

**Before the Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of )  
 )  
Restoring Internet Freedom ) WC Docket No. 17-108

**COMMENTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL RAPPORTEUR ON FREEDOM  
OF EXPRESSION AND THE SPECIAL RAPPORTEUR FOR FREEDOM OF  
EXPRESSION OF THE INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS**

David Kaye  
United Nations Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Opinion and Expression  
Clinical Professor of Law, University of California (Irvine) School of Law  
Director, International Justice Clinic  
401 East Peltason Drive Ste. 3800-C  
Irvine, CA 92697  
United States of America  
[www.freedex.org](http://www.freedex.org)  
(O): (949) 824-2427

Edison Lanza  
Special Rapporteur for Freedom of Expression of the Inter-American Commission  
on Human Rights  
Inter-American Commission on Human Rights  
Organization of American States  
1889 F St NW  
Washington, DC, 20006  
United States of America  
[www.oas.org](http://www.oas.org)  
(O): (202) 370-0816

August 17, 2017

## **I. Introduction**

1. The United Nations (“U.N.”) Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression David Kaye and the Special Rapporteur for Freedom of Expression of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (“IACHR”) of the Organization of American States Edison Lanza submit these comments in response to the Commission’s Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (“NPRM”) regarding proposed changes to existing rules and regulations governing broadband Internet access service providers.
2. David Kaye was appointed the U.N. Special Rapporteur in August 2014. U.N. Human Rights Council resolution 7/36, Section 3(c), mandates the Special Rapporteur to “make recommendations and provide suggestions” to U.N. member States concerning alleged or potential violations of the rights to freedom of opinion and expression, wherever they may occur.<sup>1</sup> The Special Rapporteur’s observations and recommendations are based on an analysis of international human rights law, including relevant jurisprudence, standards, and international practice, as well as relevant regional and national laws, standards, and practices. Mr. Kaye is also Clinical Professor of Law and Director of the International Justice Clinic at the University of California (Irvine) School of Law.
3. Edison Lanza was appointed Special Rapporteur by the IACHR in October 2014. His mandate was renewed for additional three years in July 2017. The Office of the Special Rapporteur for Freedom of Expression was created by the IACHR to stimulate a hemispheric defense of the right to freedom of thought and expression, considering its fundamental role in the consolidation and development of the democratic system and promotion of other human rights. Article 18 of the IACHR’s Statute mandates the Commission “to make recommendations to the governments of the [member] states [of the Organization of American States] on the adoption of progressive measures in favor of human rights in the framework of their legislation, constitutional provisions and international commitments, as well as appropriate measures to further observance of those rights”<sup>2</sup>.
4. The comments below have also been directly communicated to the U.N. Permanent Mission of the United States and the Organization of American States (OAS) Permanent Mission of the United States.

## **II. International Human Rights Framework for Assessing the Commission’s Obligations to Respect and Ensure Freedom of Expression**

5. Before explaining our concerns with the proposed rule changes, we wish to stress the obligation of the U.S. government – and by extension, the Commission – to respect and protect the right to freedom of opinion and expression under Article 19 of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Human Rights Council Res. 7/36 at ¶3(c), U.N. Doc. A/HRC/7/36 (Mar. 28, 2008).

<sup>2</sup> Statute of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights. Approved through Resolution No 447 adopted by the OAS General Assembly during its ninth period of sessions, held in La Paz, Bolivia, in October 1979.

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (“Covenant”)), which the United States ratified on 8 June 1992. The White House ratification statement reaffirmed that the right to freedom of expression is “inherent in a democracy.”<sup>3</sup> Ratification of the Covenant, the statement concluded, “underscor[es] [the United States’] commitment to these principles at home and abroad.”<sup>4</sup>

