§ 52.247 Control Strategy and regulations: Fine Particle Matter.

* * * * *

(u) *Determination of attainment.* Effective September 14, 2026, the EPA has determined that, based on 2023 to 2025 ambient air quality data, the Portola $PM_{2.5}$ nonattainment area has attained the 2012 annual $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS by the applicable attainment date of December 31, 2025. Therefore, the EPA has met the requirement pursuant to CAA section 179(c)(1) to determine whether the area attained the standards. Under the provisions of the EPA's $PM_{2.5}$ implementation rule (see 40 CFR 51.1015), this determination suspends the requirements for this area to submit an attainment demonstration, a reasonable further progress plan, quantitative milestones, quantitative milestone reports, contingency measures, and any other planning SIP revisions related to attainment for as long as this area continues to attain the 2012 annual $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS. If the EPA determines, after notice-and-comment rulemaking, that this area no longer meets the 2012 annual $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS, the corresponding determination of attainment for that area shall be withdrawn.

[FR Doc. 2026–16510 Filed 8–12–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 8

[CG Docket No. 22–2, GN Docket No. 25–133; FCC 26–48; FR ID 361584]

Empowering Broadband Consumers Through Transparency

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Federal Communications Commission (Commission) eliminates or modifies certain broadband label requirements to ensure that consumers have clear, accurate, and concise information when shopping for broadband plans. Specifically, the Commission enables providers to describe label information in a natural, conversational style over the phone; simplify fee presentation to avoid clutter; remove outdated information from the label; use links or icons at point-of-sale to avoid unwieldy amounts of information that can overwhelm consumers; and eliminate requirements that go beyond our mandate. At the same time, the Commission ensures the labels remain accessible to people with disabilities, and that labels are displayed in the same language(s) used when marketing a service.

DATES: Effective September 14, 2026, except for instruction 3 (§ 8.1(a)), which is delayed indefinitely. The Commission will publish a document in the **Federal Register** announcing the effective date.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, 45 L Street NE, Washington, DC 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information about the Report and Order (*Order*), contact Michelle Branigan of the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at (202) 418–1345 or *Michelle.Branigan@fcc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's Report and Order (*Order*) in CG Docket No. 22–2 and GN Docket No. 25–133, document FCC 26–48, adopted on July 22, 2026 and released on July 23, 2026. The full text of this document is available online at *https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/FCC-26-48A1.pdf.*

Paperwork Reduction Act Analysis: The *Order* may contain proposed new and revised information collection requirements. The Commission, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burdens, will invite the general public and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to comment on the information collection requirements described in this document, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. In addition, pursuant to the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2002, Public Law 107–198, see 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(4), we previously sought specific comment on how we might further reduce the information collection burden for small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees.

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 Report & Order to Congress and the Government Accountability Office pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

Ex Parte Rules: The proceeding shall be treated as a ''permit-but-disclose'' proceeding in accordance with the Commission's ex parte rules. Persons making *ex parte* presentations must file a copy of any written presentation or a memorandum summarizing any oral presentation within two business days after the presentation (unless a different deadline applicable to the Sunshine period applies). Persons making oral *ex parte* presentations are reminded that memoranda summarizing the presentation must (1) list all persons attending or otherwise participating in the meeting at which the *ex parte* presentation was made, and (2) summarize all data presented and arguments made during the presentation. If the presentation consisted in whole or in part of the presentation of data or arguments already reflected in the presenter's written comments, memoranda or other filings in the proceeding, the presenter may provide citations to such data or arguments in his or her prior comments, memoranda, or other filings (specifying the relevant page and/or paragraph numbers where such data or arguments can be found) in lieu of summarizing them in the memorandum. Documents shown or given to Commission staff during ex parte meetings are deemed to be written *ex parte* presentations and must be filed consistent with § 1.1206(b) of the Commission's rules. In proceedings governed by § 1.49(f) of the Commission's rules or for which the Commission has made available a method of electronic filing, written *ex parte* presentations and memoranda summarizing oral *ex parte* presentations, and all attachments thereto, must, when feasible, be filed through the electronic comment filing system available for that proceeding, and must be filed in their native format (*e.g.,* .doc, .xml, .ppt, searchable .pdf). Participants in this proceeding should familiarize themselves with the Commission's *ex parte* rules.

Synopsis

I. Discussion

In this *Order,* we eliminate or modify certain broadband label requirements to make the label clearer and more usable for consumers, and as a result, also reduce compliance costs. Based on the record in response to *Empowering Broadband Consumers Through Transparency; Delete, Delete, Delete,* CG Docket No. 22–2, GN Docket No. 25–133, Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 25–74, 90 FR 55713 (Dec. 3, 2025) (*Second Further Notice*), we amend the rule to: (1) enable providers to describe label information in a natural, conversational style over the phone; (2) enable providers to simplify fee presentation to avoid label clutter; (3) remove outdated information from the label by eliminating the requirement that providers display information about the now-concluded Affordable Connectivity Program; (4)

clarify that providers may use hyperlinks or icons within account portals to make the customer's label ''easily accessible''; (5) allow providers to use a hyperlink or icon at the point of sale in lieu of displaying the full label; (6) eliminate the requirement that providers make label information available in machine readable database format; and (7) eliminate the requirement that providers archive labels for at least two years after a service is no longer offered to new customers. We do so while retaining the requirements that labels be accessible to people with disabilities and that providers display labels in any language(s) in which they market their services. We also close open inquiries from *Empowering Broadband Consumers Through Transparency,* CG Docket No. 22–2, Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 22–86, 87 FR 77048 (Dec. 16, 2022) (*First Further Notice*).

A. Improving Label Display and Content

1. Phone Sales

We enable providers' phone sales representatives to present label information in natural, conversational style by eliminating the requirement that they read the labels verbatim to customers. We agree with commenters that a more conversational presentation of the labels fits the unique nature of the telephone sale, which is time-limited and requires the consumer to remember information, unlike written labels that consumers can refer to at any point. By contrast, verbatim recitation of a document that consumers cannot see serves neither providers nor consumers well. Provider phone sales representatives must orally summarize the following label fields during the sales interaction: monthly price inclusive of any monthly fees, including the introductory rate and its duration if applicable; typical download and upload speeds; latency; data allowance; contract term duration if applicable; and early termination fees if applicable.

We agree that consumers using the phone to shop for broadband service may also want the opportunity to see the label. Some commenters urge us to require provider phone sales representatives to offer to transmit the full broadband consumer label to the consumer, if the consumer so desires, via text message, email, or U.S. mail—consistent with the consumer's preference. We decline to do so, but encourage providers to direct consumers to the labels on the provider's website.

