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999), because it will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

G. Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments

This action does not have Tribal implications as specified in Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), because it will not have substantial direct effects on Tribal governments, on the relationship between the federal government and the Indian Tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the federal government and Indian Tribes.

H. Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children From Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks

This action is not subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997) because tolerance actions like this one are exempt from review under Executive Order 12866.

However, EPA's 2026 *Policy on Children's Health* applies to this action. This rule finalizes tolerance actions under the FFDCA, which requires EPA to give special consideration to exposure of infants and children to the pesticide chemical residue in establishing a tolerance and to ''ensure that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to infants and children from aggregate exposure to the pesticide chemical residue . . .'' (FFDCA 408(b)(2)(C)). The Agency's consideration is summarized in Unit III.D.

I. Executive Order 13211: Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution or Use

This action is not subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355) (May 22, 2001) because it is not a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866.

J. National Technology Transfer Advancement Act (NTTAA)

This action does not involve technical standards that would require Agency consideration under NTTAA section 12(d), 15 U.S.C. 272.

K. Congressional Review Act (CRA)

This action is subject to the CRA, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.,* and EPA will submit a rule report to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. This action is not a ''major rule'' as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 180

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: June 26, 2026.

Charles Smith,

Director, Registration Division Office of Pesticide Programs.

Therefore, 40 CFR chapter I is amended as follows:

PART 180—TOLERANCES AND EXEMPTIONS FOR PESTICIDE CHEMICAL RESIDUES IN FOOD

■ 1. The authority citation for part 180 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 321(q), 346a and 371.

■ 2. Add § 180.731 to subpart C to read as follows:

§ 180.731 Epyrifenacil; tolerances for residues.

General. Tolerances are established for residues of the herbicide epyrifenacil, including its metabolites and degradates, in or on the commodities in the table below. Compliance with the tolerance levels specified below is to be determined by measuring only epyrifenacil, ethyl 2-[[3-[2-chloro-5-[3,6-dihydro-3-methyl-2,6-dioxo-4-(trifluoromethyl)-1(2*H*)-pyrimidinyl]-4-fluorophenoxy]-2-pyridinyl]oxy]acetate in or on the commodity.

TABLE 1 TO § 180.731

Commodity	Parts per million
Corn, field, forage	0.005
Corn, field, grain	0.005
Corn, field, stover	0.005
Rapeseed, seed	0.005
Soybean, forage	0.005
Soybean, hay	0.005
Soybean, seed	0.005
Wheat, forage	0.005
Wheat, grain	0.005
Wheat, hay	0.005
Wheat, straw	0.005

[FR Doc. 2026–13193 Filed 6–29–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 4

[PS Docket Nos. 21–346 and 15–80; ET Docket No. 04–35 FR ID 351629]

Resilient Networks; Concerning Disruptions to Communications

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Federal Communications Commission

(Commission) modernizes the Disaster Information Reporting System (DIRS) to reduce reporting burdens on stakeholders and ensure that the information being collected is useful for disaster response. Our modernization allows manual filers to submit a single, dynamic form instead of multiple worksheets, and enables them to use a ''one-click'' option to easily indicate there is no change from the previous day's report. Further, unnecessary fields and worksheets will be eliminated to ensure that DIRS is collecting the information that is most important for emergency response. This modernization also eliminates the requirement for service providers to file a DIRS final report within 24 hours of DIRS' deactivation, and exempts non-facilities-based providers from DIRS reporting. This document also recognizes the emergence of public safety voice and broadband networks and the critical connectivity they provide to public safety stakeholders by requiring providers of these services to submit DIRS reports on the status of their public safety network infrastructure. Finally, we augment providers' ability to voluntarily submit geospatial information on infrastructure affected by disasters. Together, these changes provide public safety officials with the additional information they need, while also making it easier for service providers to satisfy their reporting obligations.

DATES: Effective June 30, 2026, except for amendatory instruction 3 (47 CFR 4.18), which is delayed indefinitely. The Commission will publish a document in the **Federal Register** announcing the effective date.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jeanne Stockman, Attorney Advisor, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau at (202) 418–7830 or *Jeanne.Stockman@fcc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's Third Report and Order (*Third Report and Order*), FCC 26–34, adopted May 20, 2026, and released May 21, 2026. The full text of this document is available by downloading the text from the Commission's website at: *https://www.fcc.gov/document/fcc-modernizes-disaster-information-reporting-system-0.* The full text of this document is available for public inspection and copying during regular business hours in the FCC Reference Center, 45 L Street NE, Washington, DC 20554. To request materials in accessible formats for people with disabilities (Braille, large print, electronic files, audio format), send an email to *FCC504@fcc.gov* or call the Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau at 202–418–0530 (voice).

Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, as amended (RFA), 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.'' Accordingly, the Commission has prepared a Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (FRFA) concerning possible impact of the rule and policy changes contained in the *Third Report and Order* on small entities concerning possible impact of the rule and policy changes contained in the *Third Report and Order* on small entities. The FRFA is set forth in Appendix B.

Congressional Review Act

The Commission has determined, and the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, concurs, that this rule is ''non-major'' under the Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 804(2). The Commission will send a copy of this *Third Report and Order* to Congress and the Government Accountability Office pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

Paperwork Reduction Act

This *Third Report and Order* may contain new or substantively modified information collection requirements subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), Public Law 104–13. All such requirements will be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review under Section 3507(d) of the PRA. OMB, the general public, and other federal agencies will be invited to comment on any new or modified information collection requirements contained in this proceeding. In addition, we note that pursuant to the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2002, Public Law 107–198, *see* 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(4), we previously sought specific comment on how the Commission might further reduce the information collection burden for small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees.

Synopsis

A. Simplifying the DIRS User Interface

To simplify DIRS for manual filers and make DIRS information more useful to emergency managers, we adopt our proposal to redesign the DIRS interface to replace the ten separate DIRS worksheets with a single, dynamic form as proposed in the *FNPRM.* Instead of completing a series of worksheets that collect overlapping information, manual DIRS filers will respond to initial questions about the services they provide in the DIRS activation area and the impacts to equipment and facilities caused by the disaster. Based upon these responses, manual filers will be presented with questions seeking information applicable only to the services the filer provides. Information that currently appears on multiple worksheets would only need to be entered once. While, as we noted, manual filers comprise a minority of providers that submit DIRS reports, many providers that manually file DIRS reports are small- or medium-sized businesses, and so this change will have an outsized effect in reducing burdens for providers whose resources may be most thinly stretched during a disaster.

The record supports our view that this step will simplify and reduce the time burden associated with manual data entry in DIRS. The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association observes that the current DIRS reporting framework is cumbersome and inefficient with many overlapping data fields. Accordingly, CTIA and others describe this, along with other measures we adopt today, as ''common sense changes that would reduce burdens on providers, allowing them to direct resources towards recovery efforts without impacting the actionable information provided to public safety stakeholders through DIRS reports.'' The National Association of Broadcasters (NAB) agrees that this redesign ''will facilitate filing in DIRS during a disaster[,]'' and NTCA adds that it will ''benefit public safety agencies by allowing them to more quickly identify the status of communications in their area.'' The Competitive Carriers Association (CCA) observes that these changes address a concern that is ''particularly acute for small and rural carriers. Such providers often operate with limited engineering and operations teams, many of whom are simultaneously engaged in damage assessment, power restoration, and physical repairs.'' No commenters oppose this proposal or express concern that its adoption would diminish DIRS's utility.

