

Decision PROPOSED DECISION OF COMMISSIONER ALICE REYNOLDS  
(Mailed 7/22/2024)

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Rulemaking to  
Update the California Universal  
Telephone Service (California  
LifeLine) Program.

Rulemaking 20-02-008

**DECISION IMPLEMENTING CALIFORNIA LIFELINE ENROLLMENT PATH  
FOR CALIFORNIANS WITHOUT SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBERS**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Page</b>
DECISION IMPLEMENTING CALIFORNIA LIFELINE ENROLLMENT PATH FOR CALIFORNIANS WITHOUT SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBERS .....	1
Summary .....	2
1. Background .....	2
1.1. Current Enrollment Process .....	3
1.2. Prevention of Waste, Fraud, and Abuse and Use of Applicants’ Social Security Numbers.....	4
1.3. Procedural Background .....	5
1.4. Submission Date .....	6
2. Issues Before the Commission .....	7
3. Discussion.....	7
3.1. Implementation Guidelines for Enrolling Californians Without Social Security Numbers.....	7
3.1.1. Timeline .....	7
3.1.2. Application Update: Dual Pathway .....	11
3.1.3. Application Update: Verbiage and Language .....	12
3.1.4. Individuals Without Access to Their Social Security Number or Other Eligibility Documentation.....	15
3.1.5. Program-Based Eligibility .....	16
3.1.6. Income-Based Eligibility .....	19
3.1.7. Guard Against Waste, Fraud, and Abuse.....	21
3.1.7.1. Identity Verification Software Integration .....	21
3.1.7.2. Safe Harbor .....	24
3.1.8. Data-Driven Implementation .....	25
3.1.9. General Order 153 .....	26
3.2. Subsidizing Federal Support.....	26
3.3. Identity Verification .....	27
4. Summary of Public Comment .....	28
5. Conclusion .....	29
6. Comments on Proposed Decision .....	29
7. Assignment of Proceeding .....	29
Findings of Fact.....	29
Conclusions of Law .....	31
ORDER .....	34

**Appendix A** - Changes to General Order 153

## DECISION IMPLEMENTING CALIFORNIA LIFELINE ENROLLMENT PATH FOR CALIFORNIANS WITHOUT SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBERS

### Summary

Decision 14-01-036, *Decision Adopting Revisions to Modernize and Expand the California LifeLine Program*, determined that the California Universal LifeLine Telephone Service Program (California LifeLine) should extend eligibility to Californians without a Social Security Number (SSN). This decision establishes a process for Californians without an SSN to enroll in California LifeLine.

### 1. Background

In 2012, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) revised the federal Lifeline program (Lifeline) and required applicants to provide the last four digits of their social security numbers (SSN) to receive the federal subsidy.<sup>1</sup> Californians expressed concern about the impact this change would have on the California Universal LifeLine Telephone Service Program (California LifeLine). At public participation hearings hosted by the California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) in Riverside, San Diego, and Los Angeles, parties commented that requiring applicants to provide an SSN may cause some otherwise eligible low-income individuals to become ineligible for California LifeLine services.<sup>2</sup> Such an outcome runs contrary to the Moore Universal Telephone Services Act's (Moore Act) mandate to make basic communication services at affordable rates available to the greatest number of Californians.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Lifeline and Link Up Reform and Modernization* (Fed. Communications Com. (02/06/2012) 27 FCC Rcd 6656 at 6738, no. 191); *see also* 47 C.F.R. § 54.410(d)(2)(vi).

<sup>2</sup> Decision (D.) 14-01-036 at 119.

<sup>3</sup> Public Utilities (Pub. Util.) Code §§ 871, *et seq.*

In Decision (D.) 14-01-036, the Commission authorized eligible Californians without SSNs to participate in California LifeLine.<sup>4</sup> The Commission only required that eligible Californians provide government-issued identification when applying for California LifeLine.<sup>5</sup> It deferred further implementation details, such as the types of acceptable identity documents and whether the California LifeLine Fund would make up for the lack of any federal Lifeline support, to a later time.<sup>6</sup>

D.14-01-036 also stated that Commission staff would file a waiver petition with the FCC regarding the SSN requirement.<sup>7</sup> The Commission filed a waiver petition with the FCC in February 2015.<sup>8</sup> In 2016, the FCC stated a policy that it no longer wished to support program rule exceptions for individual states.<sup>9</sup> The petition is still pending.

### **1.1. Current Enrollment Process**

The Commission operates California LifeLine as a public benefits program through a Third-Party Administrator (TPA) with funds collected through a surcharge on all telecommunications lines in California. However, the program relies heavily on private participating telecommunications companies (service providers) to enroll new participants.

---

<sup>4</sup> D.14-01-036 at 170, Conclusion of Law 46.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* at 122, 124.

<sup>7</sup> *Id.* at 124.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* at 173, Ordering Paragraph (OP) 17; see also *Staff Proposal for California LifeLine Program: Enrollment Path for Individuals without Social Security Numbers* (Staff Proposal) at 2.

<sup>9</sup> *In the Matter of Lifeline and Link Up Reform and Modernization, et al.*, Third Report and Order *et al.*, WC Docket No. 11-42, FCC 16-38 (rel. April 27, 2016) at para. 212 (stating, “[w]e amend our rules to remove state-specific eligibility criteria for Lifeline support”).

Most California LifeLine participants enroll through “Street Teams,” which work for individual service providers. Street Teams conduct in-person outreach and enrollment in areas more likely to have eligible participants, such as outside social service benefits offices or county buildings.

### **1.2. Prevention of Waste, Fraud, and Abuse and Use of Applicants’ Social Security Numbers**

The Commission has various methods to guard against waste, fraud, and abuse of public California LifeLine funds. For example, the Commission requires service providers to reimburse subsidies connected to fraudulent applications. The Commission also requires applicants to provide identity verification documents, which the TPA’s Customer Service Representatives (CSRs) manually review.<sup>10</sup>

While the Commission does not use an applicant’s SSN to determine waste, fraud, and abuse against the consumer, the Commission may use an applicant’s SSN for other purposes. Specifically, and as discussed further in Section 3.1.5 below, California LifeLine leverages applicants’ participation in other social service programs to automatically verify eligibility. Some of these other social services programs, such as CalFresh, require applicants to provide an SSN with limited exceptions.<sup>11</sup> When California LifeLine applicants also provide an SSN, the TPA can cross check the number with other programs’ databases to verify eligibility and streamline enrollment.