The approach we adopt ensures that consumers receive real-time disclosure of the fields most material to a purchase decision and have access to the full label for review without requiring providers to recite a visual document verbatim in an oral format for which it was not designed. It also addresses the concerns raised in the record by more than a half dozen accessibility organizations: the verbal summary requirement ensures consumers without internet access receive label content during the call and labels will be easily accessible to consumers with disabilities on providers' websites. For these reasons, we decline to simply exclude telephone calls from the definition of point of sale, which would restrict access to label information for the significant segment of the population that engages in telephone shopping for broadband service—including many consumers with disabilities. To ensure providers retain the flexibility to adapt verbal summaries to diverse customer interactions, we also decline to adopt a mandatory script for phone label disclosures.

We conclude that the approach we adopt is within our statutory authority. Although the provision of label information in a telephone conversation may not literally constitute the ''display'' of a label, such disclosure is an appropriate implementation of the Congressional intent that the content of labels be disclosed to consumers, especially in light of the record showing that the telephone is a frequently used sales channel, especially for older adults, lower-income households, and consumers with limited digital literacy. We find that in directing the Commission to require the display of labels ''to disclose to consumers information regarding broadband internet access service plans,'' Congress intended to authorize the Commission to adopt closely related measures to ensure such disclosure, and did not intend to prevent the Commission from ensuring that label content is accessible to consumers who use the telephone to purchase broadband service.

2. Passthrough Fees

Rather than continuing to require providers to itemize ''passthrough fees'' that can vary by location, we allow providers to display such fees in the aggregate, either as a maximum or ''up to'' amount for the total fees applicable in any location where the service plan is offered, or as the exact total of such fees assessed in a particular location. To ensure that consumers understand the fees they will pay, we also require that any provider choosing to use the ''up to'' option must break out the total ''up to'' amount into two categories: (1) the maximum amount of passthrough fees that recover government-imposed costs, and (2) the maximum amount of passthrough fees attributable to costs imposed by non-governmental third-party entities. Thus, providers choosing the ''up to'' approach must include a comprehensive ''up to'' amount, as well as an ''up to'' amount for governmental passthrough fees and an ''up to'' amount for non-governmental passthrough fees. For the governmental and third-party, non-governmental breakdowns, the label also must provide the types of passthrough fees that may be included in each category, but need not identify separate ''up to'' amounts for each type of fee in each of the two categories. The label must also direct consumers to a provider-maintained web page with clear descriptions of each type of passthrough fee listed.

The Infrastructure Act directs us to require the display of broadband labels ''as described in'' a public notice issued by the Commission in 2016, *Consumer and Governmental Affairs, Wireline Competition, and Wireless Communications Bureaus Approve Open internet Broadband Consumer Labels,* GN Docket No. 14–28, Public Notice, 31 FCC Rcd 3358 (CGB, WCB,WTB 2016) (*2016 Broadband Labels PN*), which in turn explains that labels should convey the information consumers need to know ''in plain language that is easy to understand without overwhelming consumers with too much information.'' As a commenter points out, too much detail regarding fees could draw consumers' attention away from more important label information, and research suggests that ''excessive itemization creates cognitive burdens that reduce consumer welfare.'' Commenters who advocate for retaining mandatory itemization of all fees do not persuasively address these concerns. Allowing providers to state a total ''up to'' amount, while also clearly identifying the portions of that amount attributable to governmental and non-governmental, third-party passthrough fees, will ensure that consumers can access relevant information in an easily digestible format without being overwhelmed with an exhaustive itemization of all possible passthrough fees.

The record also shows that requiring full itemization imposes burdens on providers. Itemizing fees often requires providers to generate and maintain a large number of distinct labels to account for state and local variation in fees across their service territories. This creates ongoing administrative complexity, particularly for providers operating across multiple jurisdictions.

By contrast, as demonstrated by the Broadband internet Technical Advisory Group (BITAG) maximum value field approach, calculating a maximum ''up to'' amount is technically achievable without requiring a separate label for each jurisdiction.

We amend the rule to allow two additional alternatives for the display of passthrough fees, rather than requiring full itemization of each location-specific fee. First, drawing on the BITAG recommendation, we permit providers to present passthrough fees on a single line specifying the maximum passthrough fee that would be paid by any subscriber across all jurisdictions where the service plan is offered—that is, the highest ''up to'' amount applicable anywhere in the provider's service territory for that plan. For purposes of this rule, ''service territory'' means the geographic area within which a provider offers the specific broadband service plan to which the label applies. Alternatively, providers may display, on a jurisdiction-specific basis, the exact total of the passthrough fees that subscribers in that jurisdiction will pay. Providers may also continue to itemize fees individually as current rules permit. The displayed maximum or exact total must be accurate, *i.e.,* it must not understate the current fees applicable to any consumer subscribing to that plan. If fees subsequently increase above the disclosed maximum or exact total, the provider must revise the label accordingly. Because fee disclosure must not understate current fees, we decline to adopt NTCA's safe harbor based on a historical 12-month average, because a backward-looking average may not accurately reflect current fees.

We also disagree with commenters who argue that displaying an exact total or maximum amount would undermine the effectiveness of the label, increase consumer confusion, or recreate the bill shock the label was designed to prevent. As described above, a single line totaling multiple fees can help consumers compare plan prices without forcing them to make additional calculations. Additionally, a separate breakdown of that maximum amount between governmental and third-party, non-governmental fees will provide useful context for consumers. This approach will reduce consumer confusion, rather than increase it. And because the ''up to'' amounts must be accurate, they will not cause bill shock, which can occur when providers do not disclose the true cost of service at point-of-sale. Including maximum passthrough fee amounts will result in some consumers experiencing bills below what is displayed on the label, the opposite of bill shock.

For similar reasons, we reject arguments that an ''up to'' amount will allow providers to hide charges or impair consumers' ability to understand the fees they may pay. Providers that display an ''up to'' amount will still clearly disclose the most that a consumer will pay for passthrough fees in any jurisdiction where the plan is offered. Further, requiring a breakdown of governmental fees in relation to third-party, non-governmental fees will ensure that consumers are aware of the types of fees they may be required to pay. Nothing in the record supports the point that consumer decision-making suffers when multiple fees are consolidated. As long as the exact total or maximum amount is accurate, consumers have the information necessary to make informed purchasing decisions. With respect to Public Knowledge's concern about the absence of a principled limit on embedded fees, we note that the accuracy requirement provides such a limit; a provider may not embed fees that cause the consumers' bill to exceed the maximum stated in the applicable label. Making clear to consumers the maximum aggregate passthrough fee they will face satisfies the transparency objective of the Infrastructure Act, while potentially reducing the burden of review a consumer may experience with an itemized list that may vary slightly across different provider labels.