B. Establishing a ''One-Click'' Filing Option

In the interest of reducing the burdens of required DIRS reporting and encouraging participation for voluntary DIRS filers, we adopt our proposal to establish a ''one-click'' option on the consolidated worksheet for providers to indicate there is no change in infrastructure status from the previous day's report. Commenters agree that this would reduce time spent on manual DIRS entry while preserving the value of DIRS for emergency management officials. USTelecom states that a one-click option will ''improve the efficiency'' of disaster-related data collection, and an individual commenter describes this change as ''monumental.'' In addition to saving time and streamlining DIRS report preparation, NAB believes this change ''would facilitate broadcasters' voluntary participation in DIRS, especially smaller stations.'' As reflected in these comments, we believe this step will simplify manual DIRS report submission during DIRS activations, while also enabling providers to have more time to focus on the important task of restoring service to their customers.

We decline to extend the availability of a one-click-like option to batch filers, in addition to manual filers, as recommended by WISPA—The Association for Broadband Without Boundaries (WISPA). To satisfy their DIRS reporting obligations, batch filers already enjoy a streamlined filing process whereby they upload a provider-created spreadsheet to the Commission, the production of which may be automated by network administration systems. We disagree with WISPA that implementing the equivalent of one-click filing will enable batch filers to complete their DIRS filing obligation more easily than simply resubmitting the previous day's spreadsheet. We believe that a one-click (or near one-click) option would require substantially similar effort and time for DIRS batch filers as using the existing spreadsheet upload process, particularly for those users that leverage the DIRS Upload Application Programming Interface (API). Further, in our experience, batch filers are more likely to be larger entities providing service through many facilities in a broader geographic area than manual filers. As a result of the number of facilities on which batch filers report and the dynamic nature of service restoration during and after disasters, DIRS information for batch filers is very likely to change day-over-day, making a one-click option less useful for these types of filers.

While no commenter opposes the Commission's proposal, one commenter requests that the Commission have ''a way to ensure that [] providers aren't actually skipping the daily report and are in fact checking their data to see it hasn't changed.'' We recognize this valid concern. As an initial matter, we note that providers are under an obligation to report information truthfully to the Commission. To remind providers of the requirement to submit accurate information, we will also add the following language to DIRS, which the user will be required to acknowledge when clicking ''submit'': ''By submitting this Form, you certify that the information you have provided on this Form and the attachments is true and accurate. Filers are responsible for the accuracy of the information they file with the Commission, including any data automatically populated into this Form or its attachments from other Commission databases. Failure to ensure the accuracy of information filed with the Commission may result in enforcement action.'' We believe this language puts providers further on notice that it is their responsibility to verify the accuracy of the information in their reports. We expect that this language will prompt providers to review any existing data before submitting their DIRS report.

C. Eliminating Unnecessary DIRS Fields and Worksheets

To further streamline DIRS reporting for both manual and batch filers, we eliminate many DIRS reporting fields and worksheets, as proposed in the *FNPRM.* The record affirms our view that the worksheets and fields we eliminate today are unnecessary because they are duplicative and/or provide little of actionable value for disaster response. We summarize the remaining DIRS fields that will be mandatory or voluntary to complete in Appendix C.

Eliminate the Inter-exchange Carrier (IXC) Blocking Worksheet. We eliminate the inter-exchange carrier worksheet, agreeing with ACA Connects which observes that the worksheet ''has not proven useful for disaster response.'' No commenters oppose this action.

Eliminate the ''Percent of Historical Capacity Available'' Field from the Wireless Cell Site by County Worksheet. We eliminate the ''percent of historical capacity available'' field from the Wireless Cell Site by County worksheet because this field is redundant as the information it contains can be derived from other reported data. As explained by CTIA, ''[t]he Commission has access to the relevant information provided in [this field] through other means, such as by measuring capacity based on the number of sites reported in operation or out of service.'' We agree, and find that since the Commission has the ability to calculate this percentage from other data reporting in DIRS, it is appropriate to eliminate this field from the worksheet. No commenters disagree with this conclusion.

Consolidate Cable Telephone Subscriber Data Fields. Rather than eliminate DIRS' reporting fields for cable telephony, as proposed, we consolidate the fields for cable communications providers that request (1) the number of cable telephone subscribers served and (2) the number of VoIP subscribers served with (3) the number of cable telephony subscribers down and (4) the number of VoIP subscribers whose service is down. As a result of this action, cable communications service providers will be required to respond to only two prompts: how many cable telephony and/or VoIP subscribers do you serve, and how many of them are without service? Based on data reported in NORS and DIRS over the past year, cable communications service providers themselves often appear to be unsure whether to report voice outages as VoIP or cable telephony, resulting in inconsistent and unreliable reporting for outages of each type. Moreover, the difference between cable telephony provided via a circuit-switched network and cable telephony provided via VoIP is often not material from an emergency management standpoint. We agree with ACA Connects that eliminating the need for providers to discern between these two types of service in their DIRS reports ''would substantially reduce the time burdens associated with DIRS data entry without compromising DIRS's mission.'' This action is also consistent with CTIA's advocacy that we eliminate duplicative fields in DIRS. We take this action to improve DIRS reporting efficiency and to save service providers precious time in DIRS reporting when their primary focus is on disaster recovery and restoring service to customers. No commenters oppose this action.

Eliminate Video Subscriber Data Fields from the Cable System and Major Equipment Worksheets. We remove the fields currently in the cable system and major equipment worksheet that request the number of video subscribers served and the number whose service is down to, consistent with NCTA's comments, ''facilitate more efficient reporting by providers and [to] help maximize the time and resources that are available for network restoration.'' NAB and ACA Connects support our taking this step because this information is less critical for disaster response, and no commenters oppose this action.

Eliminate the ''Number of Access Lines'' field from the Major Equipment Worksheet. We eliminate the ''number of access lines'' field from the existing major equipment worksheet because, as noted in the *FNPRM,* this information is addressed by other questions on the same worksheet that are better targeted to gathering useful information. Specifically, the major equipment worksheet requests the ''number of working numbers'' and the ''number of working numbers down.'' While there can be multiple working telephone numbers on a single access line, we do not believe it is necessary for disaster response to collect both types of data. We believe it reasonable to use ''working numbers down'' as a proxy for affected customers. Moreover, this field, in combination with the ''number of working numbers'' field, yields important information about how much of a provider's customer base is without service. ACA Connects supports our eliminating this field step because this information is covered elsewhere on the existing major equipment worksheet, and no commenters oppose our taking this step.

Harmonize Fields on the Interoffice Facilities—TSP worksheet with NORS. We update the fields on the existing interoffice facilities—TSP worksheet by collecting information about the number of Optical Carrier circuits (or their functional equivalent) affected and eliminating the requirement to report the ''number of DS3s affected (down).'' For the avoidance of doubt, we emphasize that we are not eliminating required reporting for circuits that are smaller than an OC3. Required reporting on OC3s or functional equivalents will include DS3s, for example, that are transporting volumes of traffic that are the functional equivalent of an OC3. We find this important to keep pace with marketplace changes that have added capacity to today's high-speed networks. USTelecom—The Broadband Association (USTelecom) supports harmonizing fields that currently exist on this worksheet as we proposed in the *FNPRM,* and no commenters disagreed with this modification.