Additionally, the FCC requires that applicants provide an SSN to qualify for the federal subsidy. To comply with the FCC requirement so that

---

<sup>10</sup> See Staff Proposal at 3, 5.

<sup>11</sup> CalFresh is known federally as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP).

Californians qualify for \$100 million to \$150 million in annual federal subsidies, California LifeLine asks that applicants provide an SSN.

### **1.3. Procedural Background**

On August 30, 2023, the Commission received a letter from the nonprofit organization Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles (NLSLA) requesting immediate implementation of D.14-01-036 regarding extending California LifeLine eligibility to Californians without an SSN. On September 7, 2023, Commissioner Shiroma responded to NLSLA's letter, and the Commission hosted a "LifeLine Stakeholder Roundtable" on October 4, 2023. In a letter dated December 1, 2023, NLSLA reiterated its concerns about the Commission's delayed implementation of D.14-01-036.

On December 19, 2023, Commissioner Shiroma issued an Assigned Commissioner Ruling (ACR) requesting comments on ways to implement a process for Californians without SSNs to participate in the California LifeLine program. On January 26, 2024, the Commission received opening comments on the ACR from the following: Assurance Wireless (Assurance); Pac Bell Telephone Company (AT&T); the California Public Advocates Office of the Commission (Cal Advocates); Cox California Telecom (Cox); the National LifeLine Association (NaLA);<sup>12</sup> TracFone Wireless Inc. and Cellco Partnership (TracFone); NLSLA, Legal Aid Association of California, Homeless Action Center, and Maternal and Child Health Access (Low-Income Advocates); the Small Local

---

<sup>12</sup> NaLA consists of Boomerang Wireless, LLC; AmeriMex Communications Corp. dba SafetyNet Wireless; American Broadband & Telecommunications Company; Global Connection Inc. of America d/b/a StandUp Wireless; i-wireless, LLC; and TrueConnect Communications, Inc.

Exchange Carriers (Small LECs);<sup>13</sup> and The Utility Reform Network (TURN) and The Greenlining Institute (GLI). On February 23, 2024, the Commission received reply comments on the ACR from the following: AT&T; Cox; Low-Income Advocates; NaLA; the Small LECs; TracFone; TURN and GLI; and UNITE-LA and California Community Foundation.

The Commission's Communications Division staff (Staff) reviewed the parties' comments and drafted the *Staff Proposal for California LifeLine Program: Enrollment Path for Individuals without Social Security Numbers* (Staff Proposal), which recommended an implementation process that considered parties' ACR comments. The Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) issued a ruling on April 19, 2024, inviting parties to comment on the Staff Proposal. On May 10, 2024, the Commission received opening comments on the Staff Proposal from the following: Assurance; AT&T; Cox; Low-Income Advocates; NaLA; the Small LECs; TracFone; and TURN, GLI, and UNITE-LA (Consumer Coalition). On May 24, 2024, the Commission received reply comments on the Staff Proposal from the following: AT&T; Center for Accessible Technology (CforAT); Low-Income Advocates; NaLA; the Small LECs; TracFone; and TURN and GLI.

#### **1.4. Submission Date**

This matter was submitted on May 24, 2024, upon submission of reply comments on the Staff Proposal.

---

<sup>13</sup> The Small LECs consist of Calaveras Telephone Company; Cal-Ore Telephone Co.; Ducor Telephone Company; Foresthill Telephone Co.; Happy Valley Telephone Company; Hornitos Telephone Company; Kerman Telephone Co.; Pinnacles Telephone Co.; The Ponderosa Telephone Co.; Sierra Telephone Company, Inc.; The Siskiyou Telephone Company; Volcano Telephone Company; and Winterhaven Telephone Company.



## 2. Issues Before the Commission

The issues before the Commission are the implementation issues identified in D.14-01-036 and the ACR:

1. How should the Commission implement the requirements of D.14-01-036 to ensure that Californians without SSNs can participate in California LifeLine?
2. Should the California LifeLine Fund make up for all or a portion of the lack of federal Lifeline support for Californians without an SSN?
3. What types of government-issued identity documents should California LifeLine accept from participants without an SSN?

## 3. Discussion

### 3.1. Implementation Guidelines for Enrolling Californians Without Social Security Numbers

Staff will implement a process to enroll Californians without SSNs into California LifeLine, consistent with the guidelines provided in this section.

#### 3.1.1. Timeline

The Staff Proposal describes a four-phase approach to implement D.14-01-036 that allows for an expedient near-term solution and later refinements.<sup>14</sup> In Phase 1, Staff recommends updating the application process by allowing individuals to check a box certifying that they are applying without an SSN.<sup>15</sup> During Phase 2, Staff will work with the TPA to integrate LexisNexis TrueID, a new identity verification software, to expand the acceptable forms of identification for individuals applying without an SSN.<sup>16</sup> In Phase 3, Staff will

---

<sup>14</sup> Staff Proposal at 2.

<sup>15</sup> *Id.* at 3-4.

<sup>16</sup> *Id.* at 4-5.

work with service providers that elect to integrate TrueID into their intake processes to update their systems.<sup>17</sup> Phase 4 proposes to shift the entry point for California LifeLine's enrollment process from service providers to the TPA.<sup>18</sup>

The Staff Proposal identifies an implementation timeline for Phase 1 of three months from the date the Commission approves the implementation process.<sup>19</sup> The Staff Proposal does not specify timelines for the other phases because they require coordination with external parties, such as the TPA and LexisNexis. While Staff cannot control when the TPA will integrate new software, the Staff Proposal notes that these changes will occur "as quickly as possible."<sup>20</sup>

Generally, parties support the approach described in Phase 1.<sup>21</sup> However, the Small LECs recommend an implementation timeline of six months and Low-Income Advocates recommend one month.<sup>22</sup> Low-Income Advocates argue that the Commission expanded eligibility to Californians without an SSN ten years ago and that the proposal to implement D.14-01-036 is limited.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> *Id.* at 5-6.

<sup>18</sup> *Id.* at 6-7.

<sup>19</sup> *Id.* at 4.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>21</sup> Consumer Coalition Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 2; Cox Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 2; Low-Income Advocates Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 2; NaLA Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 2; Small LECs Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 4; TracFone Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 1. *But see* Assurance Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 2-3 (opposing Phase 1 because it "places an inordinate burden on providers"); AT&T Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 2-3.

<sup>22</sup> Low-Income Advocates Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 7; Small LECs Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 4.

<sup>23</sup> Low-Income Advocates Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 7.