While we anticipate that most providers will opt to present an ''up to'' maximum or an exact, location-specific fee total, some may choose to continue to itemize passthrough fees. We expect that over time, competitive forces will encourage providers to adopt disclosure formats consumers find most useful, and in all cases the accuracy requirements ensure that consumers can reliably compare total recurring amounts across providers. The approach we adopt preserves transparent, comparable information for consumers while allowing providers flexibility to avoid label proliferation. We also recognize this is a change in course. The Commission declined to allow an ''up to'' approach in the *Empowering Broadband Consumers Through Transparency,* CG Docket No. 22–2, *Order on Reconsideration,* FCC 23–68, 38 FCC Rcd 8238 (2023), stating that a single figure would not provide sufficient transparency or facilitate comparison shopping. With the benefit of a more robust record—including evidence that mandated itemization impedes providers' flexibility, promotes unnecessary label proliferation, and may undermine consumers' ability to comparison shop and thereby frustrate the goals of the Infrastructure Act—we conclude that permitting providers to display passthrough fees as a maximum or ''up to'' amount or exact total gives consumers sufficient disclosure to enable comparison shopping and more effectively meets the objectives of the Infrastructure Act.

3. Affordable Connectivity Program

We eliminate the requirement that providers include information about the ACP in the broadband label. The program ended June 1, 2024. We agree with commenters that retaining a reference to an expired program offers no consumer benefit and risks confusing consumers who may be led to believe the program remains available. We thus decline suggestions that we maintain the requirement as a placeholder obligation that would activate automatically upon establishment of a successor federal broadband affordability program.

4. Customer Account Portal

We retain the requirement that providers that give their customers access to their account information via an online portal must give those customers easy access to the label of their current plan. And we amend the rule to clarify that providers may satisfy the ''easily accessible'' requirement for customer portals by prominently displaying a hyperlink or icon in the customer's portal directing the customer to the label for their current plan and thus providers need not display the label itself in the customer's portal. We agree with commenters that access to the label via their portal is important to enable subscribers to verify their current plan terms, detect billing discrepancies, and evaluate their current plan's suitability to their needs. We believe that allowing providers to use a link or icon, rather than displaying the label alongside all the other information in the portal, will make it easier for consumers to focus on the portal information they wish to read and benefit consumers accessing their portal on mobile devices.

Display flexibility should also reduce provider compliance costs. We agree with commenters that maintaining label display in customer portals entails costly development work, and that a requirement for full label display in customer portals ''imposes significant burdens and costs without concomitant benefit to subscribers.'' While these commenters do not specifically quantify the costs at issue, the record nonetheless reflects that full-label display imposes some compliance burden on providers, and the clarification we adopt here is responsive to that concern.

We agree that a static label displayed in a customer's portal runs the risk of becoming outdated, inaccurate, or misleading as plan terms evolve over time. However, the label accessed in a portal should reflect the terms of the customer's current plan, rather than the original plan purchased if different, to, among other things, enable market comparisons and better manage their existing plan. Thus, consumers should not be confused or misled as long as their providers meet their obligations under the rule of providing easy access to the label of each consumer's *current* plan. While we recognize that labels may not specify every charge or discount associated with a consumer's current service plan, and thus may not serve as a comprehensive billing reference document, labels that correspond to a consumer's current plan clearly ''can assist in identifying billing inaccuracies and unexpected fees,'' as the rule intends, as well as providing a baseline for future comparison shopping. We also disagree with some commenters' claims that the portal access requirement is ''divorced from the purpose of labels: to facilitate *shopping* for broadband services.'' In adopting the rule, as noted above, the Commission recognized that portal access to labels ''furthers our goal of assisting consumers with comparison shopping by allowing consumers to more easily compare their current plans to alternative plans when shopping for broadband service in the future.''

Additionally, we are unpersuaded that the costs of providing access via a link in the consumer's account portal outweigh any consumer benefit to subscribers. No commenter attempts to quantify these claimed costs. And, as described above, there is ample evidence that the portal requirement benefits consumers. Therefore, we find insufficient basis in the record to revisit the *Empowering Broadband Consumers Through Transparency,* CG Docket No. 22–2, Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 37 FCC Rcd 13686 (2022) *(2022 Broadband Label Order)* assessment that ''associating a label that is already displayed on a provider's primary advertising web page with a customer's online account should not be overly burdensome, and that the benefits to consumers far outweigh any costs to providers.'' We also disagree that information on consumers' bills obviates the need for access to the label. A label provides information (*e.g.,* ''typical'' data speeds) that is not included in bills and summarizes key information in a recognizable format that supports comparison shopping, which bills aren't usually designed to do.

5. Point-of-Sale Display

We give providers flexibility to use links or icons at the point of sale instead of displaying the full label. We agree with commenters that this change will better enable consumers viewing broadband plans on their mobile phones to read and process relevant information. And it will enable providers to avoid significant design and operational challenges, especially in the mobile device context, where screen space limitations make simultaneous display of marketing content and a full label difficult to achieve without degrading the consumer experience for either. An icon or link prominently displayed in close proximity to the advertised plan and that links directly to the associated label can resolve the operational challenges (*e.g.,* by conserving limited display space on mobile devices) while ensuring that consumers can easily access relevant label information.

We recognize this is a change in course from the Commission's *2022 Broadband Label Order* requiring full label display at the point of sale. In previously declining to allow a link in place of the full label, the Commission noted that ''commenters [did] not articulate any particular challenges in displaying the actual label alongside a provider's marketing materials.'' The record here, however, provides a more specific and documented account of the operational challenges involved in meeting the display requirement.

We find that these documented operational challenges support modifying the full label display requirement to allow the use of an icon or link, provided that any icon or link connect directly to the customer's specific plan label and appear in close proximity to the associated advertised plan. When a provider places an icon or link next to the advertised plan and that icon or link connects directly to that plan's label, the consumer is a mere single click away from the label, and need not re-enter the address or engage in a time-consuming search for information relevant to comparison shopping, as some comments suggest. Our approach strikes an appropriate balance between operational flexibility and consumer access.

To ensure consumers can easily compare plans at point-of-sale, links must connect directly to the label for the advertised plan or to a labels page on which the specific plan is immediately identifiable and accessible without additional navigation, address entry, or search. This requirement addresses concerns raised by commenters about immediacy, minimum-click access, and visibility of labels, which continue to guide our approach to point-of-sale display. Providers using a link or icon in lieu of the full label must clearly identify it as leading to the label so that consumers understand what the link or icon represents and are not left to guess whether it leads to label information.