Make Reporting the Number of Remote Aggregation Devices Voluntary. We make it voluntary, rather than mandatory, for providers to report the number of remote aggregation devices that are down as provided on the existing remote aggregation devices worksheet. We find that other fields on the current worksheet, specifically the ''number of working numbers served'' and ''number of working numbers down,'' collect more useful information about customer impact and pace of service restoration than the ''number of [remote aggregation devices] . . . down'' field. We believe we can further our goal of simplifying DIRS without sacrificing useful information for public safety stakeholders by making this field voluntary. While this will provide an incremental time savings to those providers that elect not to complete this field in DIRS, it will enable providers to continue to share this information. ACA Connects supports our rationale for this conclusion and no commenters object to proceeding in this manner.

Make Broadband Data User Fields Voluntary. We make the collection of broadband access user information voluntary, rather than mandatory, for all DIRS filers except fixed and mobile broadband providers that are stage 2 recipients of the Uniendo a Puerto Rico Fund and Connect USVI Fund, as we proposed and as supported by NCTA, CCA, and ACA Connects. This step preserves the collection, on a voluntary basis, of information that is important to public safety stakeholders, as broadband access is a critical lifeline enabling the public to stay informed during disasters and emergencies, while still reducing burdens on providers. As CCA notes, adopting streamlining measures like this ''ensure[s] providers can maximize their recovery efforts [while] critical information is shared with relevant emergency management entities.'' The record supports this modification and no commenters disagree with this step.

Retain Voluntary DIRS Reporting for Satellite Providers. As a means of maintaining visibility into critical infrastructure during disasters, we decline to adopt our proposal in the *FNPRM* to eliminate the fields on satellite services. CTIA stated it ''[did] not have any specific concerns about eliminating the satellite worksheet.'' Notwithstanding the fact that Verizon ''does not oppose'' exempting satellite providers from DIRS reporting, Verizon observes that ''wireless and wireline providers' customers may rely in part on satellite capabilities during DIRS activations'' and wireless and wireline providers have limited visibility into the status of satellite providers' networks. While acknowledging that no satellite provider has ever filed in DIRS, the National Rural Electric Cooperatives Association notes that public safety officials, the Commission, and the public deserve ''to have the best information available'' in the event of a ''powerful solar storm, 'Kessler Syndrome' ablation cascade, or a disaster of a type yet unknown[ ]'' affects satellite service. We agree that it is possible that a disaster that specifically affects satellite services could create a need for the Commission to activate DIRS; however, were we to eliminate the satellite worksheet fields as proposed, we would be unprepared to receive daily infrastructure status updates from satellite operators, even on a voluntary basis. In light of the key role satellite service plays to enable other modes of communications and to support national security interests, we are persuaded to retain the worksheet.

We decline, however to make satellite reporting in DIRS mandatory at this time as recommended by the Foundation for Defense of Democracies in consideration of the increasing threats from China and the importance of these systems to the economy and military operations. We believe retaining the worksheet on a voluntary basis strikes the appropriate balance of enabling public safety officials to receive satellite status information through DIRS in the event there is a disaster that impacts satellite service, without burdening satellite providers with mandatory reporting obligations for circumstances that have not yet come to pass in the history of DIRS. The Commission continues to retain visibility into satellite network status through satellite providers' ongoing mandatory obligation to report outages in NORS. Our approach ensures that the Commission will remain informed of significant impairments to satellite connectivity, preserves the ability for satellite providers to voluntarily report in DIRS should an unforeseen event warrant such reporting, all while avoiding burdening satellite providers with new mandatory reporting obligations.

Allow Providers Flexibility in Providing Location Information. We decline to adopt our proposal to improve the utility of DIRS data by requiring providers to submit location information for their affected equipment or facilities in a single format, either street address or latitude and longitude. While ACA Connects notes submitting ''street addresses would be significantly less burdensome than the submission of latitude/longitude data[,]'' no other stakeholder or public safety entity indicates that one format is preferable to the other for any given type of facility or equipment. Instead, industry commenters ATIS, CTIA, NTCA, and Verizon argue that providers should continue to be allowed to select their preferred format for any type of facilities or equipment. NTCA argues that maintaining our current approach would minimize ''the time providers must spend completing DIRS reports.'' We find that continuing to allow providers to choose which address format to use for equipment and facilities location reporting is appropriate because, as CTIA points out, equipment located in rural or remote areas may not have a street address at all, and requiring providers to convert information that they maintain as a street address into a latitude and longitude would, as ATIS observes, result in ''significant impacts on the industry.''

We find that previous delegations of authority to the Bureau are sufficiently broad to enable it to implement these modifications, 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. As noted in the *FNPRM,* 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.'' While no commenter challenges this delegation, some commenters seek to require the Bureau to exercise its delegated authority ''subject to consultation with wireless service providers'' or limited to ''what is expressly authorized in the final rules.'' We find it unnecessary to revise the authority delegated to the Bureau in this manner. The revision to § 4.18(a) that we adopt today will contain more specificity for PSHSB to implement as it revises the DIRS filing system and templates. We further find that it is necessary for the Bureau's authority to be sufficiently broad to ensure that the Bureau has the flexibility to timely implement lawful changes to DIRS and otherwise maintain the system as necessary to ensure that it remains effective.

We direct the Bureau to afford providers an opportunity to test the above improvements to DIRS before they are officially released, as recommended by Verizon. This process will also allow filers to provide additional feedback on the new DIRS interface to ensure usability. We decline, however, to require the Bureau to engage in a second round of notice and comment on the look and feel of the new DIRS system, as suggested by USTelecom, ATIS, AT&T, CTIA, and WISPA. While formal notice and comment was appropriate to address the information that providers are required to file in DIRS because those changes affect their legal obligations, no such formality is needed to enable the Bureau to consider feedback from industry on its implementation of the changes contemplated herein.

D. Eliminating the DIRS Final Report

As proposed in the *FNPRM,* we eliminate the requirement for providers to file a final report in DIRS within 24 hours of DIRS' deactivation. Many commenters argue that DIRS final reports are not useful to emergency managers. ATIS, WISPA, and WTA submit that the primary reason DIRS final reports have not been as useful in practice as the Commission intended is the ''uncertainty and unknowns that will still exist right after the end of the DIRS reporting period,'' which prevent providers from offering reliable, actionable service restoration estimates. We agree. In our experience, DIRS final reports have not provided emergency managers with reliable service restoration estimates, which must be made when DIRS is deactivated. Moreover, we understand from experience that the timeline for service restoration can 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, so it is not sensible to refer to estimates provided in the midst of an emergency as ''final.'' As such, we disagree with the Foundation for Defense of Democracies that the DIRS final report ''ensur[es] accountability and provid[es] a definitive record for planning repairs and analyzing outages.'' As we reasoned in the *FNPRM,* service restoration estimates that routinely prove incorrect cause more harm than good because reliance on those estimates leads to the misallocation of finite disaster response resources. Taking more time to consider the potential utility of these requirements, as Public Knowledge suggests we should, cannot change the fundamental difficulty of presenting DIRS information to emergency managers as ''final'' as if service providers can predict the future. Further, we are not persuaded to retain the DIRS final report requirement by Public Knowledge's vague assertion that, even if this information is not valuable for immediate situational awareness, it has value as ''historic information for analysis and planning.'' We also do not believe it would be beneficial to retain a streamlined version of the DIRS final report requirement that providers could satisfy with ''one-click.'' If the Bureau believes that an additional day of DIRS reporting on infrastructure status was warranted before DIRS's deactivation, it can obtain that information simply by keeping DIRS active for an additional day.

