

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking
Proceeding to Consider Service
Quality Rules for Wireless Carriers.

FILED
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
February 26, 2026
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
Rulemaking 26-02-017

ORDER INSTITUTING RULEMAKING

Summary

The California Public Utilities Commission institutes this rulemaking to consider changes to General Order 133-E. Specifically, this rulemaking will consider whether to apply the service quality standards in General Order 133-E, which currently are applicable to plain old telephone service (POTS) and Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) services, to wireless voice service.

1. Background

In response to Petition 21-10-003, on March 17, 2022, the California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) adopted Order Instituting Rulemaking (R.) 22-03-016 to consider proposed amendments to the Commission’s General Order (GO) 133. GO 133 sets minimum service quality standards for telecommunications services and includes an enforcement mechanism. As part of R.22-03-016, the Commission considered revisions to GO 133-D, and in approving Decision (D.) 25-09-031, ultimately adopted GO 133-E.

D.25-09-031 revises service restoration requirements for plain old telephone service (POTS) and adopts new rules for Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) service. This includes adopting revised enforcement mechanisms. Additionally, D.25-09-031 adopts new or revised rules for several customer service standards for POTS and VoIP service, including customer service installation and answer time standards.

D.25-09-031 found that service restoration has declined for wireless voice services, as the number of outages have increased over time, as has outage duration, to such a degree that consumers now experience outages of well over 24, 48, 72 and 96 hours.¹ This finding relied on two data sources, the FCC's Network Outage Reporting System (NORS)² metrics and Cal OES outage data.³

¹ D.25-09-031, at Finding of Fact 3.

² The FCC requires wireline, cable, satellite, wireless, and Signaling System 7 voice providers to report network outages to NORS. These providers also must submit this data concurrently to the Commission.

³ Title 19 California Code of Regulations, Division 2, Chapter 1.5 defines a community isolation outage is an outage that meets the below threshold criteria for each service type: TDM (wireline) voice service — for telecommunications service provided by facilities-based carriers, other than mobile telephony service or VoIP service, herein referred to as wireline, an outage that lasts at least 30 minutes and potentially affects (A) at least 100 end users in a single zip code, or (B) at least 50% of end users in a ZIP code with fewer than 100 end users.

- Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) service — for telecommunications service provided by VoIP or Internet Protocol enabled service, an outage that lasts at least 30 minutes and potentially affects (A) at least 100 end users in a single zip code, or (B) at least 50 percent of end users in a zip code with fewer than 100 end users.

- Wireless voice service — for telecommunications service provided by mobile telephony service, an outage that lasts at least 30 minutes and affects at least 25 percent of a carrier's coverage area in a single zip code.

NORS data indicates that during the four years from 2018 to 2021, wireline accounted for anywhere between 74 percent to 79 percent of the total outages, whereas wireless accounted for between 21 percent to 26 percent. In addition to an increase in the number of outages, there was a dramatic increase in the number of outages of longer durations. For example, in 2018, wireline carriers reported 432 outages in excess of 96 hours, with that total increasing to over 1,000 outages in California in both 2020 and 2021. In a similar manner, the number of wireless outages in excess of 96 hours increased from 31 in 2018 to 254 in 2021.⁴

Cal OES began collecting community isolation outage data in August 2020. In 2021, POTS carriers reported 1,185 community isolation events in California. In 2022, POTS carriers reported 1,759 community isolation events. In 2023, POTS carriers reported 2,407 community isolation events. In 2021, wireless carriers reported 3,315 community isolation events. In 2022, wireless carriers reported 3,319 community isolation events. In 2023, wireless carriers reported 5,865 community isolation events.⁵ This data trend led the Commission to find that “market forces, such as they exist, have not disciplined the service quality of ... wireless carriers.”⁶

In its analysis of the record evidence, the Commission concluded that it was necessary to obtain more information to determine the appropriate

⁴ D.25-09-031, at 18.

⁵ *Id.*, at 19-20.

⁶ *Id.*, at Finding of Fact 19.

enforcement process for wireless outages and customer service issues, prior to adopting new rules for wireless carriers. This effort includes obtaining more data regarding wireless outages data to be provided by, AT&T Mobility, Verizon⁷ and T-Mobile West, LLC (T-Mobile) and CTIA.^{8,9} Section 4 of this Rulemaking directs AT&T Mobility, Verizon and T-Mobile to file and serve specific information regarding wireless outages.

