

REMARKS OF FCC CHAIRMAN TOM WHEELER

AS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY MORITZ COLLEGE OF LAW

SYMPOSIUM ON “THE FUTURE OF INTERNET REGULATION”

MARCH 27, 2015

Thank you all for that warm welcome. Thank you, Professor Shane and Dean Michaels for inviting me. It’s great to be here, and I’m not just saying that because I spent 5 of the previous 8 weekdays testifying before Congress.

It’s always great to be in Columbus. I chose to deliver my first policy speech as FCC Chairman at OSU, partly to send a message that my agenda would be driven by the interests of people across America, not special interests in Washington. Largely, I spoke here because I’m a proud Buckeye.

Back then, I was new on the job and, frankly, didn’t have a whole lot to discuss. I no longer have that problem.

Today, I want to visit about the Commission’s efforts to protect and promote the greatest platform for competition the world has ever known— no, not the College Football Playoff. The Playoff would be the SECOND greatest innovation of modern history.

Of course, I’m talking about the free and open Internet. Today I would like to think out loud with you about the choices that government agencies must make.

One of the most fascinating aspects of my job is that I sit in an office to which I used to go to advocate on behalf of my client. The issues sure seem simpler when you’re an advocate for one narrow position than when you’re making a decision that is in the broad public interest.

The job of government is to decide based on the facts and the record in a media-saturated era when issues are advocated in apocalyptic terms. One day demonstrators at my home kept me from leaving my driveway with a huge banner saying “Free the Internet.” About a hundred feet from the driveway a stop sign (and multiple others in the neighborhood) has affixed to it a sticker causing it to say “STOP Wheeler from braking [sic] the Internet.” If only choices in the real world were as simple as those opposing positions.

The Commission’s Open Internet Order rejects these two purported choices as false. We can have both an Open Internet and continued investment in bigger and better broadband. We can have an Open Internet and light-touch regulation that encourages innovation and consumer choice. The Commission’s Open Internet Order rests on a basic choice – whether those who build the networks should make the rules by themselves or whether there should be a basic set of rules and a referee on the field to throw the flag if they are violated.

Let me explain.

The open Internet allows innovation to come from anyone, anywhere. All you need is a computer and a broadband connection and you can introduce new products, services, or ideas to a global audience – and this is the key part – without asking anyone’s permission. The marketplace – not some gatekeeper – gets to pick winners and losers. This simple reality has allowed inventors in dorm rooms and garages to launch start-ups that toppled powerful incumbents to become world-leading companies.

For more than a decade, the Commission has grappled with the issue of how best to preserve Internet openness. The question has not been whether to protect and promote an open Internet; that has been the bi-partisan policy of Republican and Democratic Chairs alike--but how best to achieve that objective. Last month, the FCC moved to settle this dispute once and for all, adopting the strongest open Internet protections ever proposed by the Commission.

I believe that the result will be overwhelmingly positive for consumers and innovators. I also firmly believe it is a positive as well for network operators who

now have regulatory certainty with no impact on their consumer revenue streams.

Against this order we have heard an avalanche of arguments. We have been told that our rules are too clear and too uncertain; that we are too much fixated on the past and too much focused on the future; that we will protect the profits of incumbent broadband providers and that we will threaten them.

What should we make of these contradictions; this fog of advocacy? We should conclude that the biggest broadband providers in the land have one objective – to operate free from control by their customers and free from oversight from government.

If they succeed, then, for the first time in America’s communications history, private gatekeepers will have unfettered power to control commerce and free expression.

The true choice is between protecting the gatekeepers or protecting consumers and insurgents who wish to boost the greatest strength of America’s economy, namely innovation.

To understand the problem, it is necessary to understand the power of the biggest ISPs. Consider this simple fact: About three-fourths of American households have zero or one choice for high-speed, wired broadband to their homes. No choice or one choice does not make an attractive marketplace from a consumer’s perspective. As gatekeepers, the ISPs have the power to decide what travels between consumers and the Internet; they have all of the tools necessary to block, degrade or favor some content over others. In fact, there is no doubt that broadband providers have the *ability* to disadvantage companies that need to use their transmission services to distribute products and services to the public.

You remember the story of Robin Hood when he encountered Little John; Robin Hood wanted to cross the river but Little John controlled the passage from one side to another. Unlike Robin Hood, today’s consumers lack the power to fight back against ISPs. Consumers have few choices – wireless is not a full substitute – and they face barriers in exercising the choices that may exist.