E. Exempting Non-Facilities-Based Providers From DIRS Reporting

To eliminate duplicative and potentially speculative DIRS reporting about infrastructure neither owned nor operated by the reporting entity, we revise our mandatory DIRS rules to apply only to facilities-based providers, exempting providers that do not own or operate their own facilities or infrastructure in the DIRS activation area. We agree with CTIA that providers that do not own or operate their own facilities or infrastructure should not report in DIRS because ''their service offerings rely on the facilities of underlying service providers that already report the status of those facilities'' in DIRS. In our experience, information that non-facilities-based providers submit in DIRS about the status of facilities or infrastructure that they do not own or operate tends to be either be speculative, as ACA Connects and NCTA observe, or derivative of information that the non-facilities-based provider has imposed upon the facilities-based provider to obtain, as WISPA observes. We agree with CTIA and T-Mobile that receiving information about the status of the same communications equipment from both the facilities-based provider that owns and operates that equipment and from non-facilities-based providers that rely upon that equipment to offer service introduces a risk of double counting that threatens the quality of DIRS data. It will promote our ability to quickly and reliably produce aggregated information about the status of communications equipment during disasters to receive one authoritative report about each relevant communications facility in a DIRS activation area, and we agree with ACA Connects that the report we receive should come from the party ''with direct visibility into the outage and system restoration.'' That provider will be in the best position to answer DIRS' prompts about the status of the facilities or infrastructure. Eliminating reporting requirements for other providers will result in more accurate data and remove unnecessary burdens from industry.

NCTA recommends that we extend the exemption for non-facilities-based providers to NORS for the same reasons as we offer it in the context of DIRS. We reject this recommendation and continue to require mobile virtual network operators and wireless, wireline, and interconnected VoIP resellers to report outages in NORS. As the Commission has previously found, these providers are ''uniquely positioned to provide information on outages affecting their customers.'' Unlike DIRS reporting's focus on ''infrastructure status'' during and after disasters, non-facilities-based providers are in the best position to report in NORS about the effects of outages on their subscribers because they have visibility into the status of their own subscribers, while the underlying facilities-based providers on which they rely often do not. The Commission also relies on NORS reporting as a source of information about the root causes of all kinds of network outages and the impacts of those outages on end users, which leads ''to the development of best practices and has fostered a 'data-driven, self-improvement model.' '' By maintaining the requirement that non-facilities-based providers report in NORS, the Commission preserves its insight into the impact of outages on the millions of non-facilities-based provider subscribers nationwide.

We do not adopt the *FNPRM'*s proposal to require facilities-based wireless providers to report in DIRS which mobile virtual network operators utilize their respective networks within the DIRS activation area, nor do we adopt the alternative that mobile virtual network operators identify their underlying network providers as part of a limited DIRS filing. Public Knowledge observes that there is not necessarily a simple, direct relationship between the operational status of a facilities-based provider and a non-facilities-based provider that relies upon it. As CTIA also recognizes, non-facilities-based providers often utilize the networks of multiple facilities-based providers in delivering their service. As a result, we are concerned that a list of business relationships alone would be insufficient to enable emergency managers to derive actionable insights about a disaster's impacts on their community, irrespective of whether a facilities-based or non-facilities-based provider submits it. While there are undoubtedly examples of non-facilities-based providers that rely exclusively on a single facilities-based provider to offer service, significant risk would stem from inducing emergency managers to believe that this is always the case by requiring the disclosure of business relationships as a proxy for the availability of service to communities. While Public Knowledge argues that this complexity is grounds for the Commission to continue require non-facilities-based providers to report in DIRS, we conclude that the burdens of filing this information outweigh its public safety value.

F. Voluntarily Collecting More Information on Where Facilities Are Out of Service

We direct the Bureau to upgrade DIRS to improve the ability of filers to voluntarily submit geographic information about service areas and the locations of facilities that are out of service. As Public Knowledge puts simply, collecting more granular information for stakeholders ''can improve their disaster response.'' In the *FNPRM,* we specifically sought comment on whether to collect more granular information from wireless providers about the location of cell sites that are out of service. Whereas DIRS requires providers to specify the location of major equipment other than wireless cell sites, DIRS currently only requires wireless providers to complete a worksheet to specify the number of cell sites out by county. Wireless providers, however, have voluntarily submitted more granular information than DIRS requires about the location of their wireless cell sites. T-Mobile voluntarily provides cell site location data in Keyhole Markup Language. As ATIS observes, one major wireless provider has voluntarily submitted shape files in response to DIRS activation since 2017, which provide ''information about cell site impacts on a very conservative measure of −98db.'' Accordingly, we agree with CTIA that collecting mapping data from service providers during DIRS activation on a voluntary basis is an approach that is working well, and we therefore do not require providers to submit any additional mapping data at this time. While providing this information in DIRS is voluntary, the Bureau may still exercise its delegated authority to require providers to provide this information in appropriate circumstances.

However, we recognize that DIRS does not offer an easy way for providers to voluntarily submit geographic information about service coverage and infrastructure location and believe that expanding that capability may induce more providers to submit that information and make DIRS easier to use for providers that do submit that information. We do not limit the submission of geographic information solely to cell site locations, but allow it for any kind of geographic information that filers believe would be useful to provide to emergency managers. We believe this flexibility was warranted in light of Verizon, CCA, and other commenters arguments that ''[c]overage, not site location, is most relevant to where Wireless Emergency Alerts, 911 calls and public safety-related communications are affected during disaster events.'' Upgrading DIRS to offer providers a clear way to submit a wider array of geographic information in additional formats may also reduce burdens on providers and other stakeholders.

G. Requiring DIRS Reporting for Public Safety Voice and Broadband Network Operators

To ensure that emergency managers and first responders have the information they need to stay connected during disasters, we require public safety voice and broadband network operators to submit DIRS daily reports about their infrastructure status when the Commission activates DIRS in geographic areas where they provide service. Public safety voice and broadband networks now play a vital role in keeping first responders connected during emergency response. AT&T manages and operates a nationwide public safety voice and broadband network, FirstNet, which plays a key role in enabling first responders using the network to communicate with one another and with PSAPs during emergencies. As the National Regional Planning Council states, public safety officials increasingly use FirstNet to replace older Land Mobile Radio systems for communication among first responders during emergencies. First responders use FirstNet for voice-over LTE, rich communication services and IP-based messaging to communicate with one another from a variety of operational locations, including outdoors, inside buildings, through drones and satellites, from airborne vehicles like helicopters, and from onboard maritime vessels. First responders also rely on FirstNet's network 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 that may provide the location of responders or assets, potential hazards, or relational information between personnel and assets. According to Verizon, its Frontline service prioritizes first responder communications on Verizon's 5G network and provides high speed, low latency, large capacity connectivity to over 45,000 agencies. T-Mobile USA, Inc.'s (T-Mobile) T-Priority service prioritizes data-intensive communications for public safety agencies by using 5G network slicing to enable law enforcement, fire protection, emergency medical services, and other first responders to respond to emergencies. Disruptions to services like FirstNet, Verizon Frontline, or T-Priority could be a matter of life and death for first responders or members of the public who rely on police, fire, and emergency medical services that subscribe to these services.