For Phases 2 and 3, AT&T, CforAT, Consumer Coalition, Low-Income Advocates, NaLA, and the Small LECs question TrueID's cost, accessibility features, and data protection.<sup>24</sup> AT&T, Consumer Coalition, Cox, and the Small LECs also recommend eliminating Phase 3, which the Staff Proposal labeled as optional.<sup>25</sup> Some service providers state that they do not currently use TrueID in their intake processes and request more information on the cost, which entity would bear the cost, and whether they must install it.<sup>26</sup> Notably, parties did not oppose expanding the list of identity verification documents. Indeed, Low-Income Advocates and Consumer Coalition recommend further increasing the types of acceptable eligible verification documents.<sup>27</sup>

Finally, for Phase 4, AT&T, Consumer Coalition, Cox, CforAT, Low-Income Advocates, and the Small LECs generally support the proposal.<sup>28</sup> NaLA

---

<sup>24</sup> AT&T Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 2, 3-4; Consumer Coalition Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 5; Low-Income Advocates Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 5-6; NaLA Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 3-4; Small LECs Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 4-5; *see also* CforAT Reply Comments on Staff Proposal at 1-2.

<sup>25</sup> Consumer Coalition Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 6; Cox Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 2; *see also* AT&T Reply Comments on Staff Proposal at 3; Small LECs Reply Comments on Staff Proposal at 2.

<sup>26</sup> *See, e.g.*, AT&T Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 3-4; NaLA Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 4.

<sup>27</sup> Consumer Coalition Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 4; Low-Income Advocates Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 3-5.

<sup>28</sup> Consumer Coalition Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 6; Cox Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 2; Low-Income Advocates Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 8; Small LECs Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 5; *see also* AT&T Reply Comments on Staff Proposal at 4-5; CforAT Reply Comments on Staff Proposal at 3-4.

and TracFone oppose.<sup>29</sup> NaLA and TracFone argue that Phase 4 is a significant programmatic change that requires more record development.<sup>30</sup>

We agree with Low-Income Advocates, TURN, and GLI that the Commission should implement D.14-01-036 post haste.<sup>31</sup> Accordingly, Communications Division Staff will move forward with Phase 1, and work with the TPA to update the California LifeLine application with the goal to complete the update within three months of the issuance of this decision. Simultaneously, Staff will work with the TPA to integrate identity verification software into the intake process (Phase 2). Staff will also provide quarterly updates to the service list on the TPA's progress in integrating identity verification software.<sup>32</sup> Staff is authorized to amend the TPA contract to implement the changes to the application and enrollment processes, as well as the identity verification software.

At this time, we will not establish an implementation timeframe for Phase 3. As discussed in Section 3.1.2 below, this decision obligates California LifeLine service providers to provide an enrollment path for applicants without an SSN. Upon receiving notification that identity verification software is ready, service providers shall follow the directions provided by Staff for the implementation of identity checks for LifeLine applicants without an SSN.

---

<sup>29</sup> NaLA Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 3, 4, 5-6; TracFone Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 3-8.

<sup>30</sup> AT&T Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 4-5; NaLA Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 5-6; TracFone Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 3-8; *see also* Small LECs Reply Comments on Staff Proposal at 2-3.

<sup>31</sup> TURN and GLI Reply Comments on Staff Proposal at 3.

<sup>32</sup> We address parties' concerns about accessibility and privacy in Section 3.1.7.1 below.

Finally, we agree with NaLA and TracFone that more information is needed before shifting the entry point for California LifeLine's enrollment process from service providers to the TPA (Phase 4). Therefore, we will explore this issue further at a later date.

### **3.1.2. Application Update: Dual Pathway**

In updating the California LifeLine application to comply with D.14-01-036, we reiterate that we are not eliminating the pathway for applicants with an SSN to enroll in the program with their last four digits. Applicants will still be able to apply for the program using the last four digits of their SSN to receive the federal subsidy, as required by the FCC.<sup>33</sup> This decision updates California LifeLine to implement a second application pathway for applicants without an SSN.

To accomplish a dual application pathway for Californians with and without SSNs, the Staff Proposal recommends including a "no-SSN check box" in the online and hardcopy application.<sup>34</sup> Applicants who click or fill in the no-SSN check box would then receive instructions unique to the no-SSN pathway.

NaLA, the Small LECs, TURN and GLI, and TracFone generally support this dual application pathway because it does not create the impression that applicants who have an SSN have the option not to provide it.<sup>35</sup> We agree. Therefore, the California LifeLine application will be updated to include both the

---

<sup>33</sup> *Lifeline and Link Up Reform and Modernization* (Fed. Communications Com. (02/06/2012) 27 FCC Rcd 6656 at 6738, no. 191); *see also* 47 C.F.R. § 54.410(d)(2)(vi).

<sup>34</sup> Staff Proposal at 3.

<sup>35</sup> NaLA Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 2 (supporting measures to "ensure that applications that do not collect an SSN are the exception rather than the rule"); Small LECs Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 2; TracFone Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 1, 2 (supporting generally proposed enrollment adjustments); *see also* TURN and GLI Reply Comments on Staff Proposal at 3.

option for an applicant to provide the last four digits of their SSN and the option to select the “no-SSN check box.” As discussed in Section 3.1.1 above, this update is expected to be completed within three months of the issuance of this decision. Service providers that participate in California LifeLine must use the application offering the dual application pathway.<sup>36</sup> Furthermore, to maximize participation in both federal Lifeline and California LifeLine, applicants must provide complete and accurate information in their application. If applicants do not submit complete and accurate information on their application, they may receive a correctable denial under General Order 153, Section 4.1.3.

### **3.1.3. Application Update: Verbiage and Language**

The Staff Proposal recommends updating the online and hardcopy applications with the following introductory verbiage:

Applicants who have a Social Security Number (SSN) must enter the last 4 digits to confirm their identity. If you do not have an SSN, check the box below to certify that you do not have an SSN, as you will be required to provide alternative form(s) of identification to validate LifeLine Program eligibility.

The Staff Proposal also recommends verbiage accompanying the “no-SSN check box,” requiring eligible Californians without an SSN to certify that they “have never been assigned a Social Security Number.”<sup>37</sup> Applicants who click or fill in the no-SSN check box will then see a notification that states:

---

<sup>36</sup> Assurance recommends modifying the Staff Proposal so “that providers have the option – but not the obligation – to enable the enrollment of applicants without SSNs.” (Assurance Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 2.) Giving providers the option to deny enrolling applicants without SSNs would conflict with D.14-01-036 and the Moore Act. California LifeLine service providers must enable the enrollment of applicants with and without SSNs.

<sup>37</sup> Staff Proposal at 3.

