

Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED

MAY - 3 2002

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

In the Matter of )  
 )  
 Appropriate Framework for Broadband )  
 Access to the Internet over Wireline Facilities )  
 )  
 Universal Service Obligations of Broadband )  
 Providers )  
 )  
 Computer III Further Remand Proceedings: )  
 Bell Operating Company Provision of )  
 Enhanced Services; 1998 Biennial Regulatory )  
 Review – Review of Computer III and ONA )  
 Safeguards and Requirements )

CC Docket No. 02-33

CC Dockets Nos. 95-20, 98-10

COMMENTS

The Wireless Communications Association International, Inc. (“WCA”), by its counsel and pursuant to Section 1.405(a) of the Commission’s Rules, hereby submits its comments with respect to the Commission’s *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* (the “NPRM”) in the above-captioned proceeding.<sup>1</sup>

WCA is the trade association of the wireless broadband industry. Its members include service providers, equipment vendors, Commission licensees, technical consultants and others who offer or support the provision of wireless broadband service to, among others, residential customers, businesses and educators in markets across the United States. To address the specific needs of the growing number of wireless Internet service providers (“WISPs”) that utilize license-exempt spectrum, WCA recently formed the License-Exempt Alliance (the “LEA”), a coalition of service providers, equipment vendors and others who offer or support the provision

<sup>1</sup> FCC 02-42 (rel. Feb. 15, 2002).

of wireless broadband service via the 2.4 GHz and 5 GHz bands under Part 15 of the Commission's Rules. Both WCA and the LEA have a direct interest in the Commission's request for comment on whether the Commission should require providers of wireless broadband service to contribute to the Universal Service Fund ("USF").<sup>2</sup> As discussed below, WCA does not believe that imposing such obligations on wireless broadband providers is necessary or appropriate, and would in fact have the entirely counterproductive effect of creating additional regulatory roadblocks to timely, widespread deployment of wireless broadband service.

First, in its contemporaneous *Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* in CC Docket No. 96-45 *et al.*, the Commission has proposed to assess USF contributions on the number and capacity of connections provided to the public switched telephone network ("PSTN") rather than on a contributor's end-user revenues for interstate telecommunications services, as is currently done today.<sup>3</sup> Under that proposal, wireless broadband providers would not be required to make USF contributions, since wireless broadband services are not interconnected with the PSTN.

Moreover, even if the Commission were to change course and somehow devise a methodology that would require wireless broadband providers to contribute to the USF without running afoul of any relevant statutory limitations, there are a number of additional reasons why wireless broadband providers should be exempt from USF reporting and contribution obligations. The Commission's existing USF rules already include a *de minimis* exemption for smaller providers of telecommunications services "where the administrative cost of collecting contributions from a carrier or carriers would exceed the contribution that carrier would

---

<sup>2</sup> *NPRM* at ¶ 79.

<sup>3</sup> *Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service*, CC Docket No. 96-45 *et al.*, FCC 02-43, at ¶ 2 (rel. Feb. 26, 2002).

otherwise have to make under the formula for contributions selected by the Commission.”<sup>4</sup> It should be noted here that strict application of the Commission’s USF reporting and contribution requirements to wireless broadband providers would in all likelihood increase the costs of administering the USF fund substantially, since it would require USF oversight of smaller licensed providers and potentially thousands of license-exempt Part 15 operators who have only a limited number of subscribers and thus only a limited amount of subscriber revenue.<sup>5</sup> Given the Commission’s observation that “there are significant operational difficulties associated with determining the amount of . . . an Internet service provider’s revenues to be assessed for universal service purposes and with enforcing such requirements,”<sup>6</sup> imposing such additional burdens on the administration of the USF will entail significant costs with little or no countervailing benefit to the intended beneficiaries of the fund.

In addition, the Commission must not forget that wireless broadband technology is a nascent but critical component of the Commission’s broader effort to ensure that broadband service is deployed to all Americans on a reasonable and timely basis. For example, in its most recent Section 706 Report to Congress on the status of broadband deployment in the United States, the Commission cited statistics indicating that fixed wireless technology may account for as much as 15 to 20 percent of the U.S. market for “high-speed” Internet access service by the year 2005.<sup>7</sup> Such projections arise from the fact that cable modem and DSL services cannot or

---

<sup>4</sup> *Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service*, 13 FCC Rcd 11501, 11570 (1998) (the “1998 USF Report”). Specifically, the Commission’s Rules provide that entities whose annual universal service contribution is less than \$10,000 are not required to contribute to the USF. 47 C.F.R. § 54.708.