6. Multilingual Requirement

We retain the requirement that providers display the label in English and any other languages in which the provider markets its services in the United States and its territories. Although the Commission sought comment on whether to remove this requirement, we agree with CTIA and other commenters supporting retaining the requirement and find it is a commonsense way of ensuring the label is a useful tool for consumers.

We find insufficient the arguments of two commenters urging us to eliminate this requirement. We see no cost data or other evidence to indicate that retaining the requirement will deter providers from marketing in languages other than English. In the absence of such evidence, it is reasonable to infer that a provider will not incur a substantial incremental cost in translating the label to a language in which the provider is already conducting marketing, and the consumer benefit is concrete and immediate. If a provider has affirmatively sought out and recruited customers in their native language, investing in the research, outreach, and translation resources that multilingual marketing entails, the record offers no persuasive evidence that translating a standardized label into that same language would impose an unreasonable burden. As CTIA acknowledges, the current requirement reflects sound policy precisely because providers that market in a given language already possess the translation resources necessary to produce the label in that language.

B. Eliminating Burdensome Reporting and Recordkeeping Requirements

1. Machine-Readability and Data File Requirements

We eliminate the requirement that providers make the contents of labels available separately in a machine readable spreadsheet file format hosted at a dedicated URL, while emphasizing that providers remain obligated to make labels accessible to consumers with disabilities, including ensuring such information is compatible with screen readers and other assistive technologies used by people with disabilities. We agree with commenters arguing that this action aligns the label requirements more closely with the Infrastructure Act's purpose of disclosure to consumers, not third parties, and alleviates a significant burden on providers. The Infrastructure Act directs the Commission to require ''the display of broadband consumer labels'' that provide consumers with information about broadband plans. This requirement was modeled on nutrition labels, which are focused on point-of-sale disclosure to consumers.

In requiring machine readability, the Commission appeared to believe third-party access advances the statutory objective by facilitating the creation of comparison-shopping tools for consumers, as well as enabling more efficient data collection and compliance monitoring by the Commission, and promoting marketplace research. However, the Infrastructure Act's directive ''to disclose to consumers information'' and the prior Commission-approved label referenced in the Act do not appear to contemplate third-party data aggregation and research. Section 60504 only directs us to require the display of labels to *disclose information* about broadband plans *to consumers.* Nor does the Commission's *2016 Broadband Labels PN,* cited in section 60504 of the Infrastructure Act as a description of what we are directed to require, indicate that the labels described in that public notice must be in machine-readable data file formats for processing by computers. To the contrary, the public notice found that the format of the approved labels ''displays [the key factors consumers need to know] in plain language that is easy to understand.'' For these reasons, we reach a different conclusion than the Commission did in 2022.

We also conclude that the substantial compliance burdens imposed by this requirement are not justified by the minimal, if any, likely benefits for consumers. The current record offers a fuller description of the relevant compliance burdens than was available to the Commission in 2022. We also find insufficient evidence that the requirement is needed to facilitate transparency and consumer decision-making, as some commenters argue. The statute and our consumer-focused requirements give consumers the transparency necessary to make good purchase decisions. And there is no record evidence that any third parties have used machine-readable label content to develop pro-consumer tools.

Some commenters raise concern that, without machine readability, labels will not be easily accessible to consumers with disabilities. We emphasize that our action in this Order does not affect providers' obligation to make labels accessible to consumers with disabilities, including ensuring such information is compatible with screen readers and other assistive technologies used by people with disabilities. The rules' requirement that labels be easily accessible to consumers with disabilities is independent of the machine-readability provision deleted by this Order. We remind broadband providers of the guidance on accessibility offered by the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines. While machine readability in some form may be involved in ensuring that labels are easily accessible to people with vision disabilities (*e.g.,* by being compatible with screen readers, among other steps), the more specific machine-readability requirement of § 8.1(a)(3)—that label content be provided separately in a spreadsheet file format via a dedicated uniform resource locator (URL) that contains all of a provider's labels—was not adopted to advance accessibility.

2. Archiving

We eliminate the requirement that providers archive all labels for at least two years after a service plan is no longer available to new customers and the provider has removed the plan's label from its website or alternate sales channels. In adopting the archiving requirement in 2022, the Commission assumed that archiving would not impose a significant incremental burden on providers. However, the current record indicates there are substantial compliance costs, while supporters do not point to any demonstrated consumer benefit. According to providers, archiving imposes ongoing costs that fall hardest on small providers, diverting time and resources from core operations. NTCA explains, for example, that the enforcement rationale for the rule is ''based on speculative future utility in complaint proceedings.'' CTIA and ICLE further contend that requiring archiving of labels for service plans that are no longer offered to new purchasers does not aid comparison shopping for currently available services.

We emphasize that deleting this provision does not affect the Commission's transparency rule, which requires a broadband provider to ''publicly disclose accurate information regarding the network management practices, performance characteristics, and commercial terms of its broadband internet access services sufficient to enable consumers to make informed choices regarding the purchase and use of such services.'' We believe the transparency rule and the requirement that customers maintain access to their current plan label through their account portal—as well as other sources of information such as the customer's service agreement, monthly bills, and records of any plan changes during a customer's subscription—sufficiently address concerns that, absent archiving, subscribers whose service plans are no longer offered to new customers would be deprived of access to key information about their plans.

The *2022 Broadband Label Order* explained that archived labels would help the Commission and state authorities investigate potential inaccuracies in labels, including in cases arising from consumer complaints. Yet it did not point to any provision of the Infrastructure Act, nor anything in the *2016 Broadband Labels PN,* suggesting that an archiving requirement is needed to achieve the Congressional purpose, and we affirmatively conclude today that it is not needed. Further, the *2022 Broadband Label Order* merely speculated that giving subscribers the ability to request archived labels would help them, without indicating why other customer records, including billing and service agreements, would not do the same at lower marginal cost.

We disagree with commenters who say the archiving requirement is essential for enforcement. We retain authority to obtain historical plan data through investigative demands when needed to evaluate potential noncompliance. Providers have other incentives to retain records of their marketing materials in light of federal and state bans on deceptive advertising. And we disagree that archiving is essential for the customers themselves to check if they received the service they signed up for. Service agreements, billing statements, and other records already provide much of the information relevant to resolving billing or service disputes.

