Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

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

OPENING COMMENTS OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UTILITY CONSUMER ADVOCATES (NASUCA) AND THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK (TURN)

David Springe,
Executive Director

National Association of State Utility
Consumer Advocates (NASUCA)
8380 Colesville Road, Suite 101
Silver Spring, MD 20910
Phone (301) 589-6313

May 13, 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

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

OPENING COMMENTS OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UTILITY CONSUMER ADVOCATES (NASUCA) AND THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK (TURN)

I. Introduction

On January 26, 2024, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC or Commission) issued a Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (FNPRM) seeking comment on sets of rule changes that will "improve network reliability and resiliency and operational transparency, both during and in the aftermath of disasters and outages."[1] The National Association of State Utility

[1] *Resilient Networks*; *Amendments to Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruption to Communications*; *New Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruption to Communications*; PS Dockets No. 21-346 and 15-80; ET Docket No. 04-35; Second Report and Order and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 24-5 (rel. Jan. 26, 2024) (*FNPRM* or *Resilient Networks 2024 Order*).

Consumer Advocates (NASUCA)[2] and The Utility Reform Network (TURN)[3] submit these comments in response to the FNPRM.

The FNPRM builds upon years of experience with outage reporting rules and voluntary frameworks for communication disruptions during natural disasters or "sunny day" outages, and other emergencies. These communication disruptions' growing cadence and prevalence are felt nationwide and in some states at record-breaking levels. Our communications infrastructure continues to be susceptible to disruption, which we have seen in recent events, including Hurricane Ida, severe winter storms in Texas, and wildfires in California, Hawaii, and New Mexico. NASUCA and TURN support the Commission's efforts to modernize the outage reporting rules to include the facilities and infrastructure that deliver today's and tomorrow's communications. The proposals in the FNPRM answer the call of the growing need and complicated nature of situational awareness required for local and state public safety response to all these events. Moreover, NASUCA and TURN support the Commission's goal to safeguard a "consumer's right to public safety and potentially life-saving information"[4] regardless of the technology employed by and size of their telecommunications provider. Furthermore, NASUCA and TURN support the effort to ensure that small rural communities are "entitled to functioning

[2] NASUCA is a voluntary association of 61 consumer advocates. NASUCA members represent the interest of utility consumers in 44 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Barbados, and Jamaica. NASUCA is incorporated in Florida as a non-profit corporation. NASUCA's full members are designated by the laws of their respective jurisdiction to represent the interests of utility consumers before state and federal regulators and in the courts. Members operate independently from state utility commissions. Some NASUCA member offices are separately established advocate organizations while others are divisions of larger state agencies (e.g., the state Attorney General's office). NASUCA's associate and affiliate members also represent the interests of utility consumers but are not created by state law or do not have statewide authority. Some NASUCA member offices advocate in states whose respective state commissions do not have jurisdiction over certain telecommunications issues.

[3] TURN is a California nonprofit organization that promotes racial and economic equity advancement and accessibility through regulatory and legislative work to achieve affordable and reliable communication services. At several levels of government, either directly or through coalitions, TURN advocates for policies that support the widespread deployment of reliable and high-quality communications services.

[4] Resilient Networks 2024 Order para. 11.

networks that provide alerts and 911 capability" and not just communities served by large providers.[5]

As the pace of copper landline service retirement or phaseout has accelerated, people are relying on new and other modes of communication, by choice or otherwise. This has left a gap in the Commission's understanding and awareness of the prevalence and severity of outages. The Commission proposes to rightfully capture all modes of communication in its resiliency and outage work to create a more complete picture during and after communication disruptions.