A Social Security Number (SSN) or proof of U.S. citizenship is not required to receive California LifeLine Program benefits. The California LifeLine Program is available to anyone who lives in California, regardless of immigration status. The California LifeLine Program will not ask anyone for their immigration status. While SSNs are not required to enroll in the California LifeLine Program, alternative forms of identity documentation will be required to confirm your identity, which may increase application review and processing time.<sup>38</sup>

The Staff Proposal states that the applications will be translated into Spanish, Korean, Chinese, Japanese, Tagalog, and Vietnamese.<sup>39</sup>

The Small LECs support the introductory language because it “effectively communicates that there are two application paths: one for those with SSNs and another for those without SSNs.”<sup>40</sup>

For the verbiage accompanying the no-SSN check box, Low-Income Advocates argue that asking applicants to certify that they were never assigned an SSN is problematic for immigrants and applicants who cannot easily access their SSN, such as disaster survivors.<sup>41</sup> The Consumer Coalition provides additional examples of eligible Californians who may not have their SSN easily accessible, such as people who escaped domestic violence or are struggling with housing insecurity.<sup>42</sup> Low-Income Advocates, Consumer Coalition, and the

---

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>40</sup> Small LEC Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 2.

<sup>41</sup> Low-Income Advocates Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 2-3.

<sup>42</sup> Consumer Coalition Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 2-3.

Small LECs recommend modifying the check-box verbiage so that it states variations of “I cannot provide a Social Security Number.”<sup>43</sup>

Low-Income Advocates, Consumer Coalition, and the Small LECs also recommend modifications to the notification that appears after applicants click the no-SSN check box.<sup>44</sup> In general, these parties assert that their recommended modifications will eliminate confusing verbiage and encourage applicants with an SSN to provide the last four digits.

We appreciate the Staff Proposal and parties’ detailed verbiage recommendations because they provide a good starting point for the application update. When the new application first launches, the verbiage accompanying the check box shall read,

I attest I do not have a Social Security Number to provide. I understand that I will be required to submit alternative forms of identification document(s) so the LifeLine Program can authenticate my identity.

Additionally, we acknowledge that over time, verbiage in the application may need to be updated. Therefore, Staff may modify and update any of the verbiage in the application to respond to eligible Californians’ needs, comply with state and federal requirements, and guard against waste, fraud, and abuse, as needed. Any updates made will conform to the following criteria:

1. Verbiage shall encourage applicants to provide the last four digits of their SSN if they have one;

---

<sup>43</sup> Consumer Coalition Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 2; Low-Income Advocates Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 3; Small LECs Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 3.

<sup>44</sup> Consumer Coalition Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 3; Low-Income Advocates Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 3; Small LECs Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 2.



2. Verbiage shall be sensitive to the many different situations that may make it difficult or impossible for an eligible Californian to provide an SSN; and
3. Verbiage in all translations shall be clear.

**3.1.4. Assistance to Individuals Without  
Access to Their Social Security Number  
or Other Eligibility Documentation**

We recognize that applicants without access to their SSN or other eligibility documentation may require additional assistance with the enrollment process. Currently, the California LifeLine Call Center helps applicants sign up for the program. The Call Center is available from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Pacific Time, Monday to Friday, excluding federal holidays.

The Commission will consider expanding this assistance with a network of trusted partners, such as government agencies and/or authorized nonprofit organizations. This framework was discussed at the October 4, 2023, LifeLine Stakeholder Roundtable. Certain attendees expressed concerns about the proposal because of the time it would take to implement, administrative challenges, and accessibility concerns for applicants in rural areas.<sup>45</sup> We recognize these concerns while also recognizing the need to give California LifeLine applicants assistance that supplements what the TPA and service providers offer. The benefits of “an enrollment partner process where vulnerable populations can get assistance navigating LifeLine phone applications in trusted

---

<sup>45</sup> TURN and GLI Opening Comments on ACR at Appendix A (stating the “largest issue with this proposal is that creating a functional, statewide network that has partnering organizations accessible to every potential LifeLine applicant could easily require years of work, and many people could still be left without an easily accessible partner organization in their area”); Cox Opening Comments on ACR at 3; NLSLA Opening Comments on ACR at 4, n.2.

spaces like [Community-Based Organizations], clinics, and schools” was also recognized by Low-Income Advocates and CforAT.<sup>46</sup>

Therefore, to ensure that we provide sufficient enrollment assistance to applicants without access to their SSN or other eligibility documentation, Staff will develop a proposal for the trusted partner framework that addresses the following:

1. A definition of a trusted partner;
2. Review, approval, and renewal process for trusted partners;
3. A description of the authority and process trusted partners will have to enroll applicants;
4. A description of any materials and training trusted partners may receive;
5. A description of any new technology or other services California LifeLine program and applicants may need to work with trusted partners;
6. Any funding information; and
7. A description of how trusted partners will interact with service providers and the TPA.

Staff will gather feedback on this proposal through a workshop and/or comments. We will then examine Staff’s proposal and party feedback in a subsequent decision.

### **3.1.5. Program-Based Eligibility**

Californians can qualify for California LifeLine through either program-based or income-based eligibility. Program-based eligibility allows individuals to qualify for California LifeLine if one or more people in their household are

---

<sup>46</sup> Low-Income Advocates Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 8; *see also* CforAT Reply Comments on Staff Proposal at 2-3.

enrolled in certain assistance programs.<sup>47</sup> The Staff Proposal recommends continuing to expand database sharing with qualifying assistance programs to automatically confirm an applicant's eligibility.<sup>48</sup> Consumer Coalition and Low-Income Advocates recommend specifically expanding the list to include Sun Bucks, California Department of Social Services (CDSS)-administered cash-aid programs for immigrants, Affordable Connectivity Program (ACP), Pell Grant recipients, and families residing in Community Eligibility Provision school districts.<sup>49</sup>

Program-based eligibility has been an important tool in streamlining California LifeLine eligibility determination and fulfilling the Commission's legislative mandate under the Moore Act. California LifeLine does not have the same resources as the various programs administered by the California Health and Human Services Agency (CHHSA). These programs rely on staff within each county social services department to interview and review the documents and questionnaires submitted by applicants. In comparison, California LifeLine cannot leverage staff in each of California's 58 counties to interview applicants, verify documents, and enroll participants – it relies heavily on service providers

---

<sup>47</sup> Pages 7-9 of the Staff Report list the programs as Medicaid/Medi-Cal; Women, Infants and Children Program (WIC); National School Lunch Program (NSL); Stanislaus County Work Opportunity & Responsibility to Kids (StanWORKS); Welfare-to-Work (WTW); Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN); Tribal TANF; Bureau of Indian Affairs General Assistance; Head Start Income Eligible (Tribal Only); Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations; TANF/California Work Opportunity & Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs); Federal Veterans and Survivors Pension Benefit Program; Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP); Supplemental Security Income (SSI); Federal Public Housing Assistance or Section 8; CalFresh, Food Stamps, or Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP).