2. Jurisdiction

Pursuant to Public (Pub.) Utilities (Util.) Code¹⁰ Section 2896(c), the Commission shall require telephone corporations to provide customer service to telecommunication customers that includes, but is not limited to, reasonable statewide service quality standards, including, but not limited to, standards regarding network technical quality, customer service, installation, repair, and billing.

The Commission has jurisdiction over public utilities, including public utility services and facilities for telephone corporations.¹¹ Under Pub. Util. Code Section 216, a “public utility” includes every “telephone corporation”¹² where

⁷ Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless.

⁸ CTIA is a trade association whose membership includes the following parties in this proceeding: AT&T Mobility, T-Mobile, and Verizon.

⁹ D.25-09-031, at 180, Finding of Fact 26.

¹⁰ All subsequent references are to the Public Utilities Code unless otherwise specified.

¹¹ See, Cal. Const., Art. XII, Sections 1-6; Pub. Util. Code Section 701.

¹² Pub. Util. Code Section 234.

service is performed, or a commodity is delivered to the public or any portion thereof. The definition of a “telephone corporation” includes “every corporation or person owning, controlling, operating, or managing any telephone line for compensation in this state.”¹³ A “telephone line” includes “all conduits, ducts, poles, wires, cables, instruments, and appliances, and all other real estate, fixtures, and personal property owned, or controlled, operated, or managed in connection with or to facilitate communication by telephone, whether such communication is had with or without the use of transmission wires.”¹⁴

California’s Constitution specifically extends the Commission’s jurisdiction to companies engaged in “the transmission of telephone and telegraph messages.”¹⁵ This includes services delivered over any technology, including but not limited to, traditional copper lines, coaxial cable, fiber optic cable, and mobile or fixed wireless radios.

The Commission’s authority over public utilities includes oversight over both public utility services and facilities.¹⁶ The Commission is required to ensure that utilities, including telephone corporations, “furnish and maintain such adequate, efficient, just and reasonable service, instrumentalities, equipment, and facilities ... as are necessary to promote the safety, health, comfort, and

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ Pub. Util. Code Section 233.

¹⁵ Cal. Const., Art. XII, Section 3.

¹⁶ *See*, Cal. Const., Art. XII, Sections 1-6; Pub. Util. Code Section 701.

convenience of its patrons, employees, and the public.”¹⁷ The Commission also has an ongoing responsibility to ensure the reasonableness and sufficiency of utility facilities¹⁸ and may order “additions, extensions, repairs, or improvements to, or changes in” utility facilities that the Commission finds “ought reasonably to be made.”¹⁹

Under California law, the means by which service is provided, whether it be traditional landline, wireless technology, or IP-enabled, does not affect whether the provider meets the definition of a public utility telephone corporation. VoIP service providers fall within the definition of “Telephone Corporation” under Pub. Util. Code Section 234, and their facilities fall within the definition of “Telephone Line” pursuant to Pub. Util. Code Section 233. Thus, VoIP providers are subject to the Commission’s jurisdiction.

Wireless carriers are “telephone corporations” and therefore public utilities under Pub. Util. Code Sections 216, 233, and 234. Pursuant to 47 United States Code (USC) Section 322(c)(3), states may regulate neither wireless rates nor entry into the wireless market,²⁰ but they retain jurisdiction over “other terms and conditions” of wireless service, including service quality.

¹⁷ Pub. Util. Code Section 451.

¹⁸ *Id.*, at Section 761.

¹⁹ *Id.*, at Section 762.

²⁰ (A) Notwithstanding Sections 2(b) and 221(b) [47 USC Sections 152(b) and 221(b)], no State or local government shall have any authority to regulate the entry of or the rates charged by any commercial mobile service or any private mobile service, except that this paragraph shall not prohibit a State from regulating the other terms and conditions of commercial mobile services.