II. Outage Reporting by Satellite Providers

The Commission seeks comment on whether to expand the reporting for satellite providers from strictly reporting to the Network Outage Reporting System (NORS) to include reporting to the Disaster Information Reporting System (DIRS).[6] Given the potential for remote or rural area residents to rely on satellite-based communications for voice or broadband service, the Commission should adopt a requirement for satellite providers to report in both NORS and DIRS. This will help the Commission meet its statutory duty to regulate communication services without discrimination.[7] Moreover, as the Commission acknowledges,[8] rural communications companies sometimes rely on satellite capabilities for backhaul. Mobile recovery assets deployed to a disaster area are likely to rely on satellite capabilities for backhaul as well. Therefore, the Commission is correct in its belief that the impact on satellite communications' capabilities, especially during disasters, is important knowledge for emergency response personnel's situational awareness.[9] This is especially the case during events where terrestrial-

[5] Resilient Networks 2024 Order para. 11.
[6] *See* FNPRM paras. 54, 56.
[7] *See* 47 U.S.C. 151.
[8] *See* FNPRM para. 56.
[9] *See* FNPRM para. 56.

based infrastructure (non-satellite) is impacted and unusable.

A. Satellite Provider DIRS Reporting

The Commission seeks comment on extending mandatory DIRS reporting to satellite providers.[10] NASUCA and TURN support adding satellite providers in DIRS reporting, including for satellite BIAS providers and satellite broadcast providers[11] to the extent that they are not already covered in the recently adopted rules.

Voluntary DIRS reporting for satellite providers does not equip the Commission with key information during a DIRS event. For example, it is difficult for the Commission to determine which satellite providers are operational or experiencing issues, especially in the challenging communications environment during a DIRS event. As the Commission reflects in the FNPRM, this could be because satellite providers elect not to participate or because they are not physically capable of reporting due to infrastructure damage or some other reason, like a commercial power outage. In previous responses, commenters explain that satellite services provide connectivity, including "voice and data services, satellite imagery, and satellite for cellular backhaul."[12] For this reason, to the extent feasible, the Commission should fill in all potential information gaps with satellite provider operational status information in DIRS in order to promote public safety.

At a minimum, DIRS reporting for all satellite providers should build on the current form but provide details about the impact on their coverage area and whether the outage event is due to a commercial power loss so that stakeholders analyzing daily DIRS data can make macro-scale assessments of where to deploy limited resources and human capital in response to a disaster or emergency.

---

[10] *See* FNPRM para. 53.
[11] *See* FNPRM para. 58.
[12] FNPRM para. 56 & para. 56 n.132 (citing Iridium Comments at 3).

In addition, as stated above, to reflect the practical reality of the aftermath of a disaster during a DIRS activation event, the Commission should delegate to the Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau the task of identifying alternative DIRS reporting methods when a satellite provider has no Internet connection.

B. Satellite Provider NORS Reporting

The Commission seeks comment on the current NORS reporting requirements for satellite providers.[13] NORS Part 4 rules should be recalibrated for satellite providers in a way that reflects technological changes to these networks since the rules were adopted in 2004. Moreover, as NASUCA members have observed, more state agencies are requiring sets of emergency response information to be presented on company websites. Thus, it is crucial for NORS to capture any trends that diminish satellite broadband service. Capturing these network elements with today's and tomorrow's satellite technologies in mind renders the rules more useful. The public safety benefits outweigh the cost burden to satellite providers. As the Commission observes, even in today's mandatory requirements to submit in NORS, there are a limited number of satellite providers that supply a small number of NORS reports.[14] Given the evolving satellite marketplace and technologies, this reporting trend could be a signal to update the rules.

The Commission should also revisit the scope of its NORS requirement. For example, the Commission should consider including in its rules a requirement to report an outage that impacts satellite infrastructure used for internal networks and one-way distribution of audio or

[13] *See* FNPRM para. 57.
[14] *See* FNPRM para. 54.

video.[15] The NORS form should collect information about whether the outage is related to a commercial power outage.

