BEFORE THE
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of

Inquiry Concerning the Deployment of	)	
Advanced Telecommunications	)	
Capability to All Americans in a Reasonable	)	GN Docket No. 04-54
and Timely Fashion, and Possible Steps	)	
to Accelerate Such Deployment	)	
Pursuant to Section 706 of the	)	
Telecommunications Act of 1996	)	

REPLY COMMENTS OF COMCAST CORPORATION

Joseph W. Waz, Jr.
COMCAST CORPORATION
1500 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19102

James R. Coltharp
COMCAST CORPORATION
2001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20006

Terry S. Bienstock
Thomas R. Nathan
COMCAST CABLE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
1500 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19102

James L. Casserly
Ryan G. Wallach
Stephanie L. Podey
WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER LLP
1875 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-1238

May 24, 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY 1

II. BROADBAND SERVICES ARE BEING DEPLOYED RAPIDLY IN A DYNAMIC AND INCREASINGLY COMPETITIVE MARKETPLACE. 2

A. Status of Broadband Deployment. 2

B. Competition in the Broadband Marketplace Is Thriving. 6

III. THE COMMISSION SHOULD CONTINUE TO PURSUE THE DEREGULATORY POLICIES THAT HAVE STIMULATED BROADBAND INVESTMENT, INNOVATION, AND COMPETITION. 10

IV. CONCLUSION 14

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington DC 20054

In the Matter of

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 706 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996	)	GN Docket No. 04-54

REPLY COMMENTS OF COMCAST CORPORATION

Comcast Corporation ("Comcast") hereby replies to comments submitted in response to the Federal Communications Commission's ("FCC" or "Commission") Notice of Inquiry ("*Notice*") in the above captioned proceeding.[1]

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

The first-round comments provide detailed and compelling evidence that broadband services are being deployed on a reasonable and timely basis throughout the country. The record further demonstrates that the broadband marketplace is already intensely competitive and will become even more so as additional service providers implement their diverse technological strategies for bringing broadband services to consumers.

The evidence clearly shows that cable operators and digital subscriber line ("DSL") providers are competing aggressively for customers and that, after expanding availability and cutting prices, DSL providers are quickly closing the gap in market share. In addition to fierce competition between cable operators and telephone companies, competition from wireless and

---

[1] *In re 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 706 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Notice of Inquiry, 19 FCC Rcd. 5136 (2004) ("*Notice*").

satellite broadband is growing. Moreover, new broadband technologies that will bring still more choice to consumers are attracting significant investments and are being readied for market. Certainly one major factor in this extraordinary marketplace -- and consumer -- success is the Commission's steadfast policy of regulatory restraint.

Despite this evidence, a handful of commenters claim that broadband services are not being deployed fast enough and that the Commission should now intervene in the marketplace. These proposals for Commission intervention are unnecessary and counterproductive. Some would diminish incentives for competitors to invest in "last mile" broadband facilities. Others would have the Commission substitute its judgment for the judgment of the marketplace as to what services consumers want and service providers should provide. Instead, the Commission should remain committed to rely to the greatest extent feasible on the power of robust, intermodal, facilities-based competition -- rather than command-and-control regulation -- to deliver the services that American consumers want and need.

II. BROADBAND SERVICES ARE BEING DEPLOYED RAPIDLY IN A DYNAMIC AND INCREASINGLY COMPETITIVE MARKETPLACE.

A. Status of Broadband Deployment.

The majority of commenters share Comcast's assessment that broadband services are being deployed to all Americans on a reasonable and timely basis. Commenters from varying industries describe broadband service deployment as "spreading at a rapid pace,"[2] "rapidly increasing,"[3] and "ubiquitous."[4] These observations are supported by strong evidence.

---

[2] National Rural Telecommunications Cooperative ("NRTC") Comments at 1.

[3] Sprint Corporation ("Sprint") Comments at 4.

[4] National Cable & Telecommunications Association ("NCTA") Comments at 2.