The *FNPRM* sought comment on whether the Commission should revamp DIRS to enable voluntary or mandatory reporting on the status of public safety voice and broadband networks. The Commission also proposed to require FirstNet to report in DIRS in 2024, and received significant support. As Public Knowledge, Communications Workers of America, and New America's Open Technology Institute observed, effective crisis response ''can only happen if those responding to the crisis—and managing the response—have clear knowledge of the communications environment in as close to real time as possible.'' NASUCA and TURN recognized 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.'' And Next Century Cities observed that, ''without mandatory DIRS or NORS reporting the Commission and state and local officials are left without critical information about how the nation[']s emergency services are connected.'' We agree with these views and find that DIRS reports are inadequate for providing actionable infrastructure status information if they do not specifically identify impacts to public safety voice and broadband network customers and efforts to restore service for public safety customers. Moreover, government stakeholders commonly request that the FCC share DIRS reports about FirstNet, but no public safety voice and broadband network operator has voluntarily provided information specific to the status of those network functions in their DIRS reports to date. Mandatory DIRS reporting will close this gap and provide critical visibility and situational awareness into these vital public-safety networks during disasters, consistent with the Commission's reasoning for previously requiring other types of providers to file in DIRS.

AT&T and Verizon oppose making public safety voice and broadband network reporting mandatory, asserting such additional reporting is unnecessary, duplicative, and may be misleading. With respect to FirstNet, AT&T's states that information about FirstNet's network status, infrastructure, and assets is already included as part of AT&T's DIRS reporting and is provided directly to FirstNet's public safety customers via the FirstNet Central platform. Verizon acknowledges the Commission's ''legitimate situational awareness interest in a wireless outage's impact on public safety users[,]'' but is concerned such reporting may double-count infrastructure impacts since the same networks are used for commercial and public safety purposes, be inaccurate as providers may have different designations for what constitutes a public safety customer, and, as AT&T notes, likely duplicates information being provided directly to customers. We find that mandatory reporting for public safety voice and broadband networks in DIRS is both necessary to ensure public safety officials can respond during disasters, and, as Verizon observes, will provide important situational awareness that does not exist today regarding the status of all of these critical networks.

We find that direct reporting to enterprise customers via interfaces such as FirstNet Central is an inadequate substitute for the visibility that DIRS reporting will yield. AT&T asserts that FirstNet Central provides its users with ''near real-time network status[,]'' enabling FirstNet users access to more information [than DIRS], even during emergency events that do not rise to the level of a DIRS activation. We are unpersuaded by the argument that outage information public safety voice and broadband network operators share with public-safety subscribers obviates DIRS reporting. While a public safety voice and broadband network operator may share information about its network status relevant to its own customers, not all public safety customers subscribe to the same public safety voice and broadband network. During a disaster, those customers may need to communicate with public safety entities that are customers of a different public safety voice and broadband network. Thus, broader visibility to the public safety voice and broadband network ecosystem is essential to identify outages that may impede seamless communications among customers of all public safety voice and broadband networks. Through mandatory DIRS reporting, the Commission can aggregate public safety voice and broadband network status information for all such networks and provide more comprehensive visibility than any single, network-specific outage reporting platform like FirstNet Central can provide. While AT&T describes how it and ''the FirstNet Authority actively engage in state emergency operations centers during a disaster,'' state emergency operations centers lack access to the aggregated network status available as a result of the DIRS reporting requirements we adopt today.

Other aspects of the outage notifications provided by public safety voice and broadband network operators to their customers today further demonstrate how those notifications fail to sufficiently accomplish our goals. Information that public safety voice and broadband network operators report directly to enterprise customers is not available to state, Tribal, territorial, or Federal agencies that are not themselves FirstNet users. Additionally, while FirstNet Central may provide some outage-specific information, T-Mobile observes that FirstNet does not provide information within any specific timeframe after an outage begins, or update information at any specific interval thereafter. It is also unclear whether FirstNet Central provides its customers with outage information on a customer-specific basis, or on a larger scale such as a region, state, or for its network as a whole. Moreover, it is uncertain the extent to which FirstNet Central provides infrastructure status in addition to the information it provides on ''operational status[.]'' DIRS' inclusion of infrastructure status makes it more robust and useful, providing visibility to the damaged equipment that would need to be restored to reestablish critical connectivity. Aside from FirstNet, the record is silent on whether or how Verizon and T-Mobile notify Frontline and T-Priority users, respectively, of outages on their public safety voice and broadband networks, but no information about the operational status of these networks has been reported directly to the Commission, nor are we aware of state, Tribal, territorial, or Federal agencies that are not themselves Frontline or T-Priority users receiving access to this information. Verizon states that detailed service availability and restoration information is likely already being provided in accordance with contractual terms and conditions as part of the provider-enterprise customer relationship, but neither definitively states that such communications are, in fact, occurring, nor provides any specifics about those communications. Accordingly, we find that customer-specific outage communications are inadequate substitutes for the visibility and situational awareness DIRS reporting will yield for emergency management agencies and the Commission.

We require public safety voice and broadband network operators to file in DIRS irrespective of whether their service is integrated into their network or standalone. T-Mobile asserts that only FirstNet and other providers of standalone public safety networks should be required to report in DIRS, and that T-Mobile, which offers its T-Priority service through a dedicated 5G network slice, should be exempt. In our view, this distinction is immaterial. Operators of public safety voice and broadband networks can prioritize service restoration to those networks irrespective of whether they are physically or logically diverse. Network slicing allows network administrators to dynamically prioritize access (and, potentially, post-outage service restoration) to transport, backhaul, and core network functions for public safety customers during emergency response and disaster recovery efforts when network congestion is more likely to occur. Excluding such offerings from the requirement we adopt today would limit our and public safety agencies' visibility into the status of these important services based on a network architecture distinction that is irrelevant to their importance during disasters and emergencies.

To eliminate the potential for both duplicative reporting burdens and ''overstating the physical and user impact of an outage,'' we will allow operators of public safety voice and broadband networks to satisfy their DIRS reporting obligation by indicating whether the status of their public safety voice and broadband network is the same as the status of their other network infrastructure. In the event that the status is not the same, then we require the fields in DIRS that are applicable to that network to be completed to identify specific impacts. This approach is consistent with Verizon's proposal for ''a simple voluntary Yes/No checkbox field . . . that answers the question 'Public Safety Voice and Broadband Network Customers Affected?' '' At the same time, we find it critical to require these providers to submit additional information to help the Commission identify public safety communications-specific impacts and restoration information, so we require them to submit the information that is appropriate for their type of network (*e.g.,* the provider of a wireless public safety voice and broadband network shall complete the wireless service provider fields in DIRS). This approach strikes a balance that will ensure we collect important information about public safety impacts that will provide the Commission and our federal, state, Tribal, and territorial partners with visibility into the operational status of these networks while minimizing new burdens on providers. While Verizon expresses concern about the potential for ''apples-to-oranges comparisons between providers that have different designations for what constitutes a 'public safety' entity,'' this does not deter us from our conclusion. We think it reasonable that each public safety voice and broadband network operator will have eligibility criteria that requires customers on their respective networks to have a legitimate public safety purpose in order to subscribe. We acknowledge this criteria may not be identical across all public safety voice and broadband networks, but find this potential variance will not adversely affect our goal of capturing impacts to public safety customers. As with the other changes we implement today, we delegate authority to the Bureau to integrate public safety voice and broadband networks' infrastructure status into DIRS reporting.