<sup>48</sup> Staff Proposal at 8.

<sup>49</sup> Consumer Coalition Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 9; Low-Income Advocates Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 9.

to enroll participants. Similarly, California LifeLine relies on the TPA to review the eligibility documents of each applicant.

For these reasons, program-based eligibility has been the primary enrollment path for applicants. The Commission has adopted an expansive list of qualifying assistance programs that are eligible for federal and state support and qualifying assistance programs supported only by the California LifeLine Fund.<sup>50</sup> Approximately 95.5 percent of California LifeLine program enrollments are verified through their participation in other social service programs. California LifeLine leverages the CHHSA enrollment processes to automatically verify eligibility.

It is important to note that enrollment in any state program that provides cash assistance or general relief is accepted by California LifeLine as proof that an individual qualifies under income eligibility. Thus, many of the programs that parties recommended, such as Cash Assistance for Program for Immigrants (CAPI), California Food Assistance Program (CFAP), Trafficking and Crime Victim Assistance Program (TCVAP), and Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA), qualify the applicant for California LifeLine benefits. These programs are administered by the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) and leverage the efforts of CDSS to review and enroll individuals without SSNs in their programs.

We note that California LifeLine is implementing changes to the existing application intake process by introducing benefit qualifying persons (BQP) as a form of eligibility. This will align the application intake process of the California LifeLine with the federal Lifeline program. BQP can be either a minor child or

---

<sup>50</sup> General Order (G.O.) 153 § 5.1.5; *see also* D.18-02-006 at 20.

dependent residing in the same address as the applicant. Currently, most households are eligible for California LifeLine based on the applicant's participation in a qualifying program like SNAP or Medicaid. However, this change will enable households with minors or other individuals in the households who have an SSN and meet one of the LifeLine eligibility requirements to enroll in the program.

Currently, the list of qualifying assistance programs for California LifeLine is updated via Staff resolution. Staff will continue to modify the list of qualifying assistance programs through this process. Accordingly, we modify General Order 153, Section 5.1.5 to reflect that approved qualifying assistance programs eligible for state and/or federal support may be modified through a Staff resolution that is adopted by the Commission. The Staff resolution will also include updates to General Order 153 incorporating the proposed changes and an index of the resolutions and decisions modifying General Order 153.

### **3.1.6. Income-Based Eligibility**

Approximately 4.5 percent of California LifeLine participants qualify via income-based eligibility. Applicants who use this eligibility pathway must provide documentation that their household income is at or less than 150 percent of the Federal Poverty Limit (FPL), such as the prior year's state, federal, or Tribal tax return, current income statement, or other document listed in General Order 153.<sup>51</sup> The Staff Proposal recommends continuing the current practice for applicants without an SSN.<sup>52</sup> For applicants who claim zero income, Staff proposes a new requirement that applicants provide either bank statements for

---

<sup>51</sup> G.O. 153 § 5.4.1.2.1.

<sup>52</sup> Staff Proposal at 9.

the past three consecutive calendar months or a notarized affidavit/self-declaration.<sup>53</sup>

Consumer Coalition, CforAT, and Low-Income Advocates argue that requiring three months of bank statements may be problematic for certain eligible Californians, and paying for notary service could be prohibitive.<sup>54</sup> These parties recommend accepting sworn statements from applicants or their employers instead. In contrast, Assurance recommends deleting the self-declaration option to reduce exposure to fraudulent applications.<sup>55</sup>

We are sensitive to the concerns raised by Consumer Coalition, CforAT, and Low-Income Advocates and can see how eligible Californians would struggle to provide bank statements or a notarized affidavit/self-declaration. However, we also share Assurance's concern about fraudulent applications. If we subsidize service providers without verifying that new applicants are eligible, the California LifeLine Fund could be jeopardized.

We, therefore, adopt a modified version of the Staff Proposal's recommendation. Any applicant seeking income-based eligibility, whether with an SSN or without, must provide documentation required by General Order 153 demonstrating that the applicant's total household income does not exceed the program's income eligibility limits. This is consistent with the documentation requirements of other social services programs.

---

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>54</sup> Consumer Coalition Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 7-9; Low-Income Advocates Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 8-9; *see also* CforAT Reply Comments on Staff Proposal at 3.

<sup>55</sup> Assurance Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 4.

For an applicant who claims zero income, we decline to adopt the Staff Proposal's recommendation to require a notarized affidavit/self-declaration. The proposal to require a notary provides limited benefits for reducing waste, fraud, and abuse. Moreover, it is appropriate to place the burden of verifying documentation on the TPA and California LifeLine, not on the applicant who needs assistance.

Finally, in an effort to continuously protect the integrity of the program, Staff will monitor for any abnormal increase in California LifeLine applicants seeking income-based eligibility and claiming zero income. If Staff identifies a significant increase, the Commission will be alerted, and the Commission may require that a service provider pause new enrollments to protect the California LifeLine Fund from waste, fraud, and abuse.

We also note that a trusted partner network, as discussed in Section 3.1.4 above, may help California LifeLine participants verify their income.

### **3.1.7. Guard Against Waste, Fraud, and Abuse**

To ensure that private service providers use public funds for public benefits, the Commission must exercise its power to guard against waste, fraud, and abuse. Below we discuss two relevant proposals for mitigating waste, fraud, and abuse: (1) integrating identification verification software into the TPA intake process; and (2) offering service providers a safe harbor in cases of fraudulent applications.

#### **3.1.7.1. Identity Verification Software Integration**

The Staff Proposal recommends accepting limited types of identity documents when the updated application first launches so CSRs can thoroughly,

accurately, and quickly process a possible increase in applications.<sup>56</sup> The types of acceptable identity documents can significantly expand if the Commission amends its TPA contract to pay for LexisNexis TrueID, according to the Staff Proposal.<sup>57</sup> The Staff Proposal also recommends that the Commission authorize a contract amendment, which would integrate TrueID into the TPA process and allow the TPA additional time to process applications for individuals without an SSN.<sup>58</sup>

In response to the Staff Proposal, multiple parties recommend allowing applicants to opt-out of using TrueID. Low-Income Advocates and CforAT question the practicality of asking applicants, some of whom may be vision impaired or experiencing other disabilities, to use a smartphone or digital device when applying for a low-income phone plan.<sup>59</sup> Low-Income Advocates, Consumer Coalition, and the Small LECs also identify concerns about data privacy.<sup>60</sup>

We appreciate the parties' comments. The integration of web technologies into public benefit programs raises legitimate accessibility concerns. The Commission must address these concerns under the Moore Act's mandate to

---

<sup>56</sup> Staff Proposal at 4. Initially, the Staff Proposal recommends limiting identity documents to (1) foreign passports; (2) consular identification cards; (3) Assembly Bill (AB) 60 driver's licenses; and (4) Mexican federal electoral cards.

