



520 Third Street, Third Floor,  
San Francisco, CA 94107

**Phone:** 415-276-5000

**Fax:** 415-276-8490

[www.wired.com](http://www.wired.com)

June 8, 2009

Dear FCC Commissioners and Staff,

In March, Wired.com asked its readers to submit their best ideas about how to shape the FCC's upcoming National Broadband plan and then vote for the policies and comments they thought were best. See <http://www.wired.com/epicenter/2009/03/feds-need-your/>.

Users responded enthusiastically and in droves, submitting more than 200 separate ideas, and registering thousands of votes.

Clearly, this is a subject that citizens are deeply concerned about, and their voices need to be listened to over the loud horns that the nation's entrenched interests are able to buy to have their voices heard.

Wired.com is honored to present the Commission with our readers' most popular suggestions, as well as some handpicked favorites. We learned much from these passionate comments and hope that the FCC staff and commissioners take the time to listen to their voices as well.

Most importantly, Wired.com hopes that these comments and votes from Wired.com's technologically savvy audience will help guide the FCC to craft a national strategy that is bold, innovative, fair and forward-looking.

Sincerely,

Ryan Singel  
Staff Writer  
Wired.com

---

## HOW JAPAN DID IT.

Submitter: Fullback

664 up votes, 13 down votes

"I've lived in Japan through all iterations of Internet access and providers, from dialup, through Adsl and fiber. I've had 100Mbps (symmetrical) fiber for 7 years now for about US\$50 per month. It's important to point out that I've not lived in the heart of any city, living instead about an hour drive away in suburban areas no different than in the US. The argument that America is simply too big is false. If that were the case, how in the world did everyone get water, electricity, gas and telephone service?

I have multiple providers offering me a choice of service. There are no local franchises for Internet service or cable service like in the US. That competition is the reason Japanese consumers have reliable and fast service. It really is that simple. The Japanese government forced open competition and private companies continue to find ways to fill and create demand by greater efficiencies and services, including telephone, TV and mobile access.

My area is actually wired for 1Gbps service and that will eventually be unlocked as bandwidth demand is reached."

---

## ENFORCED SEPARATION BETWEEN INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICE PROVIDERS

414 up votes, 12 down votes

"I think one key thing would be to stop the vertical integration of the companies laying Internet infrastructure and provide services over that infrastructure. Having a single company own/control the infrastructure as well as the services on that infrastructure means that it's against their business interests to cooperate with and compete fairly with competing services. Infrastructure companies who provide voice are competing with VoIP providers, and those who provide video services are competing against online video sources. Even Verizon competing with a company like Speakeasy puts Speakeasy at a disadvantage.

I would propose that infrastructure companies be barred from providing services on their own network, or failing that, are required to offer identical access at identical prices to what they provide to themselves. It would open up real competition, and allow market forces to actually work toward improving service. But the single most important idea here: the Internet cables/routers are 'infrastructure', and no company should be allowed to control them more tightly than we would allow a company to control our roads, electricity, water, sewage, etc. The Internet is not an entertainment service."

---

## CUT THE CRAP

Submitter: Martin

308 up votes, 7 down votes

"I live in Rural Utah, and have one choice for DSL (if they ever hook it up). That's Frontier. But Frontier is thinking about putting in a 5GB cap! That kind of crap needs to stop <http://stopthecap.com/2008/08/04/frontier-now-with-prices-up-to-1080-per-gigabyte-limit-five-gb/>"

---

## "FIBER, FIBER, FIBER!"

Submitter: Michael Leung  
306 up votes, 21 down votes

"We need fiber! Tap those dark fibers laid from the 90s and use them. We also need greater penetration in rural areas, where anything close to DSL is satellite, and that costs too much."

---

## SET GOAL OF FULL FIBER NATION WITH UBIQUITOUS WIRELESS

305 up votes, 10 down votes

"We need fiber strung to every last building in America. Only fiber has the capacity to support the bandwidth demands of the 21st century. And while expensive to do, like our investment in copper telephone lines, we won't regret doing it 100 years from now.

We also need ubiquitous wireless. It's not about fiber vs. wireless; they're complementary, not competitive. Wireless is the ultimate extension cord.

Let's get serious about bringing the best broadband everywhere. Set high goals and then strive to achieve them. Anything less would be un-American."

---

## NATIVE IPV6 SUPPORT FROM DAY ONE

Submitter: Ted Lemon  
241 up votes, 8 down votes

"New broadband services that are part of this initiative should include IPv6 from day one. Why? Not because we necessarily need it on day one. But we will need it soon. By putting IPv6 into the plan from day one, we ensure that vendors that want to get in on the build-out have an incentive to provide IPv6 support at competitive prices. If we do not do this, we may wind up locked in and forced to pay a lot extra later for software licenses that would otherwise have been included in the purchase price of the hardware."

