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Two years ago today, Congress passed the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law. This law is a big deal. It made a $65 billion investment to ensure that everyone, everywhere in the United States has access to broadband. Nothing in our history has come close to the commitment this legislation makes to address equitable access to the opportunities of the digital age. This unprecedented investment in broadband features both deployment initiatives like the Broadband Equity Access and Deployment program at the Department of Commerce and affordability efforts like the Affordable Connectivity Program here at the Federal Communications Commission that has helped more than 21 million low-income households get online and stay online. But Congress knew that more than just this set of deployment and affordability initiatives was needed. That is why in Section 60506 of the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law Congress directed this agency to prevent and eliminate digital discrimination.

This section is the most definitive statement in the law that our work to close the digital divide is not done until we reach those who are unconnected, underserved, and overlooked. It reads: “It is the policy of the United States that, insofar as technically and economically feasible, subscribers should benefit from equal access to broadband.”

To ensure this happens, Congress directed the FCC to “adopt rules to facilitate equal access to broadband internet access service.” What should these rules involve? Again, Congress was clear. The law directs us to develop rules “preventing digital discrimination of access based on income level, race, ethnicity, color, religion, or national origin; and identifying necessary steps for the Commission to take to eliminate discrimination.”

This statutory language is powerful. It is also remarkable because it represents the consensus of a bipartisan majority of Congress. Today we give these words meaning.

But before we get into the details, let me tell you what we have done over the last two years that lead us to this moment here today. We built an extensive record through our rulemaking process. We created the Task Force to Prevent Digital Discrimination that conducted eight listening sessions in places far and wide, including Baltimore, Maryland; Los Angeles, California; and Topeka, Kansas. At each, we were able to hear from the community, listen to people fighting digital discrimination on the ground, and learn about experiences with industry.

 We also rechartered the Communications Equity and Diversity Council and broadened its lens, looking beyond media to explore diversity and equity across the broader technology and communications sector. Because the only way we were going to create rules that prevent and eliminate digital discrimination is by hearing from everyone who has a role to play, including state, local, and Tribal governments, public interest advocates, and providers.

We took this it all in. We listened to communities across the country. We read the record from front to back. It demonstrated that there are gaps in access for low-income, rural, Tribal, and minority communities. It showed that the digital divide often tracks the residential redlining that came into existence under the National Housing Act of 1934. It showed that many of the communities that lack adequate access to broadband today are the same areas that suffer from longstanding patterns of residential segregation and economic disadvantage.

Back to the statute. The language is broad. But Congress was explicit—these rules have to “facilitate equal access to broadband.” As part of this goal, Congress also told us we need to prevent and eliminate digital discrimination of access. That means our rules would miss the mark if they cover just discriminatory intent because we would fall short of meeting our statutory obligation to “facilitate equal access” to broadband. As a result, we define digital discrimination to include disparate treatment and disparate impact. I believe this approach puts us both on the right side of history and the right side of the law.

 These rules are strong. When you consider Congress explicitly directed us to “prevent” and “eliminate” digital discrimination of access, they had better be. But I would also argue that they are fair and reasonable.

Let me explain why. We do more than just define digital discrimination. As the law directs, we create a new, dedicated pathway for digital discrimination complaints. But we have created a process that is aimed at finding solutions that work for all parties. And if that is not feasible, our Enforcement Bureau will step in with the entire enforcement toolkit at its disposal to seek remedies.

 As the law requires, we accept genuine reasons of technical and economic feasibility as valid reasons why it may not be possible for equal access to a provider’s network. We will review those defenses carefully and thoughtfully on a case-by-case basis.

 But that is not all. We are standing up a process by which providers can request guidance from us to make sure they stay on the right side of the law. On top of this, we also offer guidance to help solve these problems before they even get to the FCC. This is because the law directed us develop model policies and best practices for preventing digital discrimination that can be adopted by states and localities. So we had our Communications Equity and Diversity Council take the lead developing these best practices and they are included in what we adopt today.

Like I said at the start, Section 60506 is a big deal. It is the first bipartisan civil rights law focused on the digital age. I am grateful to so many in the civil rights community who have helped us give it meaning and the companies that worked with us to improve our process. I am also grateful to my colleagues Commissioner Starks for his input on developing an Office of Civil Rights, and Commissioner Gomez for her input on creating a point person in the agency on these matters and identifying reporting mechanisms going forward.

 In addition, I want to thank the staff across the agency who worked on this effort, including Bradford Berry, Emily Caditz, Callie Coker, Lisa Edwards, CJ Ferraro, Jesse Goodwin, Trent Harkrader, Heather Hendrickson, Ed Krachmer, Aurelie Mathieu, Jodie May, Jaime McCoy, and Kiara Ortiz from the Wireline Competition Bureau; Alejandro Roark, Samantha Steen, D’wana Terry, and Sanford Williams from the Task Force to Prevent Digital Discrimination; Diane Burstein, Darryl Cooper, Aaron Garza, Suzy Rosen Singleton, and Kimberly Wild from the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau; Pamela Gallant, Rosemary McEnery, Patrick McGrath, and Keith Morgan from the Enforcement Bureau; Hillary DeNigro from the Media Bureau; John Blumenschein, David Furth, Nicole McGinnis, and James Wiley from the Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau; Susannah Larson and John Lockwood from the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau; Chin Yoo, Malena Barzilai, Michael Janson, Andrea Kearney, Jacob Lewis, Rick Mallen, William Scher, Anjali Singh, and Michele Ellison from the Office of General Counsel; Joycelyn James from the Office of Communications Business Opportunities; Mark Azic, Stacy Jordan, Eugene Kiselev, Kenneth Lynch, Eric Ralph, and Maciej Wachala from the Office of Economics and Analytics; Edward Bartholme, Chelsea Fallon, Jean Kiddoo, Kimia Nikseresht, and Steven Rosenberg from the Broadband Data Task Force; and Edward Carlson from the Office of International Affairs.