<sup>57</sup> *Id.* at 4-5, Attachment A.

<sup>58</sup> *Id.* at 5. The current contract requires the TPA to process applications within three days. The current identity verification software being considered, TrueID, typically allows applicants up to seven days to complete checks.

<sup>59</sup> Low-Income Advocates Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 5-6; *see also* CforAT Reply Comments on Staff Proposal at 1-2.

<sup>60</sup> Consumer Coalition Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 5; Small LEC Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 4-5; *see also* Low-Income Advocates Reply Comments on Staff Proposal at 5.



make high-quality communications services available to the greatest number of Californians and Government Code Section 11546.7. Under Government Code Section 11546.7(a), the Commission must ensure that its public websites comply with the current Web Content Accessibility Guidelines.<sup>61</sup> We also recognize that the identity verification software being considered affords applicants additional time to access and use technology resources than the current process.<sup>62</sup>

Similarly, the Commission must address the parties' privacy and security concerns. Through this decision, we authorize the TPA and service providers to use identity verification software to verify applicants' identity documents. However, this authorization must remain consistent with Californians' constitutional right to privacy and the California Consumer Privacy Act.<sup>63</sup> All California LifeLine applicants, whether they provide an SSN on their application or not, deserve assurance that identity verification software will not infringe upon this right. The TPA and service providers may not use applicants' information for unauthorized purposes.<sup>64</sup>

The Commission reviewed LexisNexis Risk Solutions' U.S. Consumer Privacy Notice to verify compliance with the California Consumer Privacy Act.<sup>65</sup> Notably, LexisNexis provides a "Do Not Sell or Share My Personal Information"

---

<sup>61</sup> See <https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG21>.

<sup>62</sup> Staff Proposal at 5. The current contract requires the TPA to process applications within three days. The current identity verification software being considered, TrueID, typically allows applicants up to seven days to complete checks.

<sup>63</sup> Cal. Const., art. I, §1; Civil Code §§ 1798.100, *et seq.*

<sup>64</sup> In comments, some service providers say they rely heavily on SSNs to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse. (*See, e.g.,* TracFone Opening Comments on ACR at 1.) We do not authorize service providers to use applicants' SSNs to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse. Service providers shall only use applicants' SSNs to cross-reference enrollments and collect the federal subsidy.

<sup>65</sup> LexisNexis Risk Solutions, U.S. Consumer Privacy Notice available at <https://risk.lexisnexis.com/state-privacy-act-notice>.

option that allows consumers to “opt-out” of personal information being sold to certain third parties, as defined by applicable law.<sup>66</sup> LexisNexis also allows California residents to ask to limit the use or disclosure of sensitive personal information through a “Limit the Use of My Sensitive Personal Information” request.<sup>67</sup>

In addition, Staff reviewed LexisNexis’s GAO Privacy Impact Assessment to assess the business’s security measures. The Assessment states that LexisNexis and/or its partners do not maintain images collected for transactions after validation is completed. In other words, LexisNexis will not store applicants’ data after completing the identity check.

The TPA will integrate identity verification software with the accessibility and data privacy protections described above, and Staff will work closely with the TPA to monitor integration. Staff will also include accessibility and data privacy updates in its quarterly updates to the service list.

### **3.1.7.2. Safe Harbor**

Service providers request that the Commission provide them with a safe harbor, so they do not have to reimburse the California LifeLine Fund in situations where an application was deemed fraudulent. Assurance states that unless it has a safe harbor, it cannot provide applicants without an SSN with devices or services through its third-party agents.<sup>68</sup> AT&T also urges the Commission to adopt a safe harbor given the uncertainty in the implementation timeline, the unknown aspects of the Staff Proposal, and concerns that CSRs do

---

<sup>66</sup> LexisNexis Risk Solutions, Online Request Form available at <https://consumer.risk.lexisnexis.com/request#california>.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>68</sup> Assurance Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 3.

not conduct manual reviews accurately.<sup>69</sup> The Staff Proposal recommends denying the request for a safe harbor.<sup>70</sup>

We agree with the Staff Proposal. Offering service providers a safe harbor would undermine a key protection against waste, fraud, and abuse. Service providers must not be relieved of the duty to mitigate fraudulent applications as they enroll applicants in the program. Moreover, the implementation processes described in this decision, such as integrating TrueID, provide sufficient guardrails to reduce the program's vulnerability.

### **3.1.8. Data-Driven Implementation**

The Staff Proposal recommends that the TPA collect data to assess the effectiveness of changes to the enrollment process and opportunities for further refinement.<sup>71</sup> The Small LECs also recognize that Staff may need to make adjustments “to correct unintended consequences that may arise during the implementation of the enrollment plan.”<sup>72</sup> We agree with these points. Staff will work with the TPA to gather data for 18 months – an entire enrollment and renewal period. The TPA will gather data, including, but not limited to, the points listed in the Staff Proposal and Low-Income Advocates' comments.<sup>73</sup>

This will enable Staff to implement a transparent and iterative enrollment process. For this reason, Staff will also make non-confidential data collected by the TPA available upon request, so that stakeholders can also assess the effectiveness of changes and opportunities for further refinement. Staff may

---

<sup>69</sup> AT&T Opening Comments on the Staff Proposal at 3.

<sup>70</sup> Staff Proposal at 5.

<sup>71</sup> *Id.* at 6.

<sup>72</sup> Small LECs Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 2.

<sup>73</sup> Staff Proposal at 6; Low-Income Advocates Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 8.

propose to modify or update the enrollment and renewal process based on the data it receives via Staff resolution to the Commission, to the extent that such modifications and updates are consistent with D.14-01-036 and the Moore Act.

### **3.1.9. General Order 153**

This decision revises General Order 153 to reflect changes to the application and program-based eligibility. It also revises General Order 153 to make minor modifications. The proposed revisions to General Order 153 are attached to this decision as Appendix A.