In 1993, Congress passed the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (Budget Act), which amended 47 USC Section 332(c)(3)(A) as follows:

“no State or local government shall have any authority to regulate the entries of or the rates charged by any commercial mobile service or any private mobile service, except this paragraph shall not prohibit a State from regulating the other terms and conditions of commercial mobile service.”²¹

On its face, 47 USC Section 332(c)(A)(3) preempts only state attempts to prevent new mobile service carriers from entering the market or to regulate rates charged for wireless services; any other state regulation of mobile services providers remain unaffected.²² Whether a particular regulation falls under the meaning of “market entry,” “rates,” or “other terms and conditions” is fact-specific, requiring a case-by-case determination.²³

Although states may not regulate the entry of or rates charged by wireless providers, not all matters that may indirectly affect wireless providers’ rates

²¹ Codified at 47 USC Section 332(c)(3)(A) (emphasis added). The Budget Act was part of a national redistribution of regulatory authority which continued with the 1996 Telecommunications Act and resulted in what has been referred to as a system of “cooperative federalism.” See, e.g., *Core Communications, Inc. v. Verizon Pennsylvania, Inc.* 493 F.3d 333, 335 (3d Cir. 2007) (“[T]he Act provides that various responsibilities are to be divided between the state and federal governments, making it ‘an exercise in what has been termed cooperative federalism.’ (Internal citation omitted) . . . The ‘intended effect’ of such regime was to ‘leave[e] state commissions free, where warranted, to reflect the policy choices made by their states’”).

²² *Centennial P.R. License Corp. v. Telecomms. Regulatory Bd.*, 634 F.3d 17 (1st Cir.), cert. denied 565 U.S. 826 132 S.Ct. 119, 181 Ed. 2d 42 (2011). See also Joint Consumers Response to App. for Rehearing at 7.

²³ *Telesaurus VPC, LLC v Power* (9th Cir., 2010) 623 F.3d 998, 1007 (“the FCC rejected this per se approach, adopting instead a case-by-case analysis for preemption of state tort actions”); *Shroyer v AT&T* (“the FCC rejected this per se [preemption] argument in *In re Wireless Consumers Alliance*, and so do we.”)

constitute rate regulation contemplated by 47 USC Section 332. The scope of 47 USC Section 332's preemptive language is limited to regulations that directly and explicitly control rates, prevent market entry, or require a determination of the reasonableness of rates.²⁴ The Commission still retains the clear authority to regulate "other terms and conditions of service."

As we stated in D.21-10-015, D.20-07-011, and D.25-09-031, the legislative history of 47 USC Section 332(c)(3)(A) indicates what Congress meant by the language "other terms and conditions" (also referred to as the "savings clause"), and reemphasizes the role Congress saw for the States:

"It is the intent of the Committee that the State still will be able to regulate the terms and conditions of these services [CMRS]. By "terms and conditions" the Committee intends to include such matters as customer billing information and packaging and billing disputes and other such consumer protection matters; facility siting issues (e.g. zoning); transfers of control; bundling of services and equipment; and the requirement that carriers make capacity available on a wholesale basis and such other matters as fall within the State's lawful authority. This list is intended to be illustrative only and not meant to preclude other matters generally understood to fall under "terms and conditions."²⁵

²⁴ *Spielholz v. Superior Court* (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 1366; *Fedor v. Cingular Wireless* (7th Cir. 2004) 355 F.3d 1069, 1074. (*Phillips*, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14544 at *24-25; *see also*, *Brown v. Washington/Baltimore Cellular, Inc.* (D. Md. 2000) 109 F. Supp. 2d 421, 423; *Iowa v. US Cellular Corp.* (S.D. Iowa 2000) 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21656, *5 (*US Cellular*).)

²⁵ H.R. Report No. 103-111, 103d Con. 1st Sess. (1993), at 251, reprinted in 1993 U.S.C.A.N. 378, 588 (emphasis added).