H. Retaining NORS Reporting Requirements for DIRS-Lite Activations

At this time, we decline to extend the suspension of NORS reporting requirements during DIRS activations to DIRS-Lite activations, which we believe is necessary to preserve our visibility into outages that result from disasters for which we activate DIRS-Lite. By contrast to DIRS activations, the Commission activates DIRS-Lite for disasters that are less severe than those warranting a full DIRS activation. In anticipation of disaster impacts on communications services that are less severe, but that are nonetheless important for local emergency managers to understand on a day-to-day basis, the Commission can choose to collect infrastructure status information from providers by activating DIRS-Lite. When the Commission activates DIRS-Lite, it collects infrastructure status information informally, by e-mail or phone, rather than via DIRS's online interface. All information that providers offer to the Commission during a DIRS-Lite activation is submitted voluntarily; providers are not required to submit the detailed infrastructure status information that DIRS elicits. The daily cadence of infrastructure status information during DIRS-Lite activations supplements more fulsome information that providers are required to report in NORS for outages that meet the Commission's reporting thresholds. The Commission has never waived NORS reporting requirements during an activation of DIRS-Lite. Accordingly, we disagree with ATIS, CTIA, USTelecom, and Verizon that we should waive NORS requirements during DIRS-Lite activations.

We agree with Public Knowledge that suspending NORS filing obligations during DIRS-Lite activations could create a gap in the Commission's information about network reliability by shifting the type of information that the Commission collects from information about outage root causes and subscriber impacts to information about infrastructure status at the time that network outages are most likely to occur. We also agree with Public Knowledge that extending the NORS waiver to DIRS-Lite activations may make it necessary for the Bureau to annually reconcile NORS filings, DIRS filings, and DIRS-Lite in order to maintain a complete picture of network resilience. We believe that this would pose significant administrative burdens for the Commission that outweigh the benefits of waiving NORS filings. In addition, we are not persuaded that DIRS-Lite activations present burdens to providers that would meaningfully detract from their service restoration efforts. For these reasons, we decline to extend the suspension of NORS reporting requirements to DIRS-Lite activations.

I. Compliance Timeframe

With respect to eliminating the DIRS final report and providing a filing exemption for providers that do not own or operate their own facilities, neither of these changes will necessitate technical changes to DIRS before becoming effective as the providers to which these changes apply can simply decline to file the reports in question. Accordingly, both changes to our rules shall be effective immediately upon publication of this *Third Report and Order* in the **Federal Register**. In addition to these amendments, the *FNPRM* proposed amendments to section 4.18(a) that specified the types of information that providers are required to report in DIRS. *See FNPRM and Order on Reconsideration,* 40 FCC Rcd at 6337. Because these amendments reflect information that is currently required to be reported in DIRS and do not impose any new obligations on providers, we also make those amendments effective immediately upon publication of this *Third Report and Order* in the **Federal Register**. However, we expect that many of the steps that we take today to streamline DIRS, including the creation of a dynamic form, the elimination of unnecessary fields, and the creation of a field to collect more granular location information, will require additional time to modify DIRS. We direct the Bureau to implement the necessary technical modifications to DIRS to effectuate the improvements described in this *Report and Order,* work with stakeholders to share information about and test the improvements to help facilitate any modifications to their reporting practices, and release a Public Notice to notify stakeholders when those improvements have been implemented.

We require public safety voice and broadband network operators to begin reporting in DIRS on the later of (i) 30 days after the Bureau announces that the Office of Management and Budget has completed its review of this requirement pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act and that DIRS is ready to receive public safety voice and broadband network operators' filings; or (ii) November 30, 2026. We believe that this approach will provide sufficient time for public safety voice and broadband network operators to make any necessary adjustments to their existing reporting processes to comply with the new requirement and to adjust to DIRS modifications.

J. Assessing the Benefits and Costs

We conclude that the rules we adopt today to reduce the burdens of DIRS reporting on service providers, along with new mandatory DIRS reporting requirements for public safety voice and broadband network operators, will result in annual cost savings of approximately $4 million, which outweighs the approximately $176,000 one-time cost and the $72,000 annual recurring cost to implement these changes. 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 and $3.9 million from eliminating DIRS reporting obligations for mobile virtual network operators and VoIP resellers. The cost estimates include a $176,000 one-time cost for DIRS batch filing reconfiguration, and an annual cost of $72,000 for public safety voice and broadband networks to report outages when DIRS is activated. We find that these net cost savings, along with the public safety benefits that will flow from our actions will outweigh any new costs and any potential effects on public safety from the Commission no longer receiving and sharing certain types of infrastructure status information.

By removing the need for providers to select from the current array of ten separate forms concerning different types of service and infrastructure, we find that manual filers should be able to complete their filings more quickly. In addition, we find that eliminating unnecessary and duplicative fields will allow DIRS filings to be submitted more quickly. To quantify these cost savings, we use the methodology that we proposed in the *FNPRM.* Consistent with the *FNPRM,* based on staff estimation using the most recent available data, 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. We further estimate that there are an average of six facilities-based mobile wireless voice providers and 82 mobile virtual network operators per county. Consistent with the *FNPRM,* we estimate the overall recurring cost savings to providers arising from modifying DIRS to simplify filing to be approximately $143,000 annually. We arrive at this figure by reducing by 20%, on average, the time we estimate providers will spend filing DIRS reports and by eliminating the cost burden associated with the requirement to provide a DIRS final report. 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. DIRS filers will realize these cost savings on an annually recurring basis; therefore, these savings will exceed the one-time implementation costs associated with these changes. 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. For labor costs, the *FNPRM* used an hourly compensation figure of $35.22, which remains consistent with the most recent available wage data. The most recent available data suggests a base hourly wage for an office and administrative support worker of $24.12/hour. Consistent with the *FNPRM,* we calculate the applicable benefits markup by using Bureau of Labor Statistics data, as of December 2025, where civilian wages and salaries averaged $33.45/hour and benefits averaged $15.33/hour. Using these figures, we calculate that benefits constituted a markup of $15.33/33.45 ~ 46%. Taking 46% for cost of benefits ($11.10/hour), we determine an hourly compensation of $35.22/hour ($24.12/hour + $11.10/hour). We acknowledge that a batch filer in DIRS may incur one-time costs "to reconfigure its systems to reorganize how it exports data, and to ensure that the data is formatted in a manner accepted by DIRS" and find those costs to be approximately $176,000. The most recent available data suggests a base hourly wage for a database administrator of $51.65/hour. Taking 46% for cost of benefits ($23.76/hour), we arrive at an hourly compensation of $75.41/hour (which equals $51.65/hour plus $23.76/hour using our methodology for benefits markup). We revise our facilities-based estimate in the *FNPRM,* to estimate a total cost of $175,479 = 1 database administrator × $75.41/hour × 1 hour × 2,327 facilities-based cable, wireline, wireless, and interconnected VoIP providers, which we round to $176,000. Note that in the *FNPRM,* we used the county average estimate for facilities-based providers in counties where DIRS is activated, whereas the one-time cost here applies to all providers that have set up their systems for batch-filing. On our own initiative, we update the one-time cost calculation to reflect this. Because we do not have data on the total number of batch-filers, we conservatively use the sum of all facilities-based cable, wireline, wireless, and interconnected VoIP as a cost ceiling (*i.e.,* the maximum possible number of batch filers). This consists of 53 wireless facilities based providers and 2,274 wireline end-user switched access and interconnected VoIP providers based on the most recent Voice Telephone Services Report.

