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The Commission adopts and seeks comment on three Notices of Proposed Rulemaking concerning: the Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service’s (Joint Board) recommendation on comprehensive reform of the high-cost Universal Service support mechanism; the elimination of the “Identical Support” rule; and the merits of using reverse auctions in distributing high-cost support to eligible telecommunications carriers (ETCs). I am pleased that the Commission today initiates all three NPRMs simultaneously as I have long believed that Universal Service reform must be done in a comprehensive, systematic manner. I write here to express my views on all three proceedings.

I continue to believe that there are a variety of ways to promote Universal Service and at the same time ensure the sustainability and integrity of the fund. I believe much would be accomplished if the Commission were to include broadband on both the distribution and contribution side of the ledger; eliminate the Identical Support rule; and increase its oversight and auditing of the high-cost fund. Additionally, Congressional authorization to permit the assessment of Universal Service contributions on intrastate as well as interstate revenue would be a valuable tool for supporting broadband.

That being said, the Joint Board made an assortment of recommendations of its own. I agreed with some of them and not with others. In my view, the most important part of the recommendation is its inclusion of broadband as part of USF for the 21st Century. My views on the recommendation are explained in further detail in my statement that accompanied the Joint Board’s recommendation and which is attached as an appendix to the NPRM adopted today. I believe the recommendation merits further action by the Commission, and therefore, I am pleased to support the NPRM initiated today.

Let me briefly take this opportunity to thank the members of the Joint Board who worked tirelessly on the difficult task of developing a comprehensive proposal for the FCC’s consideration. I congratulate Chairwoman Tate for her leadership in bringing these recommendations to the Commission. We are all deeply indebted to her co-chair, Commissioner Ray Baum of Oregon, for his tireless and energetic work in shepherding the Joint Board toward
consensus on many items. And I want to pay tribute to the always visionary yet practical efforts of the indefatigable Billy Jack Gregg whose endless good counsel is sewn throughout the Joint Board’s recommendations.

With regard to the NPRM on the Identical Support rule, it is clear to me that the costs of investing and maintaining wireless and wireline infrastructure are inherently different. I believe that wireless can and should be a part of Universal Service, but the time has come to put an end to the irrational and costly system of supporting wireless carriers based on the cost of wireline incumbents. I therefore am supportive of the tentative conclusion that we eliminate this rule. The NPRM is particularly important because it seeks comment on how best to replace this rule and in particular the methodologies by which CETCs should be able to recover costs for Universal Service support purposes.

The NPRM on reverse auctions is much more of a mixed bag. On the one hand, I support the Commission’s decision to seek comment on the merits of reverse auctions as a method for distributing high-cost Universal Service support. The Joint Board spent a great deal of time examining the use of reverse auctions, but I must say that our review raised in my mind many more questions than it answered. For instance, how do we ensure that the winning bidder provides adequate quality of service? What happens if the winner later decides it is no longer profitable to continue its operation? And who will be responsible for establishing the rules and enforcing them? Ironically, this purportedly market-based approach strikes me as hyper-regulatory. For these reasons, I must dissent from the NPRM’s tentative conclusion that the Commission should develop an auction mechanism to determine high-cost support. I believe that the options I outlined above—including broadband as part of Universal Service; elimination of the Identical Support rule; stepped-up accounting oversight; and Congressional action to enable Universal Service collections on an intrastate as well as an interstate basis provide a more effective and less disruptive approach to Universal Service reform.

The good news is that these three items, particularly the Joint Board recommendation, put the urgent need for comprehensive Universal Service reform squarely in front of the Commission. I hope the FCC will deal with these recommendations expeditiously and comprehensively. This is no place for piecemeal actions. We need to think expansively and creatively about implementing the path-breaking broadband decision that has now been presented to us. This country desperately needs a comprehensive broadband strategy. The Joint Board recommendation provides the opportunity for the FCC to move toward such a strategy, working with our own rules and making suggestions to Congress in those areas where legislative action may be required to ensure such a strategy. I am looking forward to working with my colleagues in order to turn these proposals into workable solutions.