

**STATEMENT OF
COMMISSIONER MICHAEL J. COPPS, APPROVING**

Re: *In the Matters of Telecommunications Services Inside Wiring, Customer Premises Equipment, CS Docket No. 95-184; Implementation of the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992: Cable Home Wiring, MM Docket No. 92-260; Clarification of the Commission's Rules and Policies Regarding Unbundled Access to Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers' Inside Wire Subloop, WC Docket No. 01-338; Report and Order and Declaratory Ruling*

This item brings together two sets of inside wiring rules in the multi-tenant environment – the rules that apply to common carriers under Title II, and the rules that apply to cable operators under Title VI. But while the lineage of the rules is different, the underlying goal is very much the same – to bring the fruits of phone and cable competition to consumers who live and work in multi-unit buildings. The clarification of our inside wiring rules on both the telephone and cable sides address the legal and practical bottlenecks that may currently stand in the way of fledgling competition. I see no reason why Americans who happen to live or work in multi-unit buildings should have a narrower range of choices when it comes to phone, video and broadband services than Americans who live in single-family homes.

But while the underlying policies are important, I want to stress that they are not before us today. That is, the basic rules themselves are not at issue. Rather, this item deals with narrow implementation questions. On the phone side, the issue is the logistics of physically transferring the wiring from one provider to another. On the cable side, the issue is even narrower – whether wiring behind sheet rock is “physically inaccessible” under the specific standard set forth in our rules. In each case, today’s Order interprets our rules in a way that promotes competition and more choices for phone, internet and video customers. I am pleased to support it.