As a concerned consumer, I deplore the lack of broadband access in the United States. We compare unfavorably to South Korea, Germany, and western Europe. Currently, I live in the Chicago area where SBC/Ameritech discontinued the deployment of Project Pronto because they disagreed with an FCC ruling. AT&T Broadband is only now building out to my area. One wireline tech told me it was because of conflicts between AT&T Broadband and my county/town over the laying of aerial or underground cabling (hearsay).
As a consumer, I would like multiple choices to broadband and at a price point of less than $40/month, the lower the better.

As an ex-CLEC employee, I dislike the environment in which the ILECs and CLECs have created for delivering broadband.
ILECs strongarm the CLECs, and CLECs spent their capital way too fast. ILECs have control over their OSS, megaliths of undiscernable codes, acronyms, and dates. They control the delivery of the last mile UNEs, and they have NO incentive to deliver these lines with any semblance of quality (it's late, it doesn't work, they lose the paperwork, the order must be resubmitted, etc). I have chased down many loops for my customers only to be frustrated at the slowness at which the ILECs worked and the inaccuracies in the paperwork. They also charged exorbitantly high fees for colocation cages.

The CLECs (with prodding from the market analysts, VC's, and investment bankers) overspent their alloted capital. Instead of keeping a large rainy day fund, they all wanted to be the first to provide national coverage. It's disappointing there weren't more frugal CLECs, building out only when the other sides of the businesses were stable and use those profits to fund expansion. It's also a little known fact that most ISP's are borderline profitable or not profitable at all.

As an individual who has thought about what a better solution would look like, I believe the answer is to put a time limit on DSL, much like a patent. A patent would protect the initial investment, but eventually allow generics to provide the same benefit but at a lower cost (which should translate into lower costs to the consumer). An added caveat is that it cannot be subject to "extensions" to prolong the time limit (see AstraZeneca's purple pill). ILECs and CLECs shouldn't vie for the same DSL customer at the same time. The ILECs have the upperhand and will have the upper hand for years to come.
If DSL is "patented," the ILECs can build out and try and recoup their investment during, perhaps, the first 10 or 20 years.
This is one of their main complaints (that they'll spend billions of dollars on infrastructure only to sell it at a loss to CLECs).
The ILECs would work for their own benefit for the first 10-20 years. It would be up to them to recoup their investment for the time duration. After the requisite 10 or 20 years, they would be mandated to turn over the facilities and services to CLECs at a fair price. ILECs would be prevented from purchasing any CLECs for an additional 10 or 20 years. The ILECs would be barred from competing in DSL for a minimum of 2 years.
The service and facilities demarcations would need to be drawn out way in advance. The service and facilities records need to be clearly tracked with the intent of simplifying future OSS' and

knowing physically where the copper/fiber plant is in the ground. Likewise, the ILEC equipment used would need to be approved by CLECs. The transition period of the first year needs to be watched. The ILEC employees may not sabotage the equipment, facilities, or services. The cost of proven disruptions would be charged back to the ILEC and be subject to additional penalties. The ILEC employees who work on DSL delivery must move into a new company entity, such as what Ireland's Eircom did.

This proposal would need to be implemented on a small basis in one ILEC/CLEC state to see if this works (similarly to a beta test). There's plenty of other details that need to be ironed out at this stage.

Strong accounting to make sure the investments pay off for both the ILECs and CLECs. The accounting must be conservative, uniform, and follow GAAP standards with no yearly "one-time charges" (see Motorola's annual reports).

Broadband is needed for this country. However, the DSL deployment costs are very high, which the normal consumer does not appreciate. The key is to align the ILEC and the CLEC goals in the same direction, and hopefully, the U.S. can navigate a workable solution.

Note, the time period (10-20 years & 2 years) is not meaningful. It was used only to illustrate a point. Some economist/accountant would need to go through a real business case to determine the optimal time period.