C. The Label Template

1. Removing the Template From the CFR

We adopt our proposal to remove the label template from the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). As we stated in the *Second Further Notice,* our approach will allow us to more easily update the visual layout and other formatting elements of the label. No party objects to our proposal, and we agree with the Accessibility Organizations that we should make sure to maintain version control and that updates, including revision history, remain publicly accessible. The template will be maintained at *fcc.gov/broadbandlabels.* We delegate to the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau authority to make non-substantive changes to the visual layout and other formatting elements of the label. The Bureau shall describe any such update in a Public Notice before an update takes effect. This delegation does not authorize the Bureau to make substantive changes to the template's content except as authorized through Commission action. Providers' underlying obligations remain governed by § 8.1 of the Commission's rules.

2. Updating the Template

We adopt our proposal to replace the ''*fcc.gov/consumer*'' reference in the template with ''*fcc.gov/broadbandlabels.*'' This change, which is unopposed, is necessary to enable consumers to access directly the broadband label information maintained by the Commission.

D. Eliminating Outdated Rules

We adopt our proposal to remove § 8.1(a)(7) from our rules. That provision set forth implementation deadlines for the *2022 Broadband Label Order:* April 10, 2024 for providers with more than 100,000 subscribers and October 10, 2024 for smaller providers. These deadlines have passed, and providers are now subject to the label requirements.

1. Issues From the First Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

We close the Commission's inquiry into the various proposals on which the Commission sought comment in the *First Further Notice.* Specifically, the Commission sought comment on whether to: specify additional accessibility standards (such as ASL, Braille, and tactile indicators); require the display of labels in additional languages; require disclosure of discounts and other price variables in labels; extend label requirements to bundled services; modify or supplement required performance information; require specific disclosures in the label regarding network management and privacy; require interactive labels; employ focus groups, surveys, or subject matter experts to provide feedback on future changes to the label; publish a style guide and implementation tools to assist providers and enhance consistency in label presentation; and permit ISPs to submit labels information directly to the Commission, in lieu of providing labels directly at the point of sale and archiving them. The record indicates that these proposals would unduly complicate the display of labels, contrary to the Commission's objective that labels convey the information consumers need to know ''in plain language that is easy to understand without overwhelming consumers with too much information,'' or would impose unwarranted compliance burdens on providers.

Several commenters support the Commission's intention to close its inquiry into the *First Further Notice* proposals, arguing that those proposals would impose unnecessary burdens and undermine the streamlining objective in this proceeding. Although one commenter urges the Commission not to close its inquiry into defining 'typical' performance metrics, arguing that the current approach results in disclosures that are not comparable between providers, we agree with the commenters who argue that the current rule is sufficient.

Other commenters oppose closing the inquiry into additional accessibility standards, specifically those relating to ASL-accessible formats, Braille, and tactile indicators, arguing that text-based accessibility alone does not adequately serve all consumers with disabilities. They urge the Commission to acknowledge multimodal accessibility as an open issue warranting further examination. We find that the requirement that providers make the labels easily accessible to people with disabilities sufficiently directs providers to ensure accessibility while providing flexibility to meet the requirement. To the extent accessibility concerns arise, providers will need to act to ensure an individual has access to the provider's labels. While the responsibility is on providers to ensure the labels are accessible for consumers with disabilities, we also encourage consumers to utilize the Commission's Consumer Inquiries and Complaints Center to apprise the Commission of any accessibility concerns requiring additional assistance.

2. Other Matters

We decline to exclude mass-market services that are marketed to business customers from the label requirements, as CTIA asks. The Infrastructure Act directs the Commission to require labels for ''broadband internet access service,'' as defined in § 8.1(b) of the Commission's rules or any successor regulation. Section 8.1(b) defines ''broadband internet access service'' as ''a mass-market retail service by wire or radio that provides the capability to transmit data to and receive data from all or substantially all internet endpoints, including any capabilities that are incidental to and enable the operation of the communications service, but excluding dial-up internet access service.'' Given the lack of evidence in the record regarding the costs imposed by the labeling requirement on providers of mass-market services used by business customers, we find no reason to pursue a definitional change.

We also decline to exclude E-Rate and Rural Health Care (RHC) services from the label requirements, as urged by DQE Communications LLC (DQE), a broadband provider that exclusively serves enterprise and business customers. Although DQE claims that the label requirement imposes disproportionate costs and obligations, it does not describe with specificity the costs and obligations it incurs with respect to E-Rate and RHC customers. Given that the label requirement applies to all mass-market broadband services, it would appear that, to the extent such ''off-the-shelf'' services are requested by E-Rate or RHC customers, the necessary labels should already be available from the upstream providers of such mass-market broadband services, and thus can be readily displayed, with minimal if any alteration, by any E-Rate or RHC provider making use of such services. Therefore, in the absence of any contrary evidence, we conclude that minimal, if any, cost would be incurred by DQE or similarly situated providers in passing such labels on to their E-Rate and RHC customers.

Further, the Schools, Health & Libraries Broadband Coalition and the Consortium for School Networking (SHLB/CoSN) list a variety of benefits that they claim result from making labels for mass-market services available to schools, libraries, and rural health care facilities. They state that in a variety of circumstances, including limited budgets, lack of competitive options, and insufficient technical expertise to navigate complex proposals, a school, library, or health care provider may choose to purchase a mass-market internet service, rather than an individualized service offered in response to an RFP. They add that by providing standardized, clear information about services available in the mass market, labels also help institutions evaluate bids, comply with program rules requiring cost-effectiveness, and plan procurements. According to SHLB/CoSN, labels also assist with documentation for funding applications, which often require details such as monthly price, contract length, and speeds—information that labels present ''in a uniform and concise manner.''

E. Assessment of Consumer Benefit

We recognize the importance of assessing, over time, whether broadband labels are achieving their intended consumer benefits. Accordingly, we direct the Consumer Protection and Accessibility Advisory Committee (CPAAC) to produce reports assessing the effectiveness of broadband labels, the first to be completed no later than two years after publication of this Order in the **Federal Register**, and the following reports to be completed every four years thereafter. Each report should address: (1) the extent to which broadband labels reach consumers (*i.e.,* are people aware the labels exist and are they using them) and any challenges that remain to their use; (2) recommendations for how the FCC, industry, and consumer groups can better publicize broadband labels to ensure that consumers are aware of them and understand how to use them; (3) the extent to which broadband labels are accessible for consumers with disabilities and any challenges that remain to full accessibility; (4) recommendations for how the FCC and providers can address the challenges that remain in ensuring broadband labels are accessible for consumers with disabilities; and (5) other opportunities to better clarify and make more useful to consumers the information on the label.