The FCC confirmed our jurisdiction over “other terms and conditions” when it stated that it anticipated the Commission would continue to conduct appropriate complaint proceedings and to monitor the structure, conduct, and performance of wireless providers.²⁶

We have successfully asserted jurisdiction over “other terms and conditions” of wireless service.²⁷ In *Pacific Bell Wireless (Cingular) v CPUC*, 140 CA4th 718 (2005) (*Cingular*), the California Court of Appeal upheld the Commission’s assertion of jurisdiction in a case relying on the “other terms and

²⁶ The FCC stated that the “CPUC retains whatever authority it possesses under state law to monitor the structure, conduct, and performance of CMRS providers in that state.” See May 19, 1995 Report and Order *In re Petition of the People of the State of California ... to Retain Regulatory Authority over Intrastate Cellular Service Rates*, 10 FCC Record 7486. Moreover, the Federal Communications Act contains “savings clauses” (described by the Court in *Farina v Nokia, infra*) and discussed further below, which are “fundamentally incompatible with complete field preemption; if Congress intended to preempt the entire field . . . there would be nothing . . . to 'save,' and the provision would be mere surplusage.” (*Farina v. Nokia Inc* (3d Cir. 2010) 625 F.3d 97, 117 (3d Cir. 2010) 121-22).

²⁷ For example, we have reviewed merger agreements between wireless carriers pursuant to Public Utilities Code Sections 851-857 (T-Mobile/AT&T proposed merger, I.11-06-009; T-Mobile/Sprint proposed merger, A.18-07-011, A.18-07-012); enforced consumer protection measures against wireless carriers in the Consumer Protection Initiative Decision (D.06-08-030) and Cramming Reporting Decision (D.10-10-034), and applied outage reporting requirements to wireless carriers (D.16-08-021).

conditions” language of 47 USC Section 332(c)(3)(A), where we penalized a wireless carrier for providing “unjust and unreasonable service.”²⁸

Under Pub. Util. Code Section 2107, the Commission has authority to impose penalties for violations of its decisions, rules, or requirements of not less than \$500 nor more than \$100,000 per offence.²⁹ Under Pub. Util. Code Section 2108, every violation is a separate and distinct offence, with continuing violations calculated as a separate and distinct offence for each additional day the violation continues.³⁰

²⁸ We issued D.04-09-062, concluding an investigation into the sale of cellular telephone equipment and Early Termination Fee (ETF) practices of Cingular Wireless (Cingular). There, the CPUC determined that Cingular’s ETF policy “constituted an unjust and unreasonable rule and resulted in inadequate, unjust, and unreasonable service in violation of both Pub. Util. Code Section 451” and a prior Commission decision, D.95-04-028 and ordered Cingular to pay customer reparations and a penalty. (D.04-12-058 at 1.) In 2006, the Court of Appeal upheld our assertion of jurisdiction over Cingular Wireless and denied Cingular’s Petition for Writ of Review. (*Pacific Bell Wireless (Cingular) v CPUC*, 140 CA4th 718 (2005). The California Supreme Court and U.S. Supreme Court summarily denied Cingular’s ensuing petitions for review.

²⁹ Pub. Util. Code Section 2107 states:

“Any public utility that violates or fails to comply with any provision of the Constitution of this state or of this part, or that fails or neglects to comply with any part or provision of any order, decision, decree, rule, direction, demand, or requirement of the commission, in a case in which a penalty has not otherwise been provided, is subject to a penalty of not less than five hundred dollars (\$500), nor more than one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000) for each offense.”

³⁰ Pub. Util. Code Section 2108 states:

“Every violation of the provisions of this part or of any part of any order, decision, decree, rule, direction, demand, or requirement of the commission, by any corporation or person is a separate and distinct offense, and in case of a continuing violation each day’s continuance thereof shall be a separate and distinct offense.”

3. Preliminary Scoping of Issues

The preliminary scope of issues in the proceeding is set forth below, in accordance with Rule 7.1(d) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rule). This proceeding will address the following issues:

1. Are there any existing service quality metrics that should be extended to wireless voice services?
2. Should the Commission modify any of the existing service quality metrics and standards or develop new service quality standards and reporting requirements applicable to wireless voice services? Are there reporting requirements or metrics that the Commission should not mandate?

After a prehearing conference (PHC), an Assigned Commissioner's Scoping Memo and Ruling will be issued laying out the issues and procedural process in greater detail.

As an initial matter, the Commission invites comments on this Order Instituting Rulemaking (OIR). Pursuant to Rule 6.2 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, comments on an OIR shall state any objections to the preliminary scoping memo regarding the category, issues to be considered, or schedule.

4. Respondents

AT&T Mobility, T-Mobile and Verizon are named as respondents to this proceeding.