III. Outage Reporting by FirstNet

The Commission seeks comment on mandatory DIRS and NORS reporting for FirstNet.[16] Given FirstNet's unique purpose to provide robust public safety communications and, by extension, carry some of the most life-saving information across public safety stakeholders when disasters strike, NASUCA and TURN fully support the proposal to incorporate FirstNet in the Commission's mandatory requirements for both DIRS and NORS. FirstNet has declined to participate on a voluntary basis in both NORS and DIRS, as the Commission observes.

Although FirstNet provides a snapshot summary to Congress every year and holds public meetings, this is several degrees removed from informing ground stakeholders with necessary life-saving information in real-time. The Commission learned from parties in other proceedings about the "lack of information with FirstNet's operations and the performance of its network during times of crisis."[17] For example, a report by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) suggested that state, local, and tribal stakeholders "lacked insight into operational status and cell site location for FirstNet."[18] Since the GAO released its 2020 report, recent online updates suggest that "contract oversight and monitoring with public-safety stakeholders" is taking place, a website tool with "quarterly" "deep dive" discussions is available, and '"end-users'

[15] *See* FNPRM para. 54.
[16] *See* FNPRM para. 60.
[17] FNPRM para. 61 & para. 61 n.145 (internal citations omitted).
[18] GAO, "Public-Safety Broadband Network" Network Deployment is Progressing, but FirstNet Could Strengthen Its Oversight," GAO-20-346 (Jan. 27, 2020) https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-20-346.

satisfaction" information is in focus.[19] However, all these elements are not commensurate with the type of information captured by NORS and DIRS, nor are they sufficient for the Commission to meet its statutory public safety duties.

Therefore, to ensure a "fuller picture" of all public safety networks, FirstNet, or AT&T on behalf of FirstNet, should file outage reports with the Commission with respect to FirstNet infrastructure and services, including the deployment of mobile recovery assets.[20] NASUCA and TURN support this proposal. There is a significant public interest in obtaining outage reports regarding FirstNet. The Commission and, by extension, first responders that rely on FirstNet, should be aware if FirstNet is experiencing an outage. AT&T, FirstNet's operator, is an experienced filer in both NORS and DIRS and fulfilling this additional obligation should not be unduly burdensome. This reporting should be mandatory to give the Commission and the rest of the stakeholders that rely on DIRS and NORS the confidence that a lack of reporting is because the network is functioning as intended, not due to a decision by AT&T and FirstNet to fail to report an outage. FirstNet is too important to leave the Commission with a limited picture of the public safety network that so many of our first responders and other public safety communities rely on.

As of September 30, 2022, the Commission provided "direct, read-only access to filings in the Network Outage Reporting System (NORS) and the Disaster Information Reporting System (DIRS) to agencies of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, Tribal nations, territories, and federal government that have official duties that make them directly responsible for

[19] GAO, "Public-Safety Broadband Network" Network Deployment is Progressing, but FirstNet Could Strengthen Its Oversight," https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-20-346 (last visited May 1, 2024).
[20] *See* FNPRM para. 62.

emergency management and first responder support functions (Participating Agencies)." This same access should be provided to NORS and DIRS reports pertaining to FirstNet.[21]

IV. Outage Reporting by Broadband Internet Access Service Providers

The Commission seeks comment on NORS or DIRS reporting for broadband Internet access (BIAS) providers.[22] These comments build upon NASUCA's previous comments that supported requiring broadband outage reports in NORS and DIRS.[23] NASUCA and TURN reiterates NASUCA's previous assertion that BIAS is used to provide emergency information to the public.[24] NASUCA observes that since 2022, more and more information is being moved online, and residents everywhere are being asked to consult utility or local government online resources to obtain key life-saving information during disasters. For example, during AT&T's recent national wireless outage, public safety authorities relied on websites and social media to disseminate information to those affected. Further, the California Public Utilities Commission has required electric utilities and wireless and wireline telecommunications carriers to provide information about service outages on websites.[25]