### **3.2. Subsidizing Federal Support**

Because the FCC requires a four-digit SSN to receive the federal subsidy, California LifeLine providers that enroll applicants without SSNs will not receive this subsidy.<sup>74</sup> To address this issue, most parties recommend that the California LifeLine Fund make up for all loss of federal support.<sup>75</sup> Cox, TURN, and GLI assert that LifeLine participants without an SSN are “California-Only Subscribers” because they meet California’s program-based eligibility standards.<sup>76</sup> We agree.

California LifeLine has a broad list of qualifying assistance programs, such as the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program and the National School Lunch Program, which do not require an SSN. For that reason, California LifeLine applicants who do not provide an SSN will likely also be California-Only Subscribers. General Order 153 allows service providers to

---

<sup>74</sup> See *Lifeline and Link Up Reform and Modernization* (Fed. Communications Com. (02/06/2012) 27 FCC Rcd 6656 at 6738, no. 191); see also 47 C.F.R. § 54.410(d)(2)(vi).

<sup>75</sup> See, e.g., AT&T Opening Comments on ACR at 3; Low-Income Advocates Opening Comments on ACR at 10-11; NaLA Opening Comments on ACR at 2; TracFone Opening Comments on ACR at 8; see also TURN and GLI Reply Comments on Staff Proposal at 2.

<sup>76</sup> Cox Opening comments on ACR at 4-5; TURN and GLI Opening Comments on ACR at 13-14; see also G.O. 153 § 5.1.5.4.

collect lost federal support from the California LifeLine Fund for California-Only Subscribers commensurate with the subsidy available to a participant with an SSN and the same service.<sup>77</sup>

Because we envision applicants without an SSN meeting these criteria, the California LifeLine Fund can be used to make up for the lost federal support for participants without an SSN. However, Staff will use the data it receives during the implementation of this process to monitor service providers' claims for the federal makeup and the impact that providing a full federal makeup has on the California LifeLine Fund. This is consistent with D.14-01-036, which states that the Commission "will monitor enrollment in this California-only fund to determine whether any adjustments are warranted."<sup>78</sup>

### **3.3. Identity Verification**

The California LifeLine enrollment process requires service providers and the TPA to verify that applicants are the same individuals who meet program- or income-based eligibility criteria. This guards against waste, fraud, and abuse. However, this can be a challenge for applicants who do not have an SSN because many identity verification documents (*e.g.*, California driver's license, United States passport, *etc.*) require one.

The Staff Proposal recommends addressing this challenge by initially accepting a limited set of identity documents: foreign passports, consular identification cards, AB 60 driver's licenses, and Mexican federal electoral cards.<sup>79</sup> According to the Staff Proposal, accepting this limited set initially will enable the TPA's CSRs to review applications manually and adhere to current

---

<sup>77</sup> See G.O. 153 § 5.1.5.4.

<sup>78</sup> D.14-01-036 at 123.

<sup>79</sup> Staff Proposal at 4.

California LifeLine requirements.<sup>80</sup> However, once the TPA integrates the identity verification software, the TPA will be able to authenticate over four hundred types of government-issued identity cards.<sup>81</sup>

Low-Income Advocates recommends that the Commission broaden the list of acceptable identification beyond government-issued identity cards to account for potential access issues.<sup>82</sup> Both Low-Income Advocates and Consumer Coalition recommend that the Commission align the California LifeLine verification process with programs that have greater success in reaching low-income communities, such as Medi-Cal, Women Infants and Children Program (WIC), and the lapsed ACP.<sup>83</sup>

We acknowledge Low-Income Advocates' and Consumer Coalition's concerns. However, California LifeLine differs from Medi-Cal and WIC because the Commission relies heavily on private telecommunications companies to increase enrollment. The approach presented in the Staff Proposal balances the Commission's duties to make California LifeLine services accessible and guard against waste, fraud, and abuse. As such, Staff will implement the identity verification process described in the Staff Proposal.

#### **4. Summary of Public Comment**

Rule 1.18 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules) allows any member of the public to submit a written comment in any Commission proceeding using the "Public Comment" tab of the online Docket

---

<sup>80</sup> *Id.* at 3-4.

<sup>81</sup> *Id.* at 4-5, Attachment A.

<sup>82</sup> Low-Income Advocates Opening Comments on ACR at 11-13; *see also* Low-Income Advocates Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 4-5.

<sup>83</sup> Consumer Coalition Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 4; Low-Income Advocates Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 5.

Card for that proceeding on the Commission's website. Rule 1.18(b) requires that relevant written comments submitted in a proceeding be summarized in the final decision issued in that proceeding. No public comments relevant to the SSN issue appeared on the Docket Card.

## **5. Conclusion**

The Commission will implement D.14-01-036, so eligible Californians without an SSN may apply to California LifeLine. Because Californians without an SSN will likely qualify as California Only Subscribers, the California LifeLine Fund shall makeup for lost federal support consistent with General Order 153. Californians without an SSN shall present documentation to verify their identity at the time of the application.

## **6. Comments on Proposed Decision**

The proposed decision of President Alice Reynolds in this matter was mailed to the parties according to Public Utilities Code Section 311 and comments were allowed under Rule 14.3. Comments were filed on \_\_\_\_\_, and reply comments were filed on \_\_\_\_\_ by \_\_\_\_\_.

## **7. Assignment of Proceeding**

President Alice Reynolds is the assigned Commissioner and Robyn Purchia is the assigned ALJ in this proceeding.

## **Findings of Fact**

1. In 2012, the FCC revised the federal Lifeline program to require applicants to provide the last four digits of their SSN.
2. Some Californians who may qualify for California LifeLine do not have SSNs or access to their SSNs.

3. The Moore Act mandates that the Commission make communications services at affordable rates available to the greatest number of California residents.

4. D.14-01-036 extended eligibility to participate in the California LifeLine program to eligible Californians without an SSN, and only required that eligible Californians provide government-issued identification.

5. D.14-01-036 does not remove the existing pathway for Californians with an SSN to provide their last four digits to enroll in the program. California LifeLine applicants who provide their SSN comply with the FCC requirement and qualify for the federal subsidy, which amounts to a total of approximately \$100 million to \$150 million to California participants annually.

6. General Order 153 allows service providers to collect lost federal support from the California LifeLine Fund for “California-Only Subscribers.”

7. The Commission filed a waiver petition with the FCC in February 2015 to enable California participants who do not provide their SSN to receive the federal subsidy. The waiver petition is still pending.

8. The Commission operates California LifeLine through a TPA with funds collected through a surcharge on all telecommunications lines in California.