In 2010, the Commission found that broadband providers have the incentive and the ability to block, degrade or unfairly favor content. And the D.C. Circuit upheld that conclusion, affirming the Commission's conclusion that broadband providers could decide to exercise their ability to the disadvantage of consumers and innovation.

The biggest ISPs also have abilities that go beyond denying, degrading, or delaying material that must pass over their last mile transmission systems. They have what may well be an equally significant power. That is the power to establish norms for their industry, the customs of the trade that often will have more practical significance than the positive laws they are required to obey. The norms will manifest themselves in standard terms in contracts with consumers—for example, mandatory arbitration clauses—or with contracts with other Internet merchants—for example, interconnection fees. Or in the quality of customer service. They can determine the culture of innovation, shaping the expectations of consumers and innovators alike.

In these circumstances, what could possibly go wrong?

Most of the approximately four million people who expressed themselves in the FCC's Open Internet proceeding apparently thought that plenty could go wrong. We received a lot of elaborate, well-reasoned and carefully supported submissions in the Open Internet proceeding. But most of the four million filings were simple expressions of preference. How to understand them? I believe by and large they were saying two things. First, they were very concerned that there be effective rules to protect a free and open Internet. And, second, they know that the ISPs have the upper hand.

The record in front of the Commission presented two fundamental choices, both of which I concluded were false choices.

First, must we choose between an open Internet and continued investment in bigger and better broadband networks? I will say frankly that this issue weighed heavily upon me during the course of our proceeding. But I concluded, in part because of the history of regulation of the wireless industry, that an open Internet

would actually boost the incentive for network investment because consumer demand will increase when networks are open.

Some ISPs say investment will suffer if an open Internet is mandated. Many ISPs, including companies like Sprint, T-Mobile, Frontier, Google Fiber and hundreds of rural companies and small, competitive wireless companies say they can build their businesses within the sort of light-touch rules we have adopted. Even Comcast, AT&T and Verizon who oppose what we did continued to invest in their networks even knowing the rule was coming. In fact, AT&T and Verizon did so very dramatically in the Commission's recent AWS-3 spectrum auction, which attracted more than \$41 billion in net bidding, more than double the previous record.

Most importantly, ISP share prices were not adversely affected by the contemplation and adoption of the regulations. Very curious. Perhaps real investors, many of them, these days, professional investors, aided by professional securities analysts, concluded that the regulations wouldn't do any damage. They might even have concluded that the regulations would do more good than harm. Just as I believe.

Following a determination that some type of regulation is needed, the issue becomes, what type? This raised the next supposed dilemma in the form of an asserted requirement to choose between two principles that the Commission has supported on a bi-partisan basis for more than a decade. On the one hand, the Commission has clearly wanted to ensure that broadband connections are not treated like old-fashioned utilities; the kind of telephone companies that your grandparents remember. Rather, it wanted to dispense with unnecessary regulatory costs and, more important, provide strong incentives for network investment. That was the basis of important Commission decisions in 2002, 2005 and 2007.

On the other hand, the bi-partisan support for an open Internet has been equally clear. From an important speech by the then-Chairman in 2004, through the adoption of a formal policy statement in 2005, through enforcement actions, to the imposition of merger conditions and the requirement that Verizon's

extremely valuable spectrum used for 4G services be subject to openness requirements, the Commission has supported a simple principle: The Commission must assure a future of an open Internet.

The Commission's concerns were based on fact, not speculation. In 2008, a Republican-led Commission found that Comcast was throttling legal peer-to-peer traffic.

In 2013, when Verizon was asked in open court if it wanted to restrict access through special commercial terms, its counsel replied, "I'm authorized to state by my client today that but for these rules we would be exploring those commercial arrangements."

Last summer, we saw disputes over the exchange of traffic between Netflix and major ISPs, and accompanying complaints from Netflix consumers that the Internet service they'd paid for was not adequately delivering the content they wanted.

Last summer, Verizon Wireless also announced plans to limit "unlimited" data customers if the subscriber went over a certain amount of data used in a month. I wrote Verizon inquiring about this policy and it was ultimately reversed.

We are told today that the principles of limited regulation and an open Internet are irreconcilable; that the quest to protect an open Internet is seeking a solution to a problem that does not exist.

I thought carefully about this and again I decided that this was, as well, a false choice. The Commission majority agreed. It concluded that by following the terms of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, exercising the power given to us expressly by Congress, we could protect the Open Internet without using utility-style regulation.

And that is what we have done, constructing Title II for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century built on the strong foundation laid by the treatment of wireless voice. I was there when Title II was *sought* by the wireless industry. I know that the application of Title II to wireless voice services was followed by hundreds of billions of dollars of investment, great innovation and, of course, enormous benefits to consumers.