---

[21] *See* FCC, "Outage Information Sharing," https://www.fcc.gov/outage-information-sharing (last visited May 10, 2024).
[22] *See* FNPRM para. 67.
[23] *See* Reply Comments of the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates (NASUCA) on the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, *Resilient Networks et al.*, PS Docket No. 21-346 *et al.*, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking at 11 (filed Jan. 18, 2022) (NASUCA NPRM Reply Comments).
[24] *See* NASUCA NPRM Reply Comments at 11 (Jan. 2022).
[25] *See, e.g.*, *Order Instituting Rulemaking Regarding Emergency Disaster Relief Program, Decision Adopting Wireless Provider Resiliency Strategies*, Rulemaking 18-03-011 at 119 (July 20, 2020) (". . . as soon as reasonably possible, at the onset of a disaster or [Public Safety Power Shutoff] event, each wireless provider shall post, and update at least daily, on its website a map of outages and service impacts, a description of any outage impacts in the specified areas, and the expected restoration time. This information shall be distributed to impacted customers and the general public by posting relevant information on the wireless provider's website and social media accounts, by sharing information with local media, and by providing updates to local and state elected officials and public safety stakeholders.").

C. BIAS Provider DIRS Reporting

The Commission should adopt mandatory reporting for BIAS providers in DIRS.[26] Reporting to DIRS requires a broadband connection, whether this be a landline, mobile, or other broadband connection. Other commenters have made similar arguments.[27] The Commission should take confidence that DIRS filers will be able to transmit DIRS reports when a DIRS event is activated. Moreover, when the Commission and other stakeholders assess the damage and coordinate resources, they should be certain that a lack of DIRS reporting by a BIAS provider is not the result of an election not to report because of a voluntary reporting framework.

DIRS reporting should include mobile and fixed wireless BIAS service due to its increased use across households to access timely information during disasters such as those that may trigger a DIRS event activation. In recent years, major wildfires (with the activation of DIRS-Lite for the Hawaii wildfires, for example) have motivated the Commission to activate a DIRS event. Although voice service is captured in DIRS under the Order,[28] broadband service that transmits and provides access to so much vital and life-saving information is not captured. This situational gap is unsustainable.

In addition, as stated above, to reflect the practical reality of disaster aftermath often during a DIRS activation event, the Commission should delegate to the Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau the task of identifying alternative DIRS reporting methods when a BIAS provider has no Internet connection.

---

[26] *See* FNPRM para. 67.
[27] *See* FNPRM para. 65 n.153 (citing Next Century Cities Comments at 11 (filed Dec. 16, 2021).
[28] *See* Resilient Networks 2024 Order para. 10 (applying DIRS requirement to cable communications, wireline, wireless, and interconnected VoIP providers).

D. BIAS Provider NORS Reporting

The Commission should adopt mandatory reporting for BIAS providers in NORS.[29] In previous comments, some raised concerns that requiring outage reporting for BIAS providers is duplicative, or that existing outage reporting requirements already capture broadband outages because these use the "same IP-enabled networks."[30] While certain NORS reporting entities have a history with outage reporting, the information provided for wireline, cable, or wireless service outages and the thresholds for each are calibrated for those services. With each iteration of outage or related reporting—from former Part 63 rules to the adoption of sets of ARMIS reports[31] to the outage reporting Part 4 requirements starting in 2004[32]—the Commission has sought to calibrate its rules for the services in use and relied on for communications. Moreover, the Commission recently recognized the importance of broadband service in its adoption of the most recent Safeguarding the Open Internet Order, designating BIAS as a Title II service.[33] Congress has repeatedly authorized programs and appropriated billions of dollars for broadband