NCTA reports that, by year's end, cable Internet service will be available to nearly 100 million cable subscribers, representing 91% of all the homes passed by cable systems, and that the seven largest cable MSOs "have substantially completed the process of ubiquitously deploying broadband Internet capability, or will achieve that objective by the end of this year."[5] DSL providers continue to make substantial investments to increase their reach and improve broadband service. For example, Verizon reports that it has "invested more than $600 million since the beginning of [2003]" to add more than 10 million more DSL-qualified lines by the end of 2003 and "with the goal of adding another 7 million DSL-qualified lines in 2004."[6] As AT&T notes, "[o]verall, the current RBOC DSL coverage is estimated to be approximately 75-80% of total RBOC lines."[7]

Although the leading suppliers of broadband services are cable operators -- who have invested over $85 billion to bring facilities-based competition to the marketplace -- and telephone companies, the record also makes clear that wireless providers and satellite companies are currently a source of competition and are poised to develop into even more vigorous competitors. Wireless offers particularly promising modes of broadband service; several different technologies offer innovative ways to provide consumers with high-speed Internet access.[8] For example, Wireless Fidelity services ("Wi-Fi") have expanded tremendously the

---

[5] *Id.* at 6.

[6] *See* Verizon Comments Ex. B at 2.

[7] AT&T Corp. ("AT&T") Comments at 6.

[8] *See* Verizon Comments at 9 ("Recent evidence confirms that fixed wireless continues to be a viable broadband alternative for many customers, and is likely to grow significantly in the future."); United States Telecom Association ("USTA") Comments at 5 (describing wireless broadband launches by Verizon Wireless, AT&T, and Nextel); General Communication, Inc. ("GCI") Comments at 6 (indicating that "when inclement weather disrupts phone or mail services [in remote Alaska communities], residents may still have [wireless broadband] service as a link for vital communications"); *see also* Michael K. Powell, Chairman, FCC, *Remarks at the FCC Wireless Broadband Forum* 2 (May 19, 2004) (describing wireless broadband as the "Holy Grail"), *available at* http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-247411A1.pdf.

reach of broadband networks, and new unlicensed services such as Wi-Max are being promoted as an alternative to the last-mile wired connections of cable and telephone companies.[9] The Wireless Communications Association ("WCA") describes its efforts to have the Commission convert the MDS/ITFS spectrum into a new broadband services medium, and emphasizes that MDS/ITFS operators "are deploying wireless broadband service in many communities throughout the United States."[10] General Communication, Inc. ("GCI") discusses how it utilizes unlicensed wireless technology, interconnected with satellite backhaul, to provide high-speed services to Alaskan bush communities.[11]

Nor is broadband service availability limited to densely-populated metropolitan areas. Several commenters, including the National Exchange Carrier Association ("NECA"), GCI, the Rural Iowa Independent Telephone Association ("RIITA"), the Independent Telephone & Telecommunications Alliance ("ITTA"), and the Organization for the Promotion and Advancement of Small Telecommunications Companies ("OPASTCO"), point out that broadband service to rural areas is being expanded and upgraded.[12] NECA, a trade association representing small rural carriers, states that its members "continue to roll out DSL at an impressive rate" even though they operate in sparsely populated areas and must face "widely varying geographic, demographic, and technological challenges."[13] GCI, a facilities-based

---

[9] *See* Wireless Communications Association International, Inc. ("WCA") Comments at 12 ("[R]ecent trade press reports confirm that the wireless industry is becoming increasingly enthusiastic about Wi-Max's potential to facilitate standards-based, interoperable wireless broadband products that yield economies of scale, pricing and performance levels, unachievable by proprietary approaches." (internal citations omitted)); *see also* AT&T Comments at 4.

[10] WCA Comments at 2-3, 5 (stating that, although it is possible to deliver wireless broadband service in a variety of frequency bands, it is "well settled that MDS and ITFS spectrum in the 2.5 GHz band is optimally suited for delivery of a secure, reliable and ubiquitous wireless broadband service to all regions of the country").

[11] *See* GCI Comments at 3.

[12] *See also* Covad Communications ("Covad") Comments at 11-12; NCTA Comments at 7-8.

[13] NECA Comments at 1-2; *see also* ITTA Comments at 2-3; OPASTCO Comments at 2.

provider that has successfully deployed broadband services to over 220 communities in Alaska, including many rural areas, has helped Alaska become "the second most 'wired' state in the country, with Alaskans using the Internet more than any other state on a per-capita basis."[14] GCI explains that its "broadband penetration rates . . . demonstrate that the status of the deployment of high-speed and advanced services to consumers living in rural areas is significant" and notes that its services are available at "a price on par with that paid for comparable service by urban consumers in Anchorage."[15] RIITA, which represents approximately 130 rural ILECs, comments that "rural independent companies have done an excellent job providing advanced telecommunications in Iowa" and that 75% of its members who responded to its survey report that they offer broadband services -- a sharp increase from the 27% who were doing so only a few years ago.[16] In the same vein, ITTA explains that, "[i]n the past few years, there has been a marked acceleration in deployment of advanced services in ITTA members' rural areas."[17] The Rural Independent Competitive Alliance ("RICA") reports that its members are "at the forefront of offering advanced telecommunications capabilities and services."[18]

The rapid pace of broadband service deployment is matched by the impressive rate of consumer adoption. Although a majority of households still opt for narrowband Internet service, broadband subscriptions are growing rapidly, and represented fully one-third of residential household Internet subscriptions at the end of 2003.[19] Independent studies, while not entirely consistent with one another, indicate widespread broadband availability and rapid growth in

---

[14] GCI Comments at 4.