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g., Gurley, “Above the Crowd: Why Wi-Fi Is the Next Big Thing,” *Fortune* (Mar. 5, 2001) (discussing projected deployments of license-exempt devices).

<sup>6</sup> *1998 USF Report*, 13 FCC Rcd at 11569-70.

<sup>7</sup> *Inquiry Concerning the Deployment of Advanced Telecommunications Capability to All Americans in a Reasonable and Timely Fashion, and Possible Steps to Accelerate Such Deployment Pursuant to Section*

will not by themselves meet consumer demand for broadband, especially in rural and smaller markets.<sup>8</sup> The scenario is equally troublesome in larger urban markets, where highly consolidated cable multiple system operators (“MSOs”) and incumbent local exchange carriers (“ILECs”) are by far the dominant providers of broadband service, via wireline cable modem and DSL technologies, respectively.<sup>9</sup> The need for wireless broadband alternatives, in other words, remains as compelling as ever.<sup>10</sup>

---

*706 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, CC Docket No. 98-146, FCC 02-33, at ¶ 72 (rel. Feb. 6, 2002) (the “*Third Section 706 Report*”).

<sup>8</sup> Due to technical issues that limit the reach of cable modem and DSL service, many consumers have access to only one or the other. *See, e.g.*, “High-Speed Services for Internet Access: Subscribership as of June 30, 2001,” Federal Communications Commission, Common Carrier Bureau, Industry Analysis Division, Table 1 (August 2001) (attached as Appendix C to the *Third Section 706 Report*) (stating that “high-speed” cable modem lines in service outnumber ADSL high-speed lines by nearly two to one) (the “*2001 High-Speed Access Report*”). As a result of the paucity of competition between cable modems and DSL, some cable providers and ILECs have increased the price for residential broadband services since the recent demise of many competitive DSL providers. *See, e.g.*, Stern, “Comcast to Raise Internet Service Fees,” *The Washington Post*, at E11 (Sept. 19, 2001) (discussing Comcast’s cable modem service fee increase from \$32.95 to \$39.95 per month); Young, “Choose a Cable Modem or DSL?” at <http://interactive.wsj.com/archive> (Sept. 10, 2001) (“[A] meltdown among DSL competitors to the regional Bell giants has killed off much of the competition in DSL services. The collapse has driven many would-be customers away from start-ups for fear they might go out of business overnight – and played into the hands of the dominant cable and phone companies. . . . Broadband providers have been quick to take advantage of the situation. . . . On average, rates have gone up about \$10 per month.”); Plosinka and Coffield, “Top-Dollar DSL,” *Interactive Week*, at 14-15 (Feb. 19, 2001) (reporting that SBC Communications “is first out of the chute, quietly boosting standard residential [DSL] packages that sold for \$40 per month last fall to \$50,” and attributing this development to the fact that “[I]n the last six months, many competitive residential DSL providers have gone bankrupt, leaving consumers in many U.S. regions a single choice for DSL service: the local phone company.”).

<sup>9</sup> *See, e.g.*, *2001 High-Speed Access Report*, Tables 1 and 2.

<sup>10</sup> *See, e.g.*, *Inquiry Concerning High-Speed Access to the Internet Over Cable and Other Facilities; Internet Over Cable Declaratory Ruling; Appropriate Regulatory Treatment for Broadband Access to the Internet Over Cable Facilities (Declaratory Ruling and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking)*, GN Docket No. 00-185 and CS Docket No. 02-52, at ¶ 6 (rel. Mar. 15, 2002) (“We recognize that residential high-speed access to the Internet is evolving over multiple electronic platforms, including wireline, cable, terrestrial wireless and satellite. By promoting the development and deployment of multiple platforms, we promote competition in the provision of broadband capabilities, ensuring that public demands and needs can be met.”) (“*Cable Modem Declaratory Ruling and NPRM*”).