9. The California LifeLine Call Center helps applicants sign up for California LifeLine and is available from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Pacific Time, Monday to Friday, excluding federal holidays.

10. Most California LifeLine participants enroll through “Street Teams,” which work for individual service providers. Street Teams conduct in-person outreach and enrollment in areas more likely to have eligible participants.



11. The Commission has various methods to guard against waste, fraud, and abuse but does not use an applicant's SSN to determine waste, fraud, and abuse against the consumer.

12. The requirement that service providers reimburse California LifeLine for any subsidies related to fraudulent applications and the integration of identity verification software are two methods to address waste, fraud, and abuse.

13. Californians may qualify for California LifeLine through either program-based eligibility or income-based eligibility.

14. Program-based eligibility allows individuals to qualify for California LifeLine discounts if one or more people in their household are enrolled in certain assistance programs. This eligibility pathway is an important tool to streamline California LifeLine eligibility determinations and fulfill the Commission's legislative mandate under the Moore Act. Of all California LifeLine enrollments, 95.5 percent are verified via program-based eligibility.

15. When California LifeLine applicants provide their SSNs, California LifeLine uses the SSN to cross-check applicants' participation in other social service programs to automatically verify eligibility.

16. Income-based eligibility applies to Californians who can prove that their household income is at or less than 150 percent of the FPL. Applicants who use this eligibility pathway must provide documentation. Of all California LifeLine enrollments, 4.5 percent are verified via income-based eligibility.

17. The California LifeLine renewal period is 18 months.

### **Conclusions of Law**

1. The California LifeLine application should be updated to comply with D.14-01-036 and allow for two enrollment pathways for eligible Californians without an SSN and eligible Californians who have an SSN.

2. Staff should work with the TPA to integrate identity verification software into the intake process as quickly as possible.
3. Staff should amend the contract with the TPA to include all changes to the application, enrollment, and implementation of identity software.
4. Service providers should follow the directions provided by Staff for the implementation of identity checks for California LifeLine applicants without an SSN.
5. Service providers that participate in California LifeLine should use the application with a dual-application pathway.
6. Staff should have the discretion to modify and update the verbiage in the California LifeLine application to respond to eligible Californians' needs, comply with state and federal requirements, and guard against waste, fraud, and abuse.
7. Contracting with a software technology service to verify a diverse array of identification documents balances the Commission's duties to make California LifeLine services accessible and guard against waste, fraud, and abuse.
8. The integration of web technologies into public benefits programs raises legitimate accessibility, privacy, and security concerns. The Commission should address these concerns under the Moore Act's mandate to make high-quality communications services available to the greatest number of Californians, Government Code Section 11546.7, and the California Consumer Privacy Act.
9. All California LifeLine applicants, whether they provide an SSN on their application or not, deserve assurance that identity verification software will not infringe upon their right to privacy.
10. California LifeLine applicants should have program enrollment assistance that supplements what the TPA and service providers offer.

11. Staff should have the discretion to update the list of approved qualifying assistance programs eligible for state and/or federal support through the California LifeLine Fund.

12. All applicants seeking income-based eligibility, whether with an SSN or without, should provide documentation required by General Order 153 demonstrating that the applicant's total household income does not exceed the program's income limits.

13. To ensure service providers use the subsidies the Commission provides from the public surcharge for a public benefit, the Commission should guard against waste, fraud, and abuse.

14. The Commission should not offer service providers a safe harbor because not requiring service providers to reimburse subsidies connected to fraudulent applications would undermine a key protection against waste, fraud, and abuse.

15. The California LifeLine enrollment process should be transparent and iterative to California LifeLine applicants' needs.

16. Staff should make non-confidential data collected by the TPA available to the public upon request so stakeholders can assess the effectiveness of changes to the California LifeLine application process and allow opportunities for further refinement.

17. Staff should have discretion to modify or update the California LifeLine enrollment process based on the data it receives through the implementation of this decision, to the extent such modifications and updates are consistent with D.14-01-036 and the Moore Act.

18. The Commission should consider adjustments to the federal makeup mechanism if warranted.

19. The Commission should modify General Order 153 to reflect changes to the application, program-based eligibility, and other minor modifications.

### **O R D E R**

**IT IS ORDERED** that:

1. All California LifeLine service providers must comply with the policies, procedures, and rules adopted in this decision.

2. The Commission's Communications Division staff will update the California LifeLine program consistent with Decision 14-01-036, and as detailed in this decision, including a) updating the California LifeLine application to provide for a dual enrollment pathway, b) amending the Third-Party Administrator contract to correspond with all updated processes and software, c) providing quarterly updates to the proceeding's service list on status, d) working with the Third-Party Administrator to integrate an identity verification software and gather data for further improvements, e) developing a proposal for the trusted partner framework, f) updating the list of qualifying assistance programs supported by the California LifeLine Fund, and g) other monitoring efforts for future improvements.

3. The California LifeLine Fund shall be made available to make up for any loss of federal subsidy for those California LifeLine participants who enroll in the California LifeLine program without social security numbers.

4. The revisions to General Order 153 in Appendix A to this decision are adopted.

This order is effective today.

Dated \_\_\_\_\_, at Sacramento, California.

# **APPENDIX A**

## **Changes to General Order 153**

## GO 153 Revisions

5.1.5 Program-Based Criterion allows a Customer to enroll in California LifeLine based on participation by the Applicant or a member of the Applicant's Household in a qualifying assistance program. [Approved qualifying assistance programs eligible for state and/or federal support may be modified through a staff resolution that is adopted by the Commission.](#)

5.4.2.2 In the Application Form, the Applicant must provide: (a) The Applicant's full name; (b) the Applicant's full Residential address; (c) whether the Residential address is permanent or temporary, (d) the Applicant's billing address, if different from the Residential address;(e) the Applicant's date of birth;~~and~~ (f) [if the Applicant can provide a Social Security Number, the Applicant must provide](#) the last four digits of ~~the Applicant's~~ [their](#) Social Security Number, or the Applicant's Tribal identification number, if the Applicant is a member of a Tribal Nation and does not have a Social Security Number; [and \(g\) if the Applicant cannot provide a Social Security Number and is not a member of a Tribal nation, they certify that they cannot provide a Social Security Number and the Applicant will be required to provide a form of government-issued identification, as defined by the Commission, to confirm their identity.](#)

5.12.4 The enrollment request freeze shall not be imposed where the California LifeLine Administrator does not have access to the Applicant's name, Residential service address, and date of birth, and last four digits of the social security number, [where applicable](#), or Tribal Identification.