5. Wireless Carriers Ordered to Submit Information

This proceeding will build a robust record on whether the Commission should adopt service quality metrics and standards for wireless carriers, and if

they are determined to be necessary, what those rules should be. As part of that effort, AT&T Mobility, T-Mobile and Verizon are ordered to file and serve the following documents that were filed after the record of R.22-03-016 was closed:

1. Declarations filed with the May 12, 2025 Motion to Reopen and Supplement the Record of R.22-03-016:
 - a. Declaration of Sinan Akkaya;
 - b. Declaration of John Consalvo;
 - c. Declaration of Lowell Handy;
 - d. Declaration of Joel Rioux;
 - e. Declaration of Connie Chaffins; and
 - f. Declaration of Brian Williams.
2. Declarations filed with the July 8, 2025 Motion to Reopen and Supplement the Record of R.22-03-016:
 - a. Declaration of Sinan Akkaya;
 - b. Declaration of John Consalvo;
 - c. Declaration of Lowell Handy;
 - d. Declaration of Joel Rioux;
 - e. Declaration of Connie Chaffins; and
 - f. Declaration of Brian Williams.
3. All materials used to create the claimed financial figures or cost estimates in the declarations listed above, including all spreadsheets and documented calculations.

4. All internal analysis related to the declarations listed above.³¹

Additionally, AT&T Mobility, T-Mobile and Verizon are ordered to file and serve the information specified below:

1. California specific operating expenses and capital expenditures to deliver each company's existing quality of service and meet existing internal customer service standards, broken down by year, by expense category, for the last three calendar years.
2. Existing company customer service standards and internal service quality standards or key performance indicators that each company tracks and strives to achieve.
3. The additional or incremental expense, if any, that would be incurred to meet the customer service standards as described in General Order 133-E, criteria i through iv. Quantify the expense categories and amounts for each category individually and include any work products or source documents used to calculate the estimate.
4. Impact on customer bills. Provide an estimate of the price increase on the monthly bill for an average customer of mobile service for a single line as a result of having to implement the customer service standards as described in General Order 133-E, criteria i through iv.

³¹ See, Request by CTIA, AT&T Mobility, T-Mobile West LLC, and Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless for Commission Review of Administrative Law Judges Ruling on Wireless Parties' Motions to File Under Seal (R.22-03-016), filed September 5, 2025, at 15: "[T]he declarations focusing on customer service rules... contained confidential and proprietary business information, such as internal analysis of current labor and other costs incurred by customer care teams and projected additional costs that would be incurred to meet answer time metrics and other requirements..."

5. The number of postpaid wireless customers that each company has served in California, on average, for each year, for the last three calendar years.
6. Average revenue per user (ARPU). For the last three years, provide California-specific ARPU for each company's postpaid wireless service customers.³² In addition provide California-specific net ARPU for postpaid wireless service customers.
7. For Community Isolation Outages as defined by the Governor's Office of Emergency Services (CalOES), data for 9-1-1 outages and community isolation outages statewide for the years 2020-2025. Data should include number of impacted users and duration of the outage event (listed by outage event).
8. Competition. Provide data clearly showing how wireless competition has directly led to a reduction in community isolation outage frequency and duration between 2015 and 2025.
9. Customer disconnection analysis. Discussion of ability of each wireless carrier's ability to identify if and when customers are disconnected due to network equipment failure.

By not later than March 26, 2026, AT&T Mobility, T-Mobile and Verizon shall file and serve the information ordered above. AT&T Mobility, T-Mobile and

³² ARPU and net ARPU should be inclusive of non-governmental fees, including AT&T Mobility's Administrative & Regulatory Cost Recovery Fee, Verizon's Administrative and Telco Recovery Charge, and T-Mobile's Regulatory Programs and Telco Recovery Fee.