[29] *See* FNPRM para. 67.
[30] *See* FNPRM para. 66 & para. 66 n.155, 157 (referencing T-Mobile's and Verizon's comments) (internal citations omitted).
[31] *Policy and Rules Concerning Rates for Dominant Carriers*, Second Report and Order, CC Docket No. 87-313, 5 FCC Rcd 6786 (1990) (Price Cap Order) (establishing sets of ARMIS reports, including AR 43-05 for service quality), https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/FCC-90-314A1.pdf; *see also* FCC, "FCC Report 43-05, Instructions" (Dec. 2000) https://transition.fcc.gov/ccb/armis/documents/2000PDFs/4305C00.PDF.
[32] *See generally* 47 C.F.R. pt. 4; *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,* Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, Second Report and Order, and Order on Reconsideration, 30 FCC Rcd 3206 (2015); *New Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications*, Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 19 FCC Rcd 16830 (2004).
[33] *See generally Safeguarding and Securing the Open Internet & Restoring Internet Freedom*, Declaratory Ruling, Order, Report and Order, and Order on Reconsideration, WC Docket Nos. 23-320 & 17-108, FCC-CIRC2404-01 (2024).

deployment and access programs[34] in recognition that broadband service is an essential and integral part of our daily lives. Accordingly, the NORS reporting and the trend analysis derived from the information should do more than fill in gaps, it should have calibrated measures and thresholds that are designed for today's and tomorrow's broadband service.

V. Reporting Mobile Recovery Assets in DIRS

NASUCA and TURN support the Commission's proposed DIRS reporting requirement to include mobile recovery assets. The Commission seeks comment on whether subject providers should include the location of their mobile recovery assets—including Cells on Wheels (COWs) and Cells on Light Truck (COLTs) or comparable assets—deployed to a disaster[35] and additional details including which entities should be covered, how this information should be collected as part of a subject provider's daily DIRS reporting, and whether a subject provider should also collect traffic load provided by the assets reported.[36]

As noted by the Commission, the current rules do not systematically collect information concerning mobile recovery assets.[37] Instead, the data is collected on an ad hoc basis.[38] The Commission tentatively concludes that incorporating this information into DIRS would permit the Commission to collect this information "more efficiently and uniformly" across providers and lead "to better public safety outcomes."[39] NASUCA and TURN agree. Deployable or mobile recovery assets serve a critical bridge function during and after a disaster to provide

---

[34] *See* Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, Pub. L. No. 117-58, div. F, tit. V, §§ 60102 & 60502 (2021) (Broadband Equity, Access and Deployment Program and Affordable Connectivity Program, respectively); Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021, Pub. L. No. 116-260, 134 Stat. 1182, div. N, tit. IX, § 904(b)(1), (i)(4). (2020) (Emergency Broadband Benefit Program).
[35] *See* FNPRM para 72.
[36] *See* FNPRM para 72.
[37] *See* FNPRM para 73.
[38] *See* FNPRM para 73.
[39] *See* FNPRM para 74.

services to first responders, emergency managers, and the affected public at large until recovery and repair efforts are completed. The Commission's proposal would serve a significant need to collect information about how mobile recovery assets are pre-positioned, deployed, shared, or requisitioned during a disaster uniformly and systematically. Collecting granular data from disasters would promote public safety by providing valuable insights for future preparedness planning.

Upon conclusion of the disaster—and in support of the After-Action Report discussed in Section VI—the Commission can use this information to assess and compare the deployment and effectiveness of mobile assets. For this reason, the Commission should collect real-time information for all mobile recovery assets deployed, COWs and COLTs, as well as compact rapid deployables, and flying COWs (cell on wings).[40] With this information, the Commission will have uniform information that can support evaluating the performance of subject provider responses and the utilization of these assets over time, including industry-wide trends and individual providers. By collecting information on all types of deployables, the Commission may determine which ones are more effective or less in certain circumstances. This information can guide improvements in deployment strategies and technology upgrades, inform best practices, and network investment decisions. However, adopting an informed and iterative approach requires granular and systemic information.

[40] *See e.g.*, FirstNet, "Deployables," https://www.firstnet.gov/network/TT/deployables (last visited May 2, 2024).