6. In particular, Article 19(2) protects the right to seek, receive, and impart information of all kinds, regardless of frontiers and through any media. This right to freedom of expression is also enshrined under Article 13(1) of the American Convention on Human Rights (“American Convention”), which grants individuals the “right to freedom of thought and expression,” and Article IV of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man (“American Declaration”), which grants every individual the “right to freedom of investigation, of opinion, and of the expression and dissemination of ideas, by any medium whatsoever.” It bears mention that Article XIII of the American Declaration establishes the right to take part in the “life of the community, to enjoy the arts, and to participate in the benefits that result from intellectual progress, especially scientific discoveries”.
7. Under Article 19(3) of the Covenant, restrictions on the right to freedom of expression must be “provided by law,” and necessary for “respect of the rights or reputations of others” or “for the protection of national security or of public order (ordre public), or of public health and morals.” Article 13(1) of the American Convention permits similar restrictions. Permissible restrictions on the Internet are the same as those offline.<sup>5</sup>
8. Under Article 2(1) of the Covenant, the United States has an obligation “to respect and to ensure to all individuals within its territory and subject to its jurisdiction” the rights recognized under the Covenant “without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.”
9. Under Article 2(2) of the Covenant, the United States “undertakes to take the necessary steps ... to adopt such laws or other measures as may be necessary to give effect” to the right to freedom of expression. In addition to legislation and judicial decisions, the adoption of “administrative” and “educative” measures may also be required to fulfill the United States’ positive obligation to respect and ensure freedom of expression.<sup>6</sup>
10. Read together with Article 19(2) of the Covenant, Article 2 imposes on the United States an obligation to protect individuals within its territory and jurisdiction from any undue or

---

<sup>3</sup> White House Statement on the Ratification of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 5 June 1992.

<sup>4</sup> *Id.*

<sup>5</sup> Human Rights Council, Report of the Spec. Rapporteur on the Promotion and Protection of the Right to Freedom of Opinion and Expression, Frank La Rue, A/HRC/17/27, para. 69.

<sup>6</sup> U.N. Human Rights Comm., General Comment No. 31 para. 7, The Nature of the General Legal Obligation Imposed on States Parties to the Covenant, U.N. Doc. CCPR/C/21/Rev.1/Add.1326 (May 26, 2004).

discriminatory interference with their freedom to seek, receive, and impart information of all kinds.

11. The U.N. Special Rapporteur has explained that net neutrality – the “principle that all Internet data should be treated equally without undue interference” – is critical to States’ parties’ fulfillment of their Article 19(2) and Article 2 obligations. The right to seek, receive, and impart information without discrimination presumes the freedom to access and “choose among information sources.”<sup>7</sup> In the digital age, this freedom is “meaningful only when Internet content and applications of all kinds are transmitted without undue discrimination or interference by non-State actors, including [broadband] providers.”<sup>8</sup>
12. The IACHR Special Rapporteur has also recognized that the principle of net neutrality is “a necessary condition for exercising freedom of expression on the Internet pursuant to the terms of article 13 of the American Convention.”<sup>9</sup> This principle ensures that “free access and user choice to use, send, receive or offer any lawful content, application or service through the Internet is not subject to conditions, or directed or restricted, such as blocking, filtering or interference.”<sup>10</sup> The Special Rapporteur has explained that net neutrality facilitates and maintains innovation, interoperability, and open standards, giving “all people the ability to innovate on the Internet, creating content, applications, and services in a decentralized manner, without the need for authorizations, bureaucracies or permits.”<sup>11</sup>
13. In their 2011 Joint Declaration on freedom of expression, the Special Rapporteurs – together with the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe Representative on Freedom of the Media, and the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Expression and Access to Information – affirmed that international human rights law prohibits “discrimination in the treatment of Internet data and traffic, based on the device, content, author, origin and/or destination of the content, service or application.”<sup>12</sup> Additionally, the Declaration emphasized that broadband and edge providers “should be required to be transparent about any traffic or information management practices they employ, and relevant information on such practices should be made available in a form that is accessible to all stakeholders.”<sup>13</sup> In their 2014 Declaration, they reaffirmed the need for States to “actively promote universal access to the Internet regardless of political, social, economic or cultural differences, including by respecting the principles of net neutrality.”<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Human Rights Council, Report of the Spec. Rapporteur on the Promotion and Protection of the Right to Freedom of Opinion and Expression, David Kaye, U.N. Doc. A/HRC/35/22, para. 23.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.*

<sup>9</sup> Inter-Am Comm'n H.R., Office of the Spec. Rapporteur for Freedom of Expression, Standards for a Free, Open, and Inclusive Internet, OEA/Ser.L/V/II CIDH/RELE/INF.17/17, para. 11.

<sup>10</sup> *Id.*

<sup>11</sup> *Id.*, at para. 26.

<sup>12</sup> Joint Declaration on Freedom of Expression and the Internet (2011), para. 5(a).

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*, para. 5(b).