[15] *Id*. at 4-5.

[16] RIITA Comments at 2-3.

[17] ITTA Comments at 3.

[18] RICA Comments at 2; *see also* OPASTCO Comments at 5.

[19] *See* NCTA Comments at 10.

subscribership.[20] This torrid growth is expected to continue, with the percentage of Internet homes using broadband expected to reach 50% by year-end 2005.[21]

B. Competition in the Broadband Marketplace Is Thriving.

In addition to demonstrating that broadband services are being rapidly deployed and that new technologies are on the short-term horizon, the record also demonstrates that competition in the broadband marketplace is thriving and resulting in benefits to consumers. A major incumbent LEC reports that "more bandwidth is available to more Americans at lower cost than ever before."[22] A DSL provider observes that the introduction of "new services at higher speed tiers reflects the[] changing dynamics in the race to make broadband available to different market segments."[23] And a coalition of wireless broadband providers reports that they "continue to speed the pace of broadband deployments to unserved and underserved areas."[24]

Importantly, as SBC puts it, "the broadband marketplace is no longer just a two-horse race between cable modem service and DSL."[25] A Commission report cited by SBC indicates that "two or more broadband providers have high-speed lines in service in about 75 percent of

---

[20] *See, e.g.,* John B. Horrigan, Ph.D., *Pew Internet Project Data Memo*, Apr. 2004, at 1 ("*Pew Report*") (finding that 39% of adult Internet users have high-speed Internet access at home, an increase of 60% since March 2003) *available at* http://www.pewinternet.org/reports/pdfs/PIP_Broadband04.DataMemo.pdf. Note that the *Pew Report* focuses on users, not households.

[21] By year end 2005, Morgan Stanley expects there will be 70 million residential Internet customers, equivalent to 61.4% of households, and of these customers, approximately half will be broadband customers. *See* NCTA Comments at 11 (citing Morgan Stanley Dean Witter, *Broadband Cable Second-Quarter Review*, Telecom-Cable Industry Overview, Aug. 29, 2001, at 41).

[22] Verizon Comments at 6; *see also* SBC Comments at 9-10.

[23] Covad Comments at 5.

[24] WCA Comments at 2.

[25] SBC Comments at 10. Many commenters share the view that several alternative broadband technologies have considerable promise. *See, e.g.,* Verizon Comments at 8-14; USTA Comments at 4-6; NCTA Comments at 8; SES Americom, Inc. Comments at 2-4; WCA Comments at 2-3; Current Communications Group, LLC ("Current") Comments at 4-7; EchoStar Satellite LLC ("EchoStar") Comments at 4-6.

the country's zip codes, and three or more broadband providers are offering high-speed service in 58 percent of zip codes."[26]

Certainly the most intense competition currently comes from the two most widespread technologies -- DSL and high-speed cable Internet. Verizon, for example, reports that, in the second half of 2003, DSL providers added over 1.6 million customers, only 400,000 fewer than cable operators.[27] AT&T notes that DSL providers are achieving parity with cable Internet service and the four Bell companies have all experienced significant DSL growth rates.[28] As SBC's Chairman Ed Whitacre explained in November 2003, "within [SBC's] footprint, we are at parity with cable modem."[29] By the end of the first quarter of 2004, after the Bell companies had cut prices for DSL services, new broadband customers reportedly had divided evenly, opting for DSL as often as they did for high-speed cable Internet service.[30] Covad reports that DSL customers have increased nearly 7000% since 1999 and explains that, with respect to new subscriber additions, cable Internet service and DSL are competing head-to-head and are

---

[26] *See* SBC Comments at 10 (citing Wireless Competition Bureau, FCC, *High-Speed Services for Internet Access: Status as of June 30, 2003* tbl. 12 (Dec. 2003)).

[27] *See* Verizon Comments Ex. A at 2; *see also Pew Report* at 2 (finding that "[a] surge in subscription to DSL high-speed Internet connections, which has more than doubled since March 2003, is largely behind the growth in broadband at home").