---

## "BEFORE MAKING ANY DECISIONS, MAKE SURE YOU KNOW WHAT 'BROADBAND' MEANS!"

Submitter: David  
228 up votes, 20 down votes

"My advice to the government- Make sure that there is a common understanding of what is referred to as 'fast internet'! To some, it means anything faster than dialup, while to others it means glitch-free transmission of full screen video. Create a standard that makes sense. During the early days of DSL,

ISPs would use 'kilobits per second' instead of 'kilobytes per second' to sell their service. The difference is a factor of 8, and some of us felt duped. Don't let them do that to you, Congress. Because we don't need a 'state-run' internet, and some of these American providers are absolute service nightmares!"

---

## OFFER MORE COMPETITION

198 up votes, 2 down votes

"Part of the problem that the country doesn't have good service on most things is because there is hardly any competition. When I mean competition I don't mean to monster companies offering the same thing at basically the same price, I mean real competition. In most areas people have one choice for High Speed Internet and typically it's also their cable company. Basically these companies have a monopoly of the power in their areas and they charge an arm and a leg for service that's subpar at best. Even in a city like Chicago there's very little choice. There's RCN, Comcast, AT&T and that's pretty much it. RCN is not all over the area too. And this is Chicago, a major metropolitan area. Make it easier for the little guy companies to offer cheap and fast internet and the bigger companies will follow."

---

## APPROPRIATE COMPARISON TO THE DEVELOPING WORLD

Submitter: Richard

192 up votes, 9 down votes

"Excellent to compare US broadband access to the developing world....we are dead last when compared to the rest of the developed world, and the gap is widening as we allow the cable companies to drag their feet to protect their Jurassic pay-per-view franchises, while using 'piracy' as an excuse to cripple bandwidth. It is about as bogus as one can get and yet another reason to avoid admitting one is an American while traveling to avoid embarrassment."

---

## A WARNING

Submitter: andergray

166 up votes, 3 down votes

"Just don't leave it to congress or the baby bells. They were supposed to do this over a decade ago. I don't remember all the details, but essentially the congress gave the phone companies a bunch of rights to charge customers extra money, and in exchange, they were supposed to use that money to create a fiber network across the US as a public good. Guess what? It never happened; fees went up, but the companies didn't do anything.

Just a warning."

---

## EXECUTIVE LEVERAGE

Submitter: gwmc

162 up votes, 18 down votes

Force every telecom executive to use a 1200 BAUD modem until everyone in the country is upgraded to Korean standards.

---

## THE FIBER IN THE GROUND

138 up votes, 11 down votes

"What happened to the fiber optic lines that were installed all over the middle of this country along the highways and byways out here there were many companies laying fiber lines in the road ditches. The cables are there not more than half a mile from my house , yet they sit there as I have a chice of one provider of DSL/Dial-up, which they buy from Quest, and I cannot. We need to allow the little guy to tap these lines and provide service to all."

---

## MAKE BROADBAND AFFORDABLE

Submitter: Kenneth Clive

133 up votes, 26 down votes

"Broadband companies should cut the crap and lower their operating costs so people will be billed less, and their CEOs should quit taking 8-figure salaries."

---

## "I'M MAD AS HELL, AND I WANT SOMETHING DONE."

130 up votes, 18 down votes

"The point is, our government has let our data companies run wild with the pricing while not giving us the product that they should. When a commodity such as internet is defined as a right for the people, then it should rightly be accessible to all American citizens. The government should step in and kill these duopolys that AT&T and Comcast create in some cities and rural areas. Give us the RIGHT to freely speak on the internet at fair prices and good speeds. I'm tired of being put at the mercy of data companies based on the neighborhood I live in. I want broadband like I expect electricity, water, and telephone service where I decide to move.

Let's cut the crap. I'm tired of hearing America is such a innovative and powerful country. We're falling behind because our government refuses to act."

---

## COMPETITION

Submitter: Doo

114 up votes, 25 down votes

Competition. America only evolves when something bigger takes its place. Start a Federally funded company that will raise the bandwidth and offer cheaper prices and access to extremely cheaper fiberoptics service. The isp's will in turn struggle to catch up and be the leaders again and the federal isp will fade out leaving lower prices for higher bandwidth in it's wake.

---

## CASH COW AGENDA

Submitter: Joe. R.