By the same token, “broadband services should exist in a minimal regulatory environment that promotes investment and innovation in a competitive market,”<sup>11</sup> and indeed the full potential of wireless broadband service will never be realized if wireless broadband providers are saddled with additional regulatory and economic obligations or, alternatively, regulatory and economic uncertainty that obstruct deployment of service in areas where it is needed the most. Commissioner Martin’s perspective on the *NPRM* bears repeating:

In this time of protecting the Internet from taxation – of “removing barriers and encouraging investment” – it is troubling to announce that we will consider placing new taxes on broadband providers. While announcing our consideration of the issue is not the same thing as enacting the obligations themselves, the uncertainty created by the announcement – *particularly for wireless, cable, and satellite providers* – will make deployment only more difficult.<sup>12</sup>

Commissioner Martin’s point is well taken where wireless broadband service is concerned. The competitive challenges facing wireless broadband are already considerable: in its *Third Section 706 Report*, for example, the Commission found that 5.2 million and 2.7 lines using cable modem and DSL technology, respectively, were in service by the end of June 2001, versus between 50,000 and 150,000 terrestrial fixed wireless high-speed lines during the same period.<sup>13</sup> By raising the question of whether wireless broadband providers will be required to contribute to the USF, the Commission has only added another layer of uncertainty to an industry

---

<sup>11</sup> *Id* at ¶ 5.

<sup>12</sup> Separate Statement of Commissioner Kevin J. Martin (approving in part and dissenting in part) re: *Appropriate Framework for Broadband Access to the Internet over Wireline Facilities; Universal Service Obligations of Broadband Providers (Notice of Proposed Rulemaking)*, CC Docket No. 02-33, FCC 02-42 (rel. Feb. 15, 2002), at 2 (emphasis added).

<sup>13</sup> *Third Section 706 Report* at ¶¶ 44, 50-51, 55.

that is already laboring under the threat that some of its spectrum might be reallocated for other services.<sup>14</sup>

Finally, the Commission has previously observed that in some cases the public interest analysis vis-à-vis who should be required to contribute to the USF “requires a more expansive examination of the goals of universal service.”<sup>15</sup> As Section 254(b) makes clear, those goals include the provision of “access to advanced telecommunications and information services” to “all regions of the nation.”<sup>16</sup> That, however, cannot be achieved if wireless broadband providers are handicapped by USF obligations that they are not equipped to meet. The simple fact is that wireless broadband providers with only a few hundred or even a few thousand subscribers do not have the extra personnel and other resources to devote to, among other things, identifying and tracking revenues that are subject to USF requirements, calculating their periodic USF contributions, preparing and submitting USF fund worksheets, adjusting subscriber billing practices to accommodate any pass-throughs of USF contributions, monitoring those billing practices to ensure compliance with the Commission’s rules, and responding to inevitable subscriber questions/complaints regarding USF pass-throughs. In turn, the diversion of existing personnel and resources from deployment and marketing of service to USF compliance puts wireless broadband providers at risk of losing existing and potential subscribers that are crucial to their survival.<sup>17</sup> WCA submits that it is impossible to square that result with either the goals

---

<sup>14</sup> See, e.g., *Amendment of Part 2 of the Commission's Rules to Allocate Spectrum Below 3 GHz for Mobile and Fixed Services to Support the Introduction of New Advanced Wireless Services, including Third Generation Wireless Systems*, 16 FCC Rcd 596, 619 (2001).

<sup>15</sup> *1998 USF Report*, 13 FCC Rcd at 11568.

<sup>16</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 254(b)(2).


<sup>17</sup> See, e.g., Weber, “Satellite Radio Stations’ Complaints Could Force FCC to Limit Wi-Fi,” *The Wall Street Journal*, at B1 (Apr. 1, 2002) (“The [FCC] wants to loosen constraints on cable and telephone companies. But if the goal is real competition, and not a cable-phone duopoly in broadband, they must not hamstring Wi-Fi and other wireless technologies.”).

of universal service or the Commission's policies on broadband deployment generally, and that the Commission therefore should eliminate any further uncertainty about the matter by issuing a clear and unequivocal statement that it will not proceed down that path.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS  
ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONAL, INC.

By:



Paul J. Sinderbrand  
Robert D. Primosch

WILKINSON BARKER KNAUER, LLP  
2300 N Street, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
202.783.4141

May 3, 2002

Their Attorneys