A. All Providers Deploying Mobile Recovery Assets Should Report Daily

Mobile recovery assets regularly feature in many providers' resiliency plans, but the efficacy of their use for a particular disaster—or across disasters—remains unclear.[41] The Commission seeks comment on the entities that should be subject to this reporting requirement.[42] NASUCA and TURN respectfully recommend that the Commission require all providers that maintain a fleet of deployable assets to report the pre-positioning and subsequent deployment and use of these assets upon activation of DIRS and until such time that DIRS is deactivated. Providers that do not maintain a fleet but obtain mobile recovery assets before or during a disaster should be subject to the proposed rule for that disaster upon acquiring their first asset.

Regardless of size, all providers should be subject to a daily reporting requirement. The proposed obligation and accompanying burdens would scale based on the size of the provider and its fleet of mobile recovery assets but be offset by the ability for a provider to absorb those burdens. In other words, a small provider that does not possess mobile recovery assets would not be subject to the rule and bear no additional reporting obligation. A small provider with a few assets would be required to monitor and report the location and status of the few assets they deploy. Larger providers, presumably, implement asset management systems to monitor the location and status of their fleet.[43]

---

[41] *See generally* PS Docket No. 19-251. In response to the outages caused by the 2019 wildfires and the planned power shutdowns in California, the Commission issued letters to all five of the facilities-based wireless providers then operating in the state seeking steps each provider took or planned to take to mitigate the effects of power shutoffs. With the exception of US Cellular, the providers listed mobile recovery assets as part of their mitigation efforts but without additional details.

[42] *See id*. para. 74 (asking "which subject providers should be required to provide such information?").

[43] *See, e.g.*, FleetComplete, "How Asset Tracking Impacts First Responders," https://www.fleetcomplete.com/firstnet/blog/how-asset-tracking-impacts-first-responders/ (last visited May 2, 2024) (describing Santa Clara County use of mobile recovery assets for searches and rescues and how the county leverages "asset tracking to deploy connectivity for this specialized equipment in remote areas). Note, FleetComplete is a service provided by AT&T as part of its FirstNet role.

Moreover, the daily collection of this type of information should not be overly burdensome to subject providers as it should be readily available. Providers that maintain mobile recovery assets appear to maintain asset management systems.[44] Once deployed in a disaster area, the provider tracks these assets' location and operational status through logistics and inventory systems as would be required to ensure that the assets are fueled or powered. Since these providers already maintain this information, providing daily updates to the Commission should not be overly burdensome. Relatedly, as this information should be readily available in such asset management processes, latitude and longitude coordinates, as well as street addresses, should also be readily available.

Where subject providers incur a burden in reporting this information, the benefit to emergency managers and first responders in service of public safety should outweigh those burdens. Public safety officials would benefit from detailed information regarding mobile recovery assets' locations and operational statuses. In an emergency or a disaster scenario, asset management for emergency managers and first responders becomes more critical as it contributes to situational awareness and their ability to effectively allocate limited resources to mission-critical needs.[45] For this reason, the Commission should collect further information

[44] *See, e.g.*, FirstNet, "Emergency Management Resource Guide," 18 (Sept. 2023), https://firstnet.gov/sites/default/files/EM_Guide_Sept_2023.pdf (noting that "AT&T technicians are responsible for transporting, setting up, and breaking down the deployable asset. During operation of the asset, they may need access to the deployable to refuel generators, but otherwise the asset will be managed remotely from AT&T's global network operations center (GNOC)" (emphasis added)).

[45] *See, e.g.*, Public Notice, FCC, "Communications Status Report for Areas Impacted by Hurricane Maria," 3 (Oct. 12, 2017). The Commission described in one of its status reports that after the significant loss of communications in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands following Hurricane Maria, the four major providers were "coordinating and prioritizing the recovery of cell sites and placement of temporary assets with the other carriers to maximize the coverage for all subscribers," along with the generic reference to the deployment of Satellite COLTs and Terrestrial COWs)/COLTs in several barrios. The MDRI requires entities to engage in mutual aid and sharing assets. If the Commission had collected information regarding how these providers sited their mobile recovery assets may yield insights in the future.

where a mobile recovery asset is redeployed or moved at the request of federal, state, local or tribal emergency managers or first responders should be reported by the subject provider. This information may allow the Commission to later follow up with the emergency managers and first responders to determine the reason for the request.