Verizon must verify the information in any declaration or motion, consistent with Rule 1.11.³³

If AT&T Mobility, T-Mobile and Verizon wish to maintain the confidentiality of any of the information required above, the carriers must file a motion to file under seal, consistent with General Order 66-D, or its successor, if applicable, demonstrating with granular specificity that the information meets

³³ See, Administrative Law Judge's Ruling on Wireless Parties' Motions to File Under Seal (R.22-03-016), issued August 27, 2025, at 10-11, which contained a warning about false attestations.

the definition of a trade secret,³⁴ or otherwise should be confidential relying on a public interest balancing test.³⁵

6. Initial Categorization; Ex Parte Communications; Need for Hearing

The Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure require that an Order Instituting Rulemaking preliminarily determines the category of the proceeding

³⁴ If an information submitter demonstrates with specific facts and legal authority that information meets all of the elements of a trade secret, as defined in Civ. Code Section 3426.1(d),¹² and the Commission determines that the assertion of the trade secret privilege would not tend to conceal fraud or otherwise work injustice as discussed above, the Commission may withhold such information from disclosure in responses to California Public Record Act (CPRA) requests pursuant to Gov. Code Section 7927.100,¹³ and from responses to discovery, on the basis of Evidence Code privileges. Civ. Code Section 3426.1(d) defines "trade secret" as "information, including a formula, pattern, compilation, program, device, method, technique, or process, that: (1) Derives independent economic value, actual or potential, from not being generally known to the public or to other persons who can obtain economic value from its disclosure or use; and (2) Is the subject of efforts that are reasonable under the circumstances to maintain its secrecy."

D.20-12-021 at 23: "Information will not fall within the definition of a trade secret if it is readily ascertainable by a competitor or others or if the claimant has not made reasonable efforts to maintain the secrecy of the information." *Altavion, Inc. v. Konica Minolta Systems Laboratory, Inc.* (2014) 226 Cal.App.4th at 62.

In 2021, the California Legislature passed Assembly Bill (AB) 473, to recodify the CPRA. The Governor signed it into law. One change is the renumbering of certain sections, including Section 6254(k), which now is Section 7927.100.

³⁵ GO 66-D, Section 3.2(b) states that if the information submitter cites Gov. Code Section 6255(a)¹⁴ (commonly known as the "public interest balancing test") as the legal authority for withholding a document from public release, then the information submitter must demonstrate with granular specificity on the facts of the particular information why the public interest served by not disclosing the record clearly outweighs the public interest served by disclosure of the record. A private economic interest is an inadequate interest to claim in lieu of a public interest. *See*, D.20-12-021 at 14. *See also*, D.17-09-023, at 22, and Appendix A, GO 66-D, Section 3.2; D.20-03-014 at 24.

and the need for hearing. As a preliminary matter, we determine that this proceeding is quasi-legislative. Accordingly, *ex parte* communications are permitted without restriction or reporting requirement pursuant to Article 8 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure.

As a preliminary matter, we determine that hearings may be necessary. That assessment is subject to the further determination of the assigned Commissioner at the time of the issuance of the Scoping Memo.

7. Preliminary Schedule

The preliminary schedule is set forth below. The Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) have the authority to set other dates in the proceeding or modify those below as necessary.

EVENT	DATE
OIR issued	Day 1
AT&T Mobility, Verizon and T-Mobile file information set forth in Section 5	March 26, 2026
Comments on OIR	March 26, 2026
Prehearing Conference	TBD

Rule 7.5 requires that, unless the Assigned Commissioner determines to modify the requirements,³⁶ all quasi-legislative proceedings must include: 1) an assigned Commissioner’s ruling or an industry division staff report setting forth recommendations on how to resolve the issues identified in the scoping memo;³⁷

³⁶ Rule 7.5(b).

³⁷ Rule 7.5(a)(1).

2) at least one workshop providing an opportunity for the parties to the proceeding to have an interactive discussion on issues identified in the scoping memo either in person or via remote participation;³⁸ and 3) at least one public engagement workshop.³⁹

The determination on the need for further procedural measures, including scheduling, will be made in one or more rulings issued by the Assigned Commissioner or the Assigned ALJ.

The Assigned Commissioner or the Assigned ALJ may change the schedule to promote the efficient and fair administration of this proceeding. The schedule for the remainder of the proceeding will be adopted in the Assigned Commissioner's Scoping Memo.

8. Service of OIR

This OIR shall be served on the Official Service List for R.22-03-016. Service of the OIR does not confer party status or place a person who has received such service on the Official Service List for this proceeding. Addition to the Official Service List is governed by Rule 1.9(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Any person will be added to the "Information Only" category of the Official Service List upon request, for electronic service of all documents in the proceeding, and should do so promptly in order to ensure timely service of

³⁸ Rule 7.5(a)(2).