F. Legal Authority

We conclude that section 60504 of the Infrastructure Act provides the Commission with the authority to modify the broadband label rules as discussed herein. Section 60504 directs the Commission to ''promulgate regulations to require the display of broadband consumer labels, as described in the *2016 Broadband Labels PN,* to disclose to consumers information regarding broadband internet access service plans.'' The *2016 Broadband Labels PN* described broadband consumer labels as an implementation of the Commission's broadband transparency rule. In approving a specific format and content for broadband labels, the *2016 Broadband Labels PN* characterized them as ''a simple-to-understand format describing the key factors consumers need to know when considering broadband service. . . .'' The changes we adopt today better align the rules with section 60504 by removing or modifying a number of requirements that do not appear to be needed to achieve the core statutory objective. We conclude that the label display requirements adopted herein raise no First Amendment concerns.

Sections 13 and 257 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, which the Commission has previously relied on as authority for the broadband transparency rule, provide additional authority. To the extent that broadband labels continue to be used for offerings through the E-Rate and Rural Health Care universal service programs, § 254 supplies authority. We also note the Commission's finding in the *Broadband Label Order* that Title III of the Act provides additional authority for the rules adopted here with respect to wireless providers.

G. Costs and Benefits

This Order streamlines the existing broadband label requirements by making minor changes to the information required to be presented and the way in which the information is required to be presented. These changes are expected to reduce costs for broadband providers, while still providing consumers information to make informed broadband purchases.

First, the Order modifies the requirement for presenting the broadband label on a sale by phone so that customer service representatives no longer have to read the label contents verbatim. This change will allow representatives to communicate the contents of the broadband label in a more natural and understandable way, which should benefit consumers. Next, instead of requiring providers to itemize all fees, which may vary by location, the rules set forth in this Order allow providers to include either (1) the ''up to'' (*i.e.,* maximum) total amount of passthrough fees that a subscriber would be charged in any location where the service plan is offered, or (2) the exact total amount the consumer would be charged for broadband fees in a particular location. Under both options, the required label content is simplified, enabling providers to convey the information consumers need to know ''in plain language that is easy to understand without overwhelming consumers with too much information.'' In addition, the first alternative—displaying the maximum a consumer would be charged—reduces compliance costs for providers because they are no longer required to create multiple labels when fees vary by location.

Further, this Order allows providers to use hyperlinks to labels at the point of sale and in customer account portals, rather than displaying the full label. While using hyperlinks to broadband labels instead of displaying the labels automatically may result in fewer consumers reading the label, interested consumers still have the opportunity to view the broadband label. The Order also eliminates the requirement that providers provide the contents of labels separately, in a machine-readable spreadsheet file format on their websites via a dedicated uniform resource locator (URL). Because consumers themselves, including consumers with disabilities, will still be able to read the labels, we do not expect that eliminating this requirement will hurt consumers, and doing so could potentially reduce providers' compliance costs. Lastly, the Order eliminates the requirement that providers retain labels for two years after they discontinue plans. This change will not affect consumers' access to labels for plans currently offered to the public and may lower costs of storage for providers. Collectively, we expect the rule changes set forth in this Order to reduce providers' costs while imposing no material harms on consumers.

II. Final 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 *Second Further Notice* released in November 2025. The Commission sought written public comment on the proposals in the Notice, including comment on the IRFA. The comments received are addressed below. 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 Rules

The Commission adopted broadband label requirements in the *2022 Broadband Label Order* to provide consumers with easy-to-understand and accurate information about broadband service plans, as mandated by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act. Since the initial implementation of these rules, for larger providers in April 2024 and for smaller providers in October 2024, the Commission has received feedback from industry stakeholders through the *Delete, Delete, Delete* proceeding asserting that certain aspects of the current broadband label requirements may be unnecessarily burdensome for providers while not providing commensurate benefits to consumers.

The primary objective of the Order is to simplify regulatory requirements while maintaining the transparency benefits that broadband labels offer consumers. Specifically, the Order (1) enables providers to describe labels in a natural, conversational style over the phone, rather than requiring customer service representatives to read label contents verbatim; (2) simplifies fee presentation by allowing providers to include either the maximum or exact amount consumers would be charged for fees that may vary by location, rather than requiring itemization of all such fees; (3) removes outdated information about the now concluded Affordable Connectivity Program (ACP) from the label; (4) allows use of hyperlinks or icons at the point of sale and in customer account portals; (5) eliminates the requirement that providers make label content machine readable; and (6) eliminates the requirement that providers retain labels for two years after a service is no longer offered to new customers. At the same time, the Order ensures that labels remain accessible to people with disabilities and requires providers to present them in English and in any other language a provider uses in marketing.

The Order does not change the core label requirements to display a broadband consumer label containing critical information about the provider's service offerings, including information about pricing, introductory rates, data allowances, and performance metrics.

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

NTCA, WISPA, Breezeline, ACA Connects, and Joink filed comments regarding the impact of the rule on small entities.

NTCA—The Rural Broadband Association (NTCA) was the only commenter to include a section specifically responding to the IRFA. NTCA, which represents small, rural local exchange carriers, supports the Commission's proposals as burden-relieving for small entities, and urged the Commission to avoid imposing any additional requirements beyond those proposed in the FNRPM. NTCA identified a material inconsistency between the 2023 Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) Worksheet supporting this proceeding, which estimated zero capital, operation, and maintenance costs for small companies, and the Commission's own acknowledgement in the *Broadband Label Order* that certain label tasks "may require more time for providers that are less likely to have in-house attorneys and compliance departments to assist in the preparation broadband labels, and thus will need to engage outside legal resources to implement several proposed requirements." NTCA further argued that even reliance on existing internal staff generates real opportunity costs, as compliance draws resources away from network investment and other operational priorities, concluding that elimination of the identified requirements would provide meaningful economic benefits to small providers.

WISPA, Breezeline, ACA Connects, and Joink also raised cost and burden concerns to small entities in their comments on the Notice more generally. These commenters supported the proposed eliminations as measures that would reduce unnecessary compliance costs and administrative burden for providers, including small entities, without undermining the consumer transparency goals of the broadband label requirements.

USTelecom and other commenters noted compliance costs and burdens associated with the existing broadband label requirements but did not specifically address the impacts of those requirements on small entities.