B. Providers Deploying Mobile Recovery Assets Should Report Granular Information Through DIRS

To collect granular information, the Commission can utilize existing processes. The Commission seeks comment on the "level of granularity for which location information should be reported (e.g., on a zip code or street address basis) and on whether this information should be reported directly in existing DIRS forms or through other means."[46] DIRS reporting includes worksheet templates in Excel format for covered entities to submit certain kinds of data.[47] The Commission proposes the collection of additional information that includes metrics for voice minutes, texts and data carried over a mobile recovery asset. To ensure uniformity of the information, the Commission should adopt a new DIRS Template Worksheet for each mobile recovery asset deployed to the affected areas. For example, the existing templates could be modified to collect the information sought (see Fig. 1). The benefit of modifying the existing worksheets would be the familiarity for subject providers have with the template.

Fig. 1

Mobile Recovery Asset Worksheet Field Descriptions		
Field Name	**Required**	**Description**
Report Number	X (See Note)	**Note**: A Report Number is required if you are providing updated data.

[46] *See* FNPRM para. 75.
[47] *See generally* FCC, "Disaster Information Reporting System (DIRS) User Guide, Version 2.1," (Dec. 2023).

Mobile Recovery Asset Worksheet Field Descriptions		
Field Name	**Required**	**Description**
Type of Mobile Recovery Asset Equipment (Cell on Wheels, Cell on Light Truck, etc.)		Select an equipment type from the drop-down menu.
Voice Utilization	X (See Note)	Enter a numerical value of the number of voice calls carried over the asset in the last 24 hours
Text Utilization	X (See Note)	Enter a numerical value of the number of text messages carried over the asset in the last 24 hours
Data Utilization	X (See Note)	Enter a numerical value of the data carried over the asset in the last 24 hours in Gigabytes
Status		Select a status from the drop-down menu.
Power Status		Select a power status from the drop-down menu.
Generator Available		Select if a generator is available.
Latitude	X (See Note)	Enter a latitude value. **Example**: 45.89213 **Notes**: • This field, **OR** Address, City, and State is required. Must be within US controlled territory.
Longitude	X (See Note)	Enter a longitude value. **Example**: -123.962 **Notes**: • This field, **OR** Address, City, and State is required. • Must be within US controlled territory.
Address	X (See Note)	• Enter an address. **Note**: This field, **OR** Latitude/Longitude is required.
City	X (See Note)	Enter a city. **Note**: This field, **OR** Latitude/Longitude is required.
State	X (See Note)	Select a state from the drop-down menu. **Note**: This field, **OR** Latitude/Longitude is required.
Notes		Enter any notes.

VI. After Action Reporting

NASUCA and TURN generally support the Commission's proposal to require providers subject to DIRS reporting requirements to additionally file after-action reports (AARs) with the Commission that offer further detail on "how their networks fared after the event or exigency

and the nature, timing, duration, and effectiveness of their pre-disaster response plans."[48] In this section, NASUCA and TURN offer analysis and proposals on which providers should file AARs, the integration of AARs with existing MDRI reporting requirements for facilities-based mobile providers, and the sharing of AARs with other government entities.

NASUCA and TURN agree that AARs have great potential to better inform Commission analysis and subsequent assessment or action in the aftermath of disasters and emergency events. Compared to daily DIRS reporting, AARs would give a full, continuous picture of a provider's network performance during the DIRS event with the benefit of post-disaster reflection. AARs could also give providers an opportunity to correct errors in their prior DIRS reports or otherwise update their accounts with information that they learned or confirmed after the Commission deactivated DIRS.

