

Media Contact:

Anne Veigle
anne.veigle@fcc.gov

For Immediate Release

**FCC SEEKS COMMENTS ON COMPETITIVE ACCESS TO
BROADBAND IN APARTMENT AND OFFICE BUILDINGS**

***Tees Up Questions on Revenue Sharing Agreements Between Building Owners and
Providers, and on Exclusive Wiring and Marketing Arrangements***

WASHINGTON, September 7, 2021—The Federal Communications Commission today announced it is inviting a new round of comments in a proceeding examining competitive access to broadband in apartment and office buildings. The new call for comments aims to better understand how the Commission can promote increased competition, consumer choice, and lower prices for Americans living and working in these buildings.

“Across the country throughout the pandemic, the need for more and better broadband access has never been clearer,” **said Acting Chairwoman Jessica Rosenworcel**. “With more than one-third of the U.S. population living in condos and apartment buildings, it’s time to take a fresh look at how exclusive agreements between carriers and building owners could lock out broadband competition and consumer choice. I look forward to reviewing the record.”

The Wireline Competition Bureau is seeking comment on three main issues related to broadband deployment in Multiple Tenant Environment (MTE) buildings. The first focuses on revenue sharing agreements between MTE owners and service providers, and whether such arrangements inhibit entry by competitive providers or affect the price and quality of service options for consumers. Second, the FCC seeks comment on exclusive wiring arrangements and whether such arrangements do not preclude access to new entrants or inhibit choice for tenants. The FCC also asks for input on whether exclusive marketing arrangements create confusion and lower choices for tenants.

###

Media Relations: (202) 418-0500 / ASL: (844) 432-2275 / Twitter: @FCC / www.fcc.gov

This is an unofficial announcement of Commission action. Release of the full text of a Commission order constitutes official action. See MCI v. FCC, 515 F.2d 385 (D.C. Cir. 1974).