In other words, we have two false choices and one real choice: Whether to stand with incumbents or with consumers and Internet innovators.

From this perspective, the order the Commission adopted last month can be understood as a calculation of risk and its distribution. The ISPs sometimes say that they no longer have any intention of engaging in any of the conduct that the Open Internet order seeks to prevent. Moreover, they and their allies have argued vociferously that there were very few incidents that could be thought of as violations of net neutrality. In other words, net neutrality violations should be understood to be very low probability events. The logic of their position is, why undertake any cost to insure against these low probability events?

The response of the FCC majority can be understood this way. Whether or not they are low probability (and we were not convinced that they would be), if they occur, they are likely to be highly consequential. As a result, the majority thought it was prudent to secure some insurance. Let me draw an analogy. There is a low probability that you'll get in an automobile crash. But the state requires you to have insurance to protect the other person in case that low probability occurs. The same concept that applies to the Interstate applies to the Internet. I am convinced we have been able to achieve this insurance at low cost for two reasons. First, we have not precluded broadband providers from doing anything that, at least in the most recent round of pleadings, they indicated they intended to do. Second, through the use of forbearance authority and after-the-fact regulatory tools, we have minimized any direct regulatory costs that a law abiding ISP would incur.

At the end of the day, the job of a government agency is to make choices. The rules in the Open Internet Order are solidly based on the record before us. But I also know from my real-life experience as an entrepreneur that gatekeeper power is real.

Once upon a time, I was part of a new pay-per-view video service. When we'd seek to get on a cable system the first question the cable operator would ask was "What's our cut?" Access had to be purchased.

And years later, as a venture capitalist in the early days of mobile data, I learned that little had changed. The only way a wireless carrier would let an application provider on its network was for a cut of the revenue. Mobile networks were a walled garden. Again, access had to be purchased.

These personal experiences get at why the Internet has been such a game-changer, and why openness is essential.

Let's look ahead. We are on the verge of a new reality for video – but it won't happen without Internet openness.

Many people are unhappy with cable rates, and customers are increasingly frustrated and looking for alternatives.

New competition to the traditional cable bundle is being introduced like never before. DISH launched its \$20-a-month Sling TV service last month. Sony just announced a streaming TV option for PlayStation owners. CBS now offers \$8-a-month streaming service. Starting next month, HBONow will be available without cable TV. The over-the-top mainstays, Netflix, Hulu, and Amazon Prime continue to grow, and Apple is expected to launch its own streaming service later this year. But these streaming ventures only work if the network is open.

When you sweep aside all the hypotheticals and look at the world we're living in, you come back to the real choice we face. The Internet is the most powerful platform for innovation, commerce and free speech in human history. We can have a cop on the beat to enforce common sense rules of the road that ensure Internet openness for consumers and innovators, without any retail rate regulation or similar rules that would hamper investment in faster networks. Or we can have the people who operate the networks making the rules for the Internet and leave decisions about blocking, throttling, and prioritizing traffic to them.

Put in simpler terms: we can have an open Internet policy that advances the interests of tens of thousands of innovators, and millions of Internet users; or we can have an Open Internet policy that advances the interests of a few powerful companies.



The choice is clear. And I'm proud that the Commission has made the right choice, adopting strong, sustainable, and sensible open Internet protections.

So what are some of the practical effects of our new Open Internet rules?

Perhaps most significantly, innovators have certainty that they will be able to get on the networks owned by Comcast, AT&T, Verizon, and other ISPs. Openness without fear of pay-to-play is the key to innovation.

Investors in Internet start-ups no longer have to worry that their capital will be siphoned off unfairly by the big network providers, or that the companies they are investing in might not be able to reach consumers. The online content-applications-services space is where competition is possible and is thriving, and we now have assurance that if someone attempts to put up barriers – tolls or otherwise – that would harm this sector, the FCC is positioned to intervene.

One final prediction: the FCC's new rules will be upheld by the courts. The DC Circuit sent the previous Open Internet Order back to us and basically said, "You're trying to impose common carrier-like regulation without stepping up and saying, 'these are common carriers.'" We have addressed that issue, which is the underlying issue in all of the debates we've had so far. That gives me great confidence going forward that we will prevail.

When that happens, the big winners will be America's consumers and innovators and our economy as a whole. We will finally have strong, enforceable rules that assure that Internet remains open now, and into the future. That is, I am confident, the right choice.

Thank you.