107 up votes, 8 down votes

"The clear and simple fact of the American corporate business plan is straight forward. In a time where technology is greater we lack the drive for better communication services in the form of data (internet), voice, and video (TV). The companies that give us our communication are in for a Cash Cow agenda where they attempt to pose as a company that gives the amazing gift of 'broadband' while in reality they are infested with a condition of no-upgrade for its primary users, the subscribers. Salt Lake City has a government subsidized Internet program that allows virtually anyone who can pay regular internet fees (~\$30) for FIBER OPTIC internet which is 100mbps or about 14 mb up and down. In relation to what almost anyone has now, this fiber optic network that a company 'Utopia' is supporting in Salt Lake trumps all other internet providers (cable and DSL) and shows the true power of the internet when invested properly. When subscribers realize the power they could be getting readily throughout their cities and suburbs, and understand how outrageous it is to be charged for the current infrastructure, they may soon begin to want to change."

---

## WIMAX AND OTHER 4G NETWORKS

99 Up Votes, 7 Down Votes

"1)Government should emphasize development of wimax and other 4g networks and make sure it is affordable for consumers (unlike the current exuberant fees cell companies charge for 5gb cap a month).  
a.

Imagine U.S with an internet umbrella over it. Connection to the net anywhere we go.

Think about (mandatory???) gps applications in each vehicle that can download traffic and construction instructions using this wireless connections . Less gridlock on the roads = less gas wasted ( one step closer to energy independence ) + more productive time + less stress and frustration ( healthier population). 2)

Why not each city give free wireless (with some kind of log in) . I assume if Google can do that in Mountain View, California , then it is possible to blanket all other U.S cities with wireless. That way people in rural areas don't have to wait for the mercy of giant telcos to bring the expensive broadband cables to them b.

Lots of students who go to their local libraries, to do their homework, can have some kind of internet access at home to sites like Wikipedia. This will help to reduce the advantage Urban and rich/middle class students have over rural/ low-income students."

---

## DARK FIBER

90 Up Votes, 2 Down Votes

"I used to be a Network Administrator in Michigan's Upper Peninsula. Broadband can be found there only in the few city centers. As I understood it before I left, there was a lot of fiber in the ground, running near many rural communities, that was laying dark. The companies that had put it there (AT&T and Charter Communications were the most frequent layers of fiber) did not find it economically viable to light this fiber up and provide the access to these communities. As a consequence there was stagnation. Libraries with multiple computers running off of dial-up internet, some sharing connections. These companies should be offered some incentive to open these fiber channels up to the communities that could be served by them. I don't think companies like AT&T should have to take a bath to provide high speed access to 30 people who choose to live in the middle of nowhere, but this access needs to be available to these consumers for a reasonable price."

## Handpicked Comments of Note:

---

### DITCH DIGGING

Submitter: Wired.com

10.5 percent of the country is unemployed. Why not put them to work digging fiber optic cable ditches from every front porch in the country to the curb?

---

### UNTITLED

"Time to end the telephone company monopoly AGAIN. And this time, do it right. Break the baby bells up into regional utilities that are regulated to serve the public interest. Do the same thing to the cable companies."

---

## NETWORK ACCESS AND DATA TRANSPORT MUST BE NON-DISCRIMINATORY

Submitter: nealw

"Regulation of digital transport networks (eg, the internet) should be approached in a more logical way, based on the technical 'protocol stack' layers of the services provided. Current regulatory scheme was cobbled together in time before modern networks, and is the result of heavy lobbying activity by the incumbent telcos.

Providers of data transport service must be required to obey strict non-interference and non-discrimination rules: For a transport network, a stream of bits is a stream of bits, period.

Where there is a need to 'throttle' network access for legitimate management purpose, ALL traffic must be treated in a non-discriminatory way, rather than allowing network operators to give preference to content or protocols at their own discretion.

An analogy would be that a phone company cannot degrade voice service to any particular businesses based on contract or business dealings with a competitor to that business. It would be manifestly unfair if 'Joe's Pizza' had their voice line degraded because 'Mike's Pizza' paid the phone company more money.

Similarly, data transport companies must not be allowed to degrade network access for protocols or servers based on their own business models. All data streams must be treated and transported without discrimination."

---

## NO BANDWIDTH CAPS!

Submitter: Eric

"Time Warner wishes to institute a cap that gives very little bandwidth allowance per month at very high prices, and are already testing this unfair pricing structure in areas where people don't have an alternative for their internet service. Without some kind of legislation, these companies could raise prices as high as they want, and with internet access being so important in today's modern world, many people would have no choice but to pay them. It's a monopoly and it must be stopped!"

---

## BANDWIDTH COST NEEDS TO COME DOWN

Submitter: NCW-Online

"I am a small ISP in the pacific northwest. I sell access over a fiber network put in place by my local public utility district or PUD. We offer 3, 6 and 12 meg service. It could be configured to go a lot faster but is being held back by backbone bandwidth cost.

This is controlled by the big telcos and they make billions from it so don't look for a meg of bandwidth to drop from 100 or 200 or even 300.00 down to 10 to 20.00 per meg any time soon.

Cost for bandwidth in other countries such as Japan is