Our action today to exclude non-facilities-based providers from mandatory DIRS reporting will result in considerable savings for these providers. We find there will be an estimated $3.9 million annual cost savings for these categories of providers, as explained in the *FNPRM.* We estimate the cost saving as follows: 1 office and administrative support worker working at a wage rate of $35.22 per hour working for ten minutes on the initial entry and ten minutes for each daily update multiplied by the 14-day average period of a DIRS activation plus the ten minutes saved as a result of no longer having to submit a final report multiplied by 339 counties in which DIRS is activated, on average, each year, multiplied by the sum of the nation's estimated 82 mobile virtual network operators and 41 resellers. The result of this calculation is $3,916,182, which we round to $3.9 million. No commenters opposed our estimated cost savings or methodology.

Expanded reporting for public safety voice and broadband network operators will bring new visibility to the status of these critical networks and the essential first responders and emergency management customers who rely on those networks to perform life-saving recovery work. We estimate that the cost of public safety voice and broadband network operators reporting infrastructure status information in DIRS will not exceed approximately $72,000 annually. We update that calculation 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 × 3 public safety voice and broadband network operators} = $71,637, which we round to $72,000. As proposed, we calculate the annual costs for public safety voice and broadband network operators filing in DIRS by applying the hourly wage of an office and administrative support worker ($35.22) multiplied by the amount of time we estimate for these providers to enter initial contact information and file one daily status update in DIRS for each day of the 14-day average duration of a DIRS activation. We note that this figure is likely conservatively high because of our actions to eliminate duplicative reporting burdens, including allowing operators of public safety voice and broadband networks to satisfy their DIRS reporting obligation by indicating whether the status of their public safety voice and broadband network is the same as the status of their other network infrastructure.

Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

As required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, as amended (RFA), the Federal Communications Commission (Commission) incorporated an Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA) in the *Resilient Networks; Amendments to Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications Third Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* (*Third Further Notice*) released in August 2025. The Commission sought written public comment on the proposals in the *Third Further Notice,* including comment on the IRFA. No comments were filed addressing the IRFA. This Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (FRFA) conforms to the RFA and it (or summaries thereof) will be published in the **Federal Register**.

A. Need for, and Objectives of, the Final Rules

The Commission's rules require 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. Today's *Third Report and Order* reduces DIRS-related burdens faced by small and other service providers and government agencies so that they can dedicate more resources to restoring and maintaining communications services during a disaster. The *Third Report and Order* makes the following changes to DIRS: Redesigning the DIRS user interface to streamline reporting for service providers who enter information in DIRS manually so these filers can submit information more efficiently; Eliminating 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; Eliminating DIRS final reports for mandated DIRS filers; and Exempting non-facilities-based providers from requirements to report in DIRS.

The *Third Report and Order* also supports the collection of new information that would offer significant public safety value during disasters, namely requiring reporting on infrastructure status by public safety voice and broadband network operators, and allowing all DIRS filers to voluntarily submit granular location maps, such as maps of downed cell sites. The Commission believes that the improvements to DIRS in the *Third Report and Order* strike the appropriate balance of reducing regulatory burdens for providers while ensuring collection of necessary and relevant information when disasters occur.

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

Comments were filed by the Competitive Carriers Association (CCA), the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB), and WTA—Advocates for Rural Broadband (WTA) addressing the impact of the proposed rules on small entities. The Competitive Carriers Association (CCA) observes that redesigning the DIRS interface to replace the ten separate DIRS worksheets with a single, dynamic form addresses a concern that is ''particularly acute for small and rural carriers. Such providers often operate with limited engineering and operations teams, many of whom are simultaneously engaged in damage assessment, power restoration, and physical repairs.'' WTA, whose members are small, rural local telecommunications carriers, also explain that ''[s]treamlining the DIRS reporting requirements is important to WTA's members, who do not have any ''surplus staff'' to deal with regulatory burdens, particularly when disasters strike.'' NAB discussed its support for a ''one-click'' option in DIRS that would allow providers to indicate there is no change in infrastructure status from the previous day's report. NAB notes that in addition to saving time and streamlining DIRS report preparation, this change ''would facilitate broadcasters' voluntary participation in DIRS, especially smaller stations.'' The Commission agrees with these views and adopts both of these changes to DIRS.

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

Pursuant to the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010, which amended the RFA, the Commission is required to respond to any comments filed by the Chief Counsel for the Small Business Administration (SBA) Office of Advocacy, and to also provide a detailed statement of any change made to the proposed rules as a result of those comments. 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

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 adopted rules. The RFA generally defines the term ''small entity'' as having the same meaning as the terms ''small business,'' ''small organization,'' and ''small governmental jurisdiction.'' In addition, the term ''small business'' has the same meaning as the term ''small business concern'' under the Small Business Act (SBA). 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. The SBA establishes small business size standards that agencies are required to use when promulgating regulations relating to small businesses; agencies may establish alternative size standards for use in such programs, but must consult and obtain approval from SBA before doing so.

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. In general, a small business is an independent business having fewer than 500 employees. These types of small businesses represent 99.9% of all businesses in the United States, which translates to 34.75 million businesses. Next, ''small organizations'' are not-for-profit enterprises that are independently owned and operated and not dominant their field. 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. Finally, ''small governmental jurisdictions'' are defined as cities, counties, towns, townships, villages, school districts, or special districts with populations of less than fifty thousand. 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.

The rules adopted in the *Third Report and Order* will apply to small entities in the industries identified in the chart below by their six-digit North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) codes and corresponding SBA size standard. Where available, we also provide additional information regarding the number of potentially affected entities in the identified industries below.

TABLE 1—2022 U.S. CENSUS BUREAU DATA BY NAICS CODE

[Footnotes specify potentially affected entities within a regulated industry where applicable]

Regulated industry	NAICS code	SBA size standard	Total firms	Total small firms	% Small firms
Radio Broadcasting Stations	516110	$47 million	2,616	2,136	81.65%
Television Broadcasting Stations	516120	$47 million	413	316	76.51
Media Streaming Distribution Services, Social Networks, and Other Media Networks and Content Providers.	516210	$47 million	5,217	3,673	70.40
Wired Telecommunications Carriers	517111	1,500 employees	3,403	3,027	88.95
Wireless Telecommunications Carriers (except Satellite)	517112	1,500 employees	1,184	1,081	91.30
Telecommunications Resellers	517121	1,500 employees	955	847	88.69
Satellite Telecommunications	517410	$44 million	332	195	58.73
All Other Telecommunications	517810	$40 million	1,673	1,007	60.19

TABLE 2—TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE PROVIDER DATA

2024 Universal service monitoring report telecommunications service provider data (data as of December 2023)	SBA size standard (1,500 employees)		
Affected entity	Total number 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
Interexchange Carriers (IXCs)	113	95	84.07
Local Exchange Carriers (LECs)	4,904	4,493	91.62
Local Resellers	222	217	97.75
Telecommunications Resellers	633	615	97.16
Toll Resellers	411	398	96.84
Wired Telecommunications Carriers	4,682	4,276	91.33
Wireless Telecommunications Carriers (except Satellite)	585	498	85.13
Wireless Telephony	326	247	75.77

TABLE 3—BROADCAST ENTITY DATA

Broadcast station owners (as of August 8, 2025)	SBA size standard ($47 million)		
Affected entity	Number commercial licensed	Small firms	% Small entities
Radio Stations (AM & FM) Groups	2,881	2,863	99.38
Television Stations	171	142	83.04

TABLE 4—CABLE ENTITIES DATA

Cable entities	Size standard	Total firms	Small firms	% Small firms in industry
Cable System Operators (Telecom Act Standard) Small Cable Operator.	Serves fewer than 498,000 subscribers, either directly or through affiliates.	530	524	98.87
Cable Companies and Systems (Rate Regulation) Small Cable Company.	Serves 400,000 or fewer subscribers nationwide	530	523	98.51

TABLE 4—CABLE ENTITIES DATA—Continued

Cable entities	Size standard	Total firms	Small firms	% Small firms in industry
Cable Companies and Systems (Rate Regulation) Small Cable System (headends).	Serves 15,000 or fewer subscribers	4,545	3,965	87.24

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

The RFA directs agencies to describe the economic impact of adopted 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 requirement and the type of professional skills necessary for preparation of the report or record.