[28] *See* AT&T Comments at 6-7.

[29] *Id.* at 3 (quoting a statement by SBC Chairman Ed Whitacre at an SBC Communications Analyst Meeting).

[30] *See The Data Game*, CableFAX Databriefs, May, 17, 2004 (citing statistics from the Leichtman Research Group showing DSL net adds of 1.173 million and cable Internet net adds of 1.170 million); *see also Data Show DSL Gaining Big Ground on Cable Modems*, Broadband Daily, May 17, 2004 (noting that during the first quarter of 2004, "the incumbent telcos added roughly the same number of net new customers as did the top cable operators, turning what had been a rout in the broadband race into a dead heat"); John C. Hodulik & Aryeh B. Bourkoff, UBS, Global Equity Research, *DSL Net Adds Greater Than Cable for First Time Ever*, May 21, 2004, at 1, 3 (finding that DSL added slightly more new customers in the first quarter and noting that they "believe DSL net adds will continue to exceed cable modem adds throughout 2004").

regularly engaging in price wars to attract new customers.[31] These statistics amply refute Verizon's and SBC's references to cable's "dominance" of the broadband marketplace.[32]

In addition to the established broadband competitors, new technologies and competitors are emerging to inject additional competition into the marketplace. For example, by all reports, competition from wireless carriers is increasing rapidly. As of September 2003, approximately 1500-1800 wireless Internet service providers were already "providing service to approximately 600,000 subscribers in the U.S.," with subscribership expected to reach nearly 2,000,000 by the end of 2004.[33] Verizon Wireless has launched third-generation ("3G") wireless networks in both Washington, D.C. and San Diego, CA, and plans to spend over $1 billion in further deployments this year and next, allowing it to reach many major metropolitan areas.[34] The Commission is continuing to expand opportunities for wireless broadband; it has now proposed rules to allow unlicensed operations in the TV bands that will "benefit wireless internet service customers by extending the service range of current providers' (WISPs) existing operations, particularly in rural and underserved areas."[35]

Similarly, broadband over power line ("BPL") providers such as Current Communications already offer customers BPL services in select markets and "fully expect" their

---

[31] Covad Comments at 6-8 (noting that "the Commission's latest data confirm the accounts offered by an increasing number of industry observers, that after years of slow-rolling by the Bells, ADSL services are finally poised to overtake cable modem deployment").

[32] *See* Verizon Comments at 5 & Ex. A at 1-12; SBC Comments at 8-11.

[33] Verizon Comments Ex. A at 15 (citing License-Exempt Alliance Comments at 3, filed in ET Dkt. No. 03-122).

[34] *See* Verizon Comments at 13.

[35] *See* News Release, FCC, *FCC Proposes Rules To Facilitate Wireless Broadband Services Using Vacant TV Channels* (May 13, 2004), *available at* http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-247169A1.pdf. In addition, the Commission recently hosted a Wireless Broadband forum that addressed a comprehensive set of issues impacting the rollout of wireless broadband services. *See* Public Notice, FCC, *Federal Communications Commission Announces Agenda for Wireless Broadband Forum*, DA 04-1376 (rel. May 13, 2004), *available at* http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DA-04-1376A1.pdf.

service to "compete directly with DSL and cable modem service" with features including "always-on" high-speed Internet access from power outlets throughout the home or business, VoIP capability, upload and download speeds higher than DSL and cable modem, and local area networking from all power outlets over existing electrical wiring.[36] The BPL industry is not alone in its view; many other commenters agree that BPL has great potential to become a ubiquitous provider of broadband services.[37]

Satellite broadband distribution also is quickly picking up momentum. The National Rural Telecommunications Cooperative ("NRTC") discusses how 225 of its electric and telephone industry members plan to provide broadband services in rural areas by distributing WildBlue services.[38] NRTC believes that "Ka-band satellite will be an essential tool in achieving universal broadband deployment" and envisions that through WildBlue broadband service its members will "duplicat[e] their earlier success in introducing DIRECTV DBS to rural America."[39] The WildBlue service will likely compete directly with a similar service provided by SES Americom and EchoStar, with a service launch planned as early as 2005.[40]

Finally, new technological advances are creating additional vehicles for distribution of broadband services. For example, EarthLink, the nation's fourth-largest Internet service provider, recently announced an arrangement to create a low-cost broadband service using a

---

[36] Current Comments at 5-6. Current indicates that "one-third of all electric utilities reported 'planning or considering using broadband.'" *Id.* at 5. BPL is already commercially available in a few markets, the largest being Cincinnati, where it is offered to Cinergy Corporation's electricity customers. *See id.*

[37] *See* AT&T Comments at 12-13 ("BPL holds the potential to cross the 'digital divide' by delivering the high-speed Internet to every customer who has electricity." (internal citations omitted)); Verizon Comments at 11-12.