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 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. 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 are not dominant in 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 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—CENSUS BUREAU DATA BY NAICS CODE TABLE

Regulated industry (NAICS classification)	NAICS code	SBA size standard	Total firms	Small firms	% Small firms in industry
Wired Telecommunications Carriers	517111	1,500 employees	3,054	2,964	97.05

TABLE 1—CENSUS BUREAU DATA BY NAICS CODE TABLE—Continued

Regulated industry (NAICS classification)	NAICS code	SBA size standard	Total firms	Small firms	% Small firms in industry
Wireless Telecommunications Carriers (except Satellite).	517112	1,500 employees	2,893	2,837	98.06
Telecommunications Resellers	517121	1,500 employees	1,386	1,375	99.21
Satellite Telecommunications	517410	$47 million	275	242	88.00
All Other Telecommunications	517810	$40 million	1,079	1,039	96.29

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 # FCC Form 499A filers	Small firms	% Small entities
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
Toll Resellers	411	398	96.84
Telecommunications Resellers	633	615	97.16
Wired Telecommunications Carriers	4,682	4,276	91.33
Wireless Telecommunications Carriers (except Satellite)	585	498	85.13
Wireless Telephony	326	247	75.77

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 Order streamlines existing broadband label requirements by making targeted changes to the information providers are required to provide and to the manner in which it must be displayed. The Commission expects these changes to reduce costs for providers, including small entities, while continuing to provide consumers with information needed to make informed broadband purchasing decisions. The Commission expects the rule changes set forth in this Order to reduce provider costs while imposing no material harm on consumers.

The Order's changes reduce compliance obligations in the following respects, each of which is particularly beneficial to small entities that are less likely than large providers to maintain dedicated in-house legal and technical compliance staff. First, the fee presentation change allows providers to disclose the maximum or exact amount consumers would be charged for location-variable fees, eliminating the need to create and maintain multiple location-specific labels. Second, the point of sale and account portal changes allow providers to use hyperlinks or icons in lieu of the full label display, reducing the technical burden of full label display systems. Third, elimination of the machine readability requirement removes a technical backend obligation that imposed costs without commensurate consumer benefit. Fourth, the telephone sales modification allows customer service representatives to describe label contents conversationally rather than verbatim, reducing training and scripting burdens. Fifth, elimination of the two-year archiving requirement may lower storage costs. Sixth, removal of the outdated ACP information (ACP) eliminates the need to maintain a label element that no longer serves any consumer information purpose.

The core broadband label requirements remain in effect for all providers, including small entities. Providers must continue to display a label containing critical information pricing, introductory rates, data allowances, and performance metrics. Compliance will continue to require professional skills in legal compliance, marketing, and broadband technology. Small entities that lack in-house compliance staff may continue to require professional assistance, although we expect that the elimination of several requirements will substantially reduce the scope and cost of such assistance.

The Order does not impose any new reporting, recordkeeping, or other compliance obligations on small entities. All adopted changes reduce burdens relative to existing requirements.

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."

Elimination of six compliance requirements. The most significant step taken to minimize economic impact on small entities is the elimination of six compliance requirements that generated disproportionate administrative, technical and financial burden, particularly for smaller providers, without commensurate consumer benefit. The legal and policy basis for each elimination is grounded in the Commission's finding that these requirements were not mandated by the Infrastructure Act or the *2016 Broadband Labels PN* and thus exceeded the Commission's statutory mandate. Eliminating requirements that lack statutory grounding and imposed real costs on small entities directly advances the RFA's objectives.

Fee Presentation Flexibility. Rather than requiring itemization of all location-variable fees, which entailed creating multiple label versions for different service areas, the Order allows providers to disclose either the maximum or exact amount a consumer will be charged for these fees. This approach achieves the transparency goal while substantially reducing administrative complexity, especially for small entities serving multiple geographic markets.

Hyperlink and Icon Alternative. The Order allows providers to satisfy point of sale and customer portal display requirements through hyperlinks or icons linking to broadband labels rather than full-label display at the point of sale. This reduces the technical burden of label display systems while preserving consumer access to label information.

Implementation Timing. The Commission notes that the Broadband Label Order provided differential implementation timelines, giving smaller providers (those with 100,000 or fewer subscribers) a six-month extension beyond the deadline applicable to large providers. Because the changes adopted in this Order exclusively reduce compliance obligations, no additional differential implantation schedule for small entities is necessary. The Commission also removes the now-moot deadline provision at § 8.1(a)(7) to streamline the rules.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 8

Communications, Consumer protection, Labeling, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Telecommunications, Telephone.

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 8 as follows:

PART 8—INTERNET TRANSPARENCY FOR CONSUMERS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 8 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 47 U.S.C. 151, 152, 154, 201(b), 257, 302a, 303(r), 312, 333, 503 and 1753.

Subpart A—Broadband Transparency

■ 2. Amend § 8.1 by revising paragraph (b) to read as follows:

§ 8.1 Transparency.

* * * * *

(b)(1) Broadband internet access service is a mass-market retail service by wire or radio that provides the capability to transmit data to and receive data from all or substantially all internet endpoints, including any capabilities that are incidental to and enable the operation of the communications service, but excluding dial-up internet access service. This term also encompasses any service that the Commission finds to be providing a functional equivalent of the service described in the previous sentence or that is used to evade the protections set forth in this part. For purposes of paragraphs (a)(1) through (6) of this section, ''mass-market'' services exclude service offerings customized for the customer through individually negotiated agreements even when the services are supported by Federal universal service support.

(2) In this section, ''passthrough fee'' means a monthly charge that:

(i) Is imposed by a government entity or third-party infrastructure owner rather than set by the provider itself;

(ii) Represents costs that the provider chooses to recover from consumers as a separate charge rather than incorporating them into the base monthly price; and

(iii) Varies by consumer location.

* * * * *

■ 3. Delayed indefinitely, further amend § 8.1 by:

■ a. Revising paragraphs (a)(1) and (2); and

■ b. Removing and reserving paragraphs (a)(3), (5), and (7).

The revisions read as follows:

§ 8.1 Transparency.

(a) * * *

(1)(i) Any person providing broadband internet access service shall create and display an accurate broadband consumer label for each stand-alone broadband internet access service it currently offers for purchase. The label must be prominently displayed, publicly available, and easily accessible to consumers, including consumers with disabilities, at the point of sale with the content and in the format prescribed by the Commission in ''[Fixed or Mobile] Broadband Consumer Disclosure Label,'' located at *www.fcc.gov/broadband labels.*

(ii) A label shall itemize any monthly fees not included in the monthly price, except that passthrough fees may be presented in the aggregate, as either the maximum monthly total or the exact monthly total of such fees assessed on subscribers in the geographic area to which the label applies. Providers opting to display passthrough fees as a maximum ''up to'' amount must additionally provide on the label a breakdown of this amount into a maximum ''up to'' amount for passthrough fees that recover government-imposed costs and a maximum ''up to'' amount for passthrough fees that recover costs imposed by non-governmental, third-party infrastructure owners, and the types of fees included in each of the two categories.