<sup>14</sup> Joint Declaration on Universality and the Right to Freedom of Expression (2014), para 1(h)(iii).

14. The full texts of the human rights instruments and standards outlined above are available online and can also be provided upon request.

### III. Concerns Regarding the Possible Repeal or Weakening of Bright Line Rules Against Blocking, Throttling, and Paid Prioritization

15. The NPRM proposes to “keep, modify, or eliminate”<sup>15</sup> the following rules that the Commission adopted on 12 March 2015, under its Open Internet Order.<sup>16</sup>

- a. **The No Blocking Rule**, which prohibits providers of broadband internet access service (“broadband providers”) from blocking “lawful content, applications, services, or non-harmful devices, subject to reasonable network management;”<sup>17</sup>
- b. **The No Throttling Rule**, which prohibits broadband providers from “impair[ing] or degra[ding] lawful Internet traffic on the basis of Internet content, application, or service, or use of a non-harmful device, subject to reasonable network management;”<sup>18</sup> and
- c. **The No Paid Prioritization Rule**, which prohibits broadband providers from engaging in network traffic management that “directly or indirectly favor[s] some traffic over other traffic ... either (a) in exchange for consideration (monetary or otherwise) from a third party, or (b) to benefit an affiliated entity.”<sup>19</sup>

16. We are concerned that the repeal or weakening of these rules will permit broadband providers to block or throttle Internet traffic associated with competing services, or charge more for access to certain types of Internet data at regular speeds, such as video streams. Particularly concerning is the prospect of paid-prioritization schemes, where broadband providers speed up prioritized content and force all other non-prioritized content into slow lanes. These schemes effectively give preferential treatment to services that enjoy commercial arrangements or other ties to the broadband provider, or grant faster access to the highest bidder.

17. We are concerned that the ensuing “hierarchy of data” stifles innovation among edge providers that are unaffiliated with the broadband provider, whom will be forced to bear higher costs to obtain access on the broadband provider’s network.<sup>20</sup> We are also particularly concerned about the chilling effect on digital innovation among startups or smaller edge providers, which will be inherently less equipped to pay for priority

---

<sup>15</sup> In the Matter of Restoring Internet Freedom, WC Docket No. 17-108, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 32 FCC Rcd 4434, (2017) (“NPRM”), para. 76.

<sup>16</sup> *Protecting and Promoting the Open Internet*, GN Docket No. 14-28, Report and Order on Remand, Declaratory Ruling, and Order, 30 FCC Rcd 5601 (2015) (“Open Internet Order”).

<sup>17</sup> *Id.*, at para. 15.

<sup>18</sup> *Id.*, at para. 16.

<sup>19</sup> *Id.*, at para. 18.

<sup>20</sup> A/HRC/35/22, *supra* note 7, at para. 24.

compared to their more established competitors. The threat to innovation may entrench the dominant position of broadband providers and affiliated services and weaken market competition, potentially creating an Internet where end users are subject to “higher costs or lower quality of service” when they seek to access Internet content and applications of their choice but that have been relegated to slow lanes.<sup>21</sup>

18. The prospect that end users may also be manipulated or otherwise “compelled to engage with content that has been prioritized without their knowledge or input” also raises serious questions about their freedom to choose among information sources without undue interference or discrimination.<sup>22</sup>

#### IV. Concerns Regarding the Proposed Repeal of the Internet Conduct Standard

19. The NPRM also proposes the repeal<sup>23</sup> of the **Internet Conduct Standard**, which prohibits broadband providers from “unreasonably interfer[ing] with or unreasonably disadvantag[ing] end users’ ability to select access, and use broadband Internet access service or the lawful Internet content, applications, services, or devices of their choice, or (ii) edge providers’ ability to make lawful content, applications, services, or devices available to end users,” subject to reasonable network management.<sup>24</sup>
20. We wish to emphasize that the Internet Conduct Standard in its existing form provides the Commission with the discretion to monitor – and if necessary regulate – interferences with net neutrality that unduly impair the right to seek, receive, and impart information online. We are concerned that the elimination of such discretion will remove regulatory oversight in a rapidly changing digital environment where broadband and edge providers continue to experiment with and roll out new methods of managing and pricing access to Internet traffic and content.
21. In particular, zero rating, the practice of not charging for the use of Internet data associated with a particular application of service even while other services or applications are subject to metered costs, is a development that the Commission should continue to monitor closely under the Internet Conduct Standard. The impact of zero rating on freedom of expression is the subject of ongoing debate: On one hand, zero rating arrangements may enhance Internet access and spur digital innovation in areas that otherwise lack robust connectivity infrastructure; on the other, they may also trap less privileged end users in “permanently walled online gardens.”<sup>25</sup> In any case, zero rating programs should not replace public policies aimed at bridging the digital divide. Such partial-access solutions are at odds with ‘internet universality’: the notion that internet

---

<sup>21</sup> *Id.*

<sup>22</sup> *Id.*

<sup>23</sup> NPRM, *supra* note 15, at para. 73.