³⁹ Rule 7.5(a)(3).

comments and other documents and correspondence in the proceeding. The request must be sent to the Process Office by email (process_office@cpuc.ca.gov) or letter (Process Office, California Public Utilities Commission, 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, California 94102). Please include the Docket Number of this rulemaking in the request.

Persons who file responsive comments become parties to the proceeding (see Rule 1.4(a)(2)) and will be added to the “Parties” category of the Official Service List upon such filing. In order to assure service of comments and other documents and correspondence in advance of obtaining party status, persons should promptly request addition to the “Information Only” category as described above; they will be removed from that category upon obtaining party status.

9. Filing and Service of Comments and Other Documents

Article 1 of the Rules governs the filing and service of comments and other documents in this proceeding. (See particularly Rules 1.5 through 1.10 and 1.13.) If you have questions about the Commission’s filing and service procedures, contact the Docket Office (Docket_Office@cpuc.ca.gov) or check the Practitioner’s Page on our website at <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov>.

When serving any document, each party must ensure that it is using the current official service list on the Commission’s website.

This proceeding will follow the electronic service protocol set forth in Rule 1.10. All parties to this proceeding shall serve documents and pleadings using

electronic mail, whenever possible, transmitted no later than 5:00 p.m., on the date scheduled for service to occur. Rule 1.10(d) requires that “the serving person must provide a paper copy of all documents served by e-mail service to the assigned Administrative Law Judge (or if not yet assigned, to the Chief Administrative Law Judge), unless the Administrative Law Judge orders otherwise.” In this proceeding, parties are excused from serving the ALJ with hardcopy (paper copy) of the electronic filed or served documents.

While serving documents on Commissioners or their personal advisers, whether or not they are on the official service list, parties must only provide electronic service. Parties must not send hard copies of documents to Commissioners or their personal advisers unless specifically instructed to do so.

Persons who are not parties but wish to receive electronic service of documents filed in the proceeding may contact the Process Office at process_office@cpuc.ca.gov to request addition to the “Information Only” category of the official service list pursuant to Rule 1.9(f).

10. Intervenor Compensation

Intervenor Compensation is permitted in this proceeding. Pursuant to Section 1804(a)(1), a party that intends to seek an award of compensation must file and serve a notice of intent to claim compensation within 30 days after the prehearing conference. Parties new to participating in Commission proceedings may contact the Commission’s Public Advisor for more information.

11. Public Advisor

Any person or entity interested in participating in this rulemaking who is unfamiliar with the Commission's procedures should contact the Commission's Public Advisor in San Francisco at (415) 703-2074 or 1-(866) 849-8390 or email public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov. The TTY number is 1-(866) 836-7825.

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. In accordance with Rule 6.1 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, the Commission institutes this rulemaking to consider changes to General Order 133-E, including whether to apply the service quality standards in General Order 133-E to wireless voice service and internet service. This proceeding may result in the adoption, repeal, or amendment of General Order 133-E.
2. The preliminary scope of issues is as set forth in Section 3.
3. The Executive Director shall cause this Order Instituting Rulemaking to be served on the Service List for Rulemaking 22-03-016 and the identified Respondents.
4. The category of this rulemaking is preliminarily determined to be quasi-legislative.
5. Evidentiary hearings may be needed.
6. The assigned Commissioner or Administrative Law Judge may make any revisions to the scheduling and filing determinations as necessary to facilitate the efficient management of the proceeding.

7. Parties are excused from Rule 1.10(d) of the California Public Utilities Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure requirement regarding service of paper copies upon the assigned Administrative Law Judge and shall avoid serving any paper copy of documents electronically filed or electronically served.

8. By not later than March 26, 2026, AT&T Mobility, T-Mobile and Verizon shall file complete and accurate responses to the questions and directions provided in Section 5, subject to the requirements indicated in Section 5, including verifying all information, consistent with Rule 1.11 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

This order is effective today.

Dated February 26, 2026, at Santa Maria, California.

ALICE REYNOLDS

President

DARCIE L. HOUCK

JOHN REYNOLDS

KAREN DOUGLAS

MATTHEW BAKER

Commissioners