[38] *See* NRTC Comments at 6-7.

[39] *Id*. at 2, 5.

[40] *See id.* at 7; *see also* EchoStar Comments at 5 ("Satellite systems are especially well-suited for the provision of broadband service to rural and other underserved areas because satellites can offer nationwide, ubiquitous service at prices that are distance insensitive, unlike cable and DSL."); SES Americom Comments at 6.

wireless technology developed by Digitalpath Networks.[41] And the Association of Public Television Stations ("APTS") states that "[t]he inherent flexibility of digital broadcast technology can allow for the delivery of data at extraordinary speeds in conjunction with a multicast television experience" and facilitate the delivery of high-quality services "through a broadband-like pipe."[42]

In sum, "[c]ompetition in the broadband mass market . . . is robust and increasing."[43] Cable operators, incumbent LECs, competitive LECs, other wireline carriers, wireless providers, satellite companies, and unlicensed operators are all competing for consumers' broadband business. Although the largest share of current customers uses high-speed cable Internet -- the first broadband service to be widely offered -- there is no doubt that multiple competitive alternatives are available, with more to come.

III. THE COMMISSION SHOULD CONTINUE TO PURSUE THE DEREGULATORY POLICIES THAT HAVE STIMULATED BROADBAND INVESTMENT, INNOVATION, AND COMPETITION.

Much of the success discussed above is attributable to the Commission's policy of regulatory restraint. Wisely, the agency has imposed only those regulations mandated by Congress or compelled by entrenched market power, and it has declined to expand regulatory burdens to competitive markets. This policy of regulatory restraint has resulted in the cable industry investing tens of billions of dollars in facilities that bring broadband services to consumers, which in turn has compelled the telephone companies to spend similar amounts to upgrade their networks. The strong consumer response to the two leading broadband providers

---

[41] *See* Clint Swett, *EarthLink, Chico Firm Join To Offer Low-Cost Broadband*, Sacramento Bee, May 19, 2004.

[42] APTS Comments at 2.

[43] Verizon Comments at 5.

has led to considerable competitive investment in wireless, satellite, and BPL technologies. As discussed above, these investments have produced precisely the result Congress and the Commission envisioned: multiple facilities-based competitors battling for consumers' broadband business in an intensely competitive marketplace.

A minority of commenters, however, tell the Commission that deployment and adoption are not proceeding in a reasonable and timely manner and that the agency must reverse course. Some of these commenters urge the Commission to adopt new regulations based on their theories -- regulations which would have the effect of boosting those particular commenters' competitive position while deterring true facilities-based competition. The Commission should stay its course of regulatory restraint and reject calls for new regulations and policies that are antithetical to facilities-based competition.

In particular, MCI urges the Commission to revise its entire regulatory regime and adopt a "horizontal layers" regulatory framework that has the effect of regulating only those companies that have invested in building broadband facilities and benefiting those who have not -- like MCI, which has shown no commitment to facilities-based "last mile" competition.[44] Whatever validity this "layered" model analysis may have in the world of engineers, it should not be perverted into a regulatory scheme that would undercut the Commission's or Congress's goals. Such a framework ignores how competitive the current broadband marketplace is and that it developed largely because of regulatory *restraint*. Importantly, MCI's proposal would diminish

---

[44] MCI Comments at 13-15. The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers ("IEEE") advocates a similar regulatory result and urges the Commission to "open common carrier networks, both telephone and CATV, and let demand for access by content suppliers drive increased bit rates." IEEE Comments ¶ 23.

incentives for additional investment in new broadband facilities, thereby undermining the statutory commitment to facilities-based competition and deregulation.[45]

The Optoelectronics Industry Development Association ("OIDA") and MCI advocate another type of government intervention in the marketplace by urging the Commission to "redirect present subsidies" to "support Universal *Broadband* Service."[46] This proposal also ignores the speed and ubiquity with which competitive broadband facilities are being deployed, as confirmed by the record cited above. Broadband deployment may actually be hampered by the distortions that would be sowed by subsidies. As GCI explains:

> GCI expects that the competitive playing field in the broadband market would have been very different – for the worse – had the Commission provided high cost support for advanced telecommunications services, as some urged in other proceedings. GCI would have been ineligible to receive such support in areas where it has not been designated an eligible telecommunications carrier ("ETC"). This would have forced GCI to compete against an ILEC receiving high cost support as a designated ETC, and would have placed GCI at a significant price disadvantage with respect to broadband service offerings – potentially deterring it from entering the broadband services market at all. The Alaska experience shows that the provision of high-cost support can distort market entry to favor subsidized ILECs and deter subsidy-free entry by innovative and efficient competitive carriers. That surely was not what Congress had in mind in Section 254 of the Act. Ultimately, erecting entry barriers through universal service preempts the market's process for discovering efficient entry and robs consumers of competitive benefits.[47]

The Commission should refrain from distorting the broadband marketplace with subsidies.

---

[45] The Commission's deregulatory efforts have fueled, and continue to fuel, investment in broadband infrastructure. For example, Comcast has invested over $39 billion on upgrading its cable systems, and telephone companies such as Verizon have announced plans to invest billions to build and improve broadband networks. *See, e.g.,* Almar Latour, *Verizon Plans To Test a Superfast Fiber Network*, Wall St. J., May 19, 2004, at D4. MCI's approach seeks to change the rules of the game to the detriment of the companies that have taken the early initiative to construct broadband networks as well as those trying to attract further investment.

[46] OIDA Comments at 9; *see* MCI Comments at 16-20. OIDA represents companies that "manufacture components such as lasers, optical discs, image sensors, or optical fibers, and all sorts of equipment and systems that are critically dependent on optoelectronics components." OIDA, *Welcome to OIDA*, *at* http://www.oida.org/ (last visited May 18, 2004).

[47] GCI Comments at 14-15.

OIDA, the Corporation for Education Network Initiatives in California ("CENIC"), and the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers ("IEEE") also urge the Commission to intervene in the broadband marketplace by choosing for consumers and service providers what services should be provided at what transmission speeds. These commenters urge the Commission to redefine broadband services to encompass only services that offer at least 100 Mbps symmetrical service, but optimally 1 Gbps symmetrical service.[48] Investment in providing higher transmission speeds should be determined by the marketplace -- i.e., the collective actions of consumers and service providers -- not by government fiat.[49]

---

[48] *See* OIDA Comments at 1-2; Corporation for Education Network Initiatives in California ("CENIC") Comments at 5-6; IEEE Comments ¶¶ 3-7.

[49] There is no indication that the quest for faster broadband service is complete. For example, even though many cable operators doubled their download speeds last year, their efforts to attain higher speeds are ongoing. *See* Alan Breznick, *Major MSOs Scramble to Boost Cable Modem Download Speeds*, Comm. Daily, Dec. 15, 2003 (reporting that cable operators, covering nearly two-thirds of cable homes in the United States and Canada, raised transmission rates 50% or more last year and noting that Comcast and other cable operators continue to explore ways to boost data speeds). Also, Verizon recently indicated that its deployment of fiber to the premises will offer customers connection speeds, at a minimum, "three times as fast as broadband speeds commonly available today." *See* Press Release, Verizon Communications, *Verizon, in Historic First, Begins Large-Scale Rollout of Advanced Fiber-Optic Technology with Keller, Texas, Deployment; Announces Plans for Offering New Services* (May 19, 2004), *available at* http://newscenter.verizon.com.

IV. CONCLUSION

The initial comments submitted in response to the Commission's *Notice* provide abundant evidence that the broadband marketplace is vibrant, dynamic, competitive, and growing. It is clear that broadband services are being deployed rapidly in urban, suburban, and (increasingly) rural areas, and that this success is due, in large part, to the Commission's policies of promoting facilities-based competition and avoiding unnecessary regulation. Based on this record, the Commission should determine that "advanced telecommunications capability is being deployed to all Americans in a reasonable and timely fashion," and it should continue the procompetitive, deregulatory policies that have contributed so substantially to this success.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ James L. Casserly

James L. Casserly
Ryan G. Wallach
Stephanie L. Podey
WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER LLP
1875 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-1238
(202) 303-1000

Attorneys for Comcast Corporation

Joseph W. Waz, Jr.
COMCAST CORPORATION
1500 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19102

James R. Coltharp
COMCAST CORPORATION
2001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20006

Terry S. Bienstock
Thomas R. Nathan
COMCAST CABLE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
1500 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19102

May 24, 2004