The Commission estimates that the reduction the burdens of DIRS reporting on small and other communications service providers, will result in annual recurring cost savings for small entities. By removing the need for providers to select from the current array of ten separate forms concerning different types of service and infrastructure, the Commission expects that manual filers should be able to complete their filings more quickly. In addition, the Commission expects that eliminating unnecessary and duplicative fields will also allow DIRS filings to be submitted more quickly. The Commission estimates the overall recurring cost savings to small providers arising from modifying DIRS to simplify the filing process to annually be approximately $23.48 for each county in which a small provider operates. The Commission arrives at this figure by reducing by 20%, on average, the time we estimate that small and other providers will spend filing DIRS reports and by eliminating the cost burden associated with the requirement to provide a DIRS final report. The Commission acknowledges that a batch filer in DIRS may incur one-time costs ''to reconfigure its systems to reorganize how it exports data, and to ensure that the data is formatted in a manner accepted by DIRS'' and find those costs to be $75.41 per small entity.

In addition, the exclusion of small and other non-facilities-based providers from mandatory DIRS reporting will result in an estimated $3.9 million annual cost savings. The Commission estimates the cost saving as follows: one office and administrative support worker working at a wage rate of $35.22 per hour, working for ten minutes on the initial entry and ten minutes for each daily update, multiplied by the 14-day average period of a DIRS activation. Added to this is the ten minutes saved due to no longer having to submit a final report. This total is then multiplied by the 339 counties in which DIRS is activated, on average, each year, and further multiplied by the sum of the nation's estimated 82 mobile virtual network operators and 41 resellers. The result of this calculation is an annual cost savings of $93.92 for each county in which a small MVNO or small reseller operates.

Expanded reporting for public safety voice and broadband network operators will bring new visibility to the status of these critical networks and the essential first responders and emergency management customers who rely on those networks to perform life-saving recovery work. The Commission estimates that small entities will not be impacted by the public safety voice and broadband network operators reporting infrastructure status information in DIRS requirement since the providers it would likely apply to are not considered small entities.

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

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.''

In the *Third Report and Order,* the Commission takes several steps that could reduce the economic impact for small entities. As noted above, our actions reduce DIRS-related burdens faced by small and other service providers and government agencies so that they can dedicate more resources to restoring and maintaining communications services during a disaster. These burden-reducing actions include streamlining the DIRS user interface eliminating unnecessary fields; eliminating DIRS final reports for mandated DIRS filers; and exempting non-facilities-based providers from requirements to report in DIRS. The Commission also considered additional ways to reduce burdens on DIRS filers that were proposed by commenters and adopted some of those proposals. In some instances, the Commission declines to make changes to DIRS on which it sought comment that had the potential to further reduce burdens, such as eliminating the voluntarily DIRS satellite form, because the potential public safety value of collecting the information outweighed the potential reduction in costs.

The Commission declines to adopt its proposal to require facilities-based wireless providers to identify which non-facilities-based provides utilize their networks within the DIRS activation area, nor does the Commission adopt the alternative that mobile virtual network operators identify their underlying network providers. The Commission is persuaded by the record that a list of business relationships alone would be insufficient to enable emergency managers to derive actionable insights about a disaster's impacts on their community, and therefore requiring the reporting of this information would be unnecessarily burdensome on small and other providers.

The Commission adopts new requirements for public safety voice and broadband network operates to report in DIRS in light of the vital role these services play in keeping first responders connected during emergency response and the need to provide visibility and situational awareness into these vital public-safety networks during disasters while only imposing costs on a small number of operators. The Commission considers whether direct reporting to enterprise customers via interfaces such as FirstNet Central would be an adequate substitute for DIRS reporting, but finds that that approach would not yield information that was comprehensive to accomplish these public safety goals.

The Commission also declines to extend the suspension of NORS reporting requirements during DIRS activations to DIRS-Lite activations to preserve visibility into outages during those activations. While this suspension would reduce filing burdens on small and other providers, the Commission finds that this would receive far less specific information that it currently receives about outages for a much smaller number of providers, which would create a gap in its situational awareness about network reliability and result in an incomplete picture of the weak points in critical communications infrastructure. The Commission also finds that this would pose significant administrative burdens that outweigh the benefits of suspending the requirement. The Commission is also not persuaded that DIRS-Lite activations present burdens to providers that would meaningfully detract from their service restoration efforts.

Ordering Clauses

Accordingly, *it is ordered* that the *Third Report and Order* in PS Docket Nos. 21–346 and 15–80 and ET Docket No. 04–35 *is adopted.*

It is further ordered that the Office of Managing Director, Performance Program Management, *shall send* a copy of this *Third Report and Order* in a report to be sent to Congress and the Government Accountability Office pursuant to the Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

It is further ordered that this *Third Report and Order shall be effective* upon publication in the **Federal Register**.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 4

Airports, Communications common carriers, Communications equipment, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Telecommunications.

Federal Communications Commission.

Aleta Bowers,

Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary.

Final Rules

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

PART 4—DISRUPTIONS TO COMMUNICATIONS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 4 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 47 U.S.C. 34–39, 151, 154, 155, 157, 201, 214, 218, 251, 301, 303, 307, 309, 316, 332, 403, 615, 615a–1, 615b, 1302(a), 1302(b), 1421, 1426, and 1433; 5 U.S.C. 301; and E.O. 10530, 19 FR 2709, 3 CFR, 1954–1958 Comp., p. 189.

■ 2. Amend § 4.18 by:

■ a. Revising the section heading and paragraph (a) introductory text; and

■ b. Removing and reserving paragraph (a)(2).

The revisions read as follows:

§ 4.18 Mandatory Disaster Information Reporting System (DIRS) reporting.

(a) Cable Communications, Wireline, Wireless, and Interconnected VoIP providers that own or operate their own facilities shall be required to report their infrastructure status information each day 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. These providers are subject to mandated reporting in DIRS and shall:

* * * * *

■ 3. Delayed indefinitely, further amend § 4.18 by revising paragraph (a) and adding paragraph (c) to read as follows:

§ 4.18 Mandatory Disaster Information Reporting System (DIRS) reporting.

(a) Cable communications, wireline communications, wireless service, and interconnected VoIP providers that own or operate their own facilities 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. These 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.

(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.

(5) 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.

* * * * *

(c) Public safety voice and broadband network operators shall submit information in DIRS concerning the status of infrastructure used by that network. They shall submit information that is applicable to the characteristics of the network (*e.g.,* the provider of a wireless public safety voice and broadband network shall complete the wireless service provider fields in DIRS). Facilities-based cable communications, wireline communications, wireless service, and interconnected VoIP providers that operate public safety voice and broadband networks shall identify the status of the infrastructure relied upon by the public safety voice and broadband network in addition to identifying the status of their infrastructure overall.

[FR Doc. 2026–13155 Filed 6–29–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P