The Commission could then use this more comprehensive information in AARs to look for patterns across providers and events to determine best practices, what preparedness measures are most effective, and what contingencies providers are not planning for. Given the value of this information and how closely related AARs would be to prior DIRS reporting, the Commission should require all providers who are required to DIRS reports to additionally file AARs.

For facilities-based mobile wireless providers, an AAR reporting requirement would complement existing MDRI reporting. The Commission currently requires these providers "to submit reports to the Commission detailing the timing, duration, and effectiveness of their implementation of the [MDRI]'s provisions."[49] The MDRI's provisions include requirements for facilities-based mobile wireless providers to create roaming under disaster agreements, establish

[48] FNPRM para. 77.
[49] 47 C.F.R. § 4.17(c).

mutual aid agreements for emergency events with other facilities-based mobile wireless providers, and make reasonable efforts to increase municipal preparedness and consumer readiness, and improve communications to stakeholders.[50] Critically, however, the MDRI reporting requirement is ad hoc and requires the Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, under delegated authority, to issue a public notice to request this report. Therefore, the need for uniform, consistent post-disaster information remains.

Given the overlap between these reporting obligations and the topics AARs would cover, the "effectiveness of [a provider's] pre-disaster response plans" would logically include reporting on how providers relied on pre-existing roaming and mutual aid agreements and whether or how their MDRI-related efforts had a notable impact on municipal preparedness and restoration, consumer preparedness, and/or communications to the public and stakeholders on service availability and restoration. Furthermore, given the probable overlap of topics, incorporating MDRI reporting into AARs seems feasible. If the Commission does decide to create a template for AARs,[51] it could create a designated section or appendix for facilities-based wireless providers that satisfy some or all MDRI requirements. Relatedly, NASUCA and TURN consider a 60-day period for filing AARs to be reasonable. Sixty days is also the period for filing MDRI reports,[52] and keeping those deadlines consistent between AARs and MDRI reporting would facilitate any integration of the two.

NASUCA and TURN strongly encourage the Commission to require that AARs be shared "with the Federal, state, local, Tribal and territorial public response agencies that managed a particular disaster pursuant to which such reports are filed."[53] In prior comments in

[50] *See* 47 C.F.R. § 4.17(a)(3).
[51] *See* FNPRM para. 77.
[52] 47 C.F.R. § 4.17(c).
[53] FNPRM para. 79.

the *Amendments to Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications* docket, NASUCA discussed previous instances where lack of access to information about emergency events and/or major telecommunications outages caused confusion for state and local emergency officials or threats to public safety.[54]

Because the content of AARs would be closely related to that of DIRS reporting, public response agencies that receive DIRS reports should also receive AARs so that they have the most up-to-date and comprehensive information in the aftermath of an emergency event. Access to AARs will further reduce the risk of confusion, enhance public safety, and facilitate preparation for future emergencies and disasters by keeping non-federal agencies on the same page.

VII. Conclusion

NASUCA and TURN support the Commission's efforts to improve the resiliency of the Nation's communications networks. Comprehensive outage reporting by the carriers and providers of the telecommunications networks that provide essential public safety information for the Commission, first responders, and the public is vital to this effort. The Commission's proposals regarding outage reporting by satellite providers, BIAS providers and FirstNet, reporting on the deployment of mobile recovery assets, and after action reporting are reasonable and should be adopted.

Respectfully Submitted,

David Springe,
Executive Director

National Association of State Utility
Consumer Advocates (NASUCA)
8380 Colesville Road, Suite 101

[54] *See* Reply Comments of NASUCA on the Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, PS Docket No. 15-80, at 2-3 (filed June 2, 2020).

Silver Spring, MD 20910
Phone (301) 589-6313

Regina Costa
Telecommunications Policy Director

Leo Fitzpatrick
Telecommunications Analyst

Alexandra Green
Telecommunications Regulatory Attorney

The Utility Reform Network (TURN)
360 Grand Avenue, #150
Oakland, CA 94610
(415) 786-8831, ext. 312
rcosta@turn.org

May 13, 2024