<sup>24</sup> Open Internet Order, *supra* note 16, at para. 136.

<sup>25</sup> A/HRC/35/22, *supra* note 7, at para. 24; *see also* OEA/Ser.L/V/II CIDH/RELE/INF.17/17, *supra* note 9, at paras. 29 – 31.

regulation and development should be human rights-based, open, accessible, and reflect multi-stakeholder participation.<sup>26</sup>

22. While it is arguable that the Internet Conduct Standard should be tightened or clarified, we are concerned that its wholesale repeal will remove a critical safeguard of net neutrality and, by extension, the freedom of expression of end users.

## V. Concerns Regarding the Possible Repeal or Weakening of the Transparency Rule and its 2015 Enhancements

23. Furthermore, the NPRM proposes to “keep, modify, or eliminate”<sup>27</sup> the **Transparency Rule** established in 2010, which requires broadband providers to “publicly disclose accurate information management practices, performance, and commercial terms of [their] broadband Internet access services sufficient for consumers to make informed choices regarding use of such services and for content, application, service, and device providers to develop, market, and maintain Internet offerings.”<sup>28</sup>
24. The NPRM also seeks guidance on how it should treat<sup>29</sup> the Commission’s **2015 enhancements to the Transparency Rule**, which, among other things, required additional disclosures concerning prices, other fees, data caps and allowances, privacy policies, network traffic inspection and information dissemination, network performance characteristics, and user-based and application-based network practices.<sup>30</sup> The 2015 enhancements also require “a mechanism for directly notifying end users if their individual use of a network will trigger a network practice, based on their demand prior to a period of congestion, that is likely to have a significant impact on the end user’s use of the service.”<sup>31</sup>
25. We are concerned that the weakening of current disclosure requirements will undermine public access to information regarding broadband providers’ network management practices and commercial terms of service. The relevant disclosures enable end users and other relevant stakeholders – such as other domestic regulatory bodies, civil society, academics, and international organizations – to understand how the exercise of freedom of expression is restricted or regulated on broadband providers’ networks, and to seek clarification, raise public awareness, or challenge such restrictions where appropriate. Such disclosures are therefore fundamental to the public’s right to receive information protected under Article 19(2).

## VI. Conclusion

---

<sup>26</sup> OEA/Ser.L/V/II CIDH/RELE/INF.17/17, *supra* note 9, at para. 13.

<sup>27</sup> NPRM, *supra* note 15, at para. 89.

<sup>28</sup> Preserving the Open Internet, GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52, Report and Order, 25 FCC Rcd 17905, (2010) (“2010 Open Internet Order”), para. 54.

<sup>29</sup> NPRM, *supra* note 15, at para. 91.

<sup>30</sup> Open Internet Order, *supra* note 16, at paras. 164 – 169.

<sup>31</sup> *Id.*, at para. 171.

26. We appreciated the importance of the Commission's mandate to protect Internet freedom, and to consider a variety of regulatory approaches that might help achieve this aim. Nonetheless, we express serious concern with the proposed rule changes, which may significantly roll back protections for net neutrality and unduly interfere with freedom of expression online in the United States. We urge the Commission to take all steps necessary to conduct a comprehensive review of its proposed rule changes, and ensure their compliance with applicable international standards as outlined in this submission.
27. We will also be happy to discuss our concerns and other issues concerning the NPRM at the Commission's convenience. Please feel free to contact us at [dkaye@law.uci.edu](mailto:dkaye@law.uci.edu) and [elanza@oas.org](mailto:elanza@oas.org).



David Kaye

United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Promotion and Protection of the Right to Freedom of  
Opinion and Expression



Edison Lanza

Special Rapporteur for Freedom of Expression of the Inter-American Commission on Human  
Rights