(2)(i) Broadband internet access service providers shall display the label required under paragraph (a)(1) of this section at each point of sale. *Point of sale* is defined to mean a provider's website and any alternate sales channels through which the provider's broadband internet access service is sold, including provider-owned retail locations, third-party retail locations, and telephone sales channels. For labels displayed on provider websites, the label (or an icon or link that connects directly to the label and is clearly identified as a way to access the label for the advertised plan) must be displayed in close proximity to the associated advertised service plan. *Point of sale* also means the time a consumer begins investigating and comparing broadband service offerings available to them at their location. For alternate sales channels, providers must document each instance when it directs a consumer to a label and retain such documentation for two years. This requirement will be deemed satisfied if, instead, the provider: establishes the business practices and processes it will follow in distributing the label through alternative sales channels; retains training materials and related business practice documentation for two years; and provides such information to the Commission upon request, within thirty days. *Point of sale* for purposes of the E-Rate and Rural Health Care programs is defined as the time a service provider submits its bid to a program participant. Providers participating in the E-Rate and Rural Health Care programs must provide their labels to program participants when they submit their bids to participants.

(ii) Broadband internet access service providers that offer online account portals to their customers shall also make each customer's current plan label easily accessible to the customer in such portals, by displaying the label (or an icon or link that connects directly to the label).

(iii) At telephone points of sale, a provider satisfies the display requirement of this paragraph (a)(2) by orally summarizing the following label fields during the sales interaction: monthly price inclusive of monthly fees, including the introductory rate and its duration if applicable; typical download and upload speeds; latency; data allowance; contract term duration if applicable; and early termination fees if applicable. Verbatim recitation of the label is not required to satisfy this obligation.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2026–16503 Filed 8–12–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 660

[Docket No. 250512–0084; RTID 0648–XF626]

Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modification of the West Coast Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Action #23–#24

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Inseason modification of 2025–2026 management measures.

SUMMARY: NMFS announces two inseason actions for the 2026 portion of the 2025–2026 ocean salmon fisheries. These inseason actions modified the commercial and recreational salmon fisheries in the area from Cape Falcon, Oregon to the United States/Mexico border.

DATES: The effective dates for these inseason actions are set out in this document under the heading ''Inseason Actions'' and the action remained in effect until superseded or modified.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Shannon Penna, (562) 980–4239, *Shannon.Penna@noaa.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The annual management measures for the 2025–2026 ocean salmon fisheries (90 FR 20810, May 16, 2025) govern the commercial and recreational fisheries in the area from the United States/Canada border to the United States/Mexico border, effective from 0001 hours Pacific Daylight Time (PDT), May 16, 2025, until the effective date of the 2026–2027 management measures, as published in the **Federal Register**. NMFS is authorized to implement inseason management actions to modify fishing seasons, catch limits, and other management measures considering factors described in regulation (50 CFR 660.409). Inseason actions in the salmon fishery may be taken directly by NMFS (50 CFR 660.409(a)—Fixed inseason management provisions) or upon consultation with the Chairman of the Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council), and the appropriate State Directors (50 CFR 660.409(b)—Flexible inseason management provisions).

Management of the salmon fisheries is divided into two geographic areas: north of Cape Falcon (United States/Canada border to Cape Falcon, OR) and south of Cape Falcon (SOF) (Cape Falcon, OR, to the United States/Mexico border). This notice describes inseason actions from the 2025–2026 management cycle. These actions affected the SOF commercial and recreational salmon fishery, as set out under the heading Inseason Actions below.

Consultations on these inseason actions took place with the Council salmon staff officer and representatives for the appropriate State Directors. Consultation for these actions occurred on March 9, 2026. This consultation included representatives from NMFS, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Representatives from the Salmon Advisory Subpanel and the Salmon Technical Team (STT) were also present.

These inseason actions were announced via the NMFS' telephone hotline and U.S. Coast Guard radio broadcast at the time the actions became effective. (50 CFR 660.411(a)(2)).

Inseason Actions

Inseason Actions #23–#24

Reason and authorization for inseason actions #23-#24: These inseasons closed fisheries on certain dates that would otherwise be open under the 2025–2026 annual management measures and modified the ocean salmon recreational and commercial fisheries between Cape Falcon, OR and the United States/Mexico border, in response to stock abundance forecasts for 2026. They modified fishing seasons in consideration of the predicted sizes of salmon runs, consistent with 50 CFR 660.409(b). Additionally, the 2025–2026 annual management measures for ocean salmon fisheries (90 FR 20810; May 26, 2025) anticipated inseason actions to adjust fisheries scheduled to occur from March 15, 2025, through May 15, 2026 (or until the effective date of the 2026 management measures), in response to new information regarding 2026 salmon stock abundance forecasts and northern salmon fisheries impacts, to keep fisheries impacts within management objectives and consistent with conservation needs.

At its March 4–9, 2026, Council meeting, the STT presented 2026 stock abundance forecasts for salmon stocks managed under the Pacific Coast Salmon Fishery Management Plan (FMP), these are described in the Council's *Pre-Season Report I: Stock Abundance Analysis and Environmental Assessment Part 1 for 2026 Ocean Salmon Fishery Regulations.* Klamath River fall-run Chinook (KRFC) were determined by NMFS to be overfished under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA) in 2018; in 2026, KRFC no longer meets the criteria for overfished status and is now considered ''not overfished-rebuilding'' (Review of 2025 Ocean Salmon Fisheries: Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation Document for the Pacific Coast Salmon Fishery Management Plan). However, KRFC will continue to be managed under its rebuilding plan until it is determined to be rebuilt, and the projected abundance for 2026 is still relatively low and likely to limit fisheries managed under the 2026–2027 management measures. While Sacramento River fall-run Chinook (SRFC) was determined to be ''rebuilt'' in 2021 (87 FR 25429, April 29, 2022) and the preliminary 2026 Sacramento Index forecast is 392,349, the highest since 2022, fisheries impacting SRFC in 2026 will likely need to be limited to address concerns regarding a pattern of low escapements in recent years combined with higher than anticipated exploitation rates, and a pattern of over-forecasting stock abundance. Inseasons #23–24 are intended to limit the impacts of the early season fisheries on KRFC and SRFC in light of the forecasts and other information, thus preserving flexibility for the Council and NMFS to design 2026–2027 management measures that allow for fishing opportunity at times and in locations that will most benefit the fishery and the public while meeting the conservation objectives and other requirements of the FMP.

NMFS took these inseason actions on March 9, 2026, concurrent with the March Council meeting.

The NMFS West Coast Regional Administrator (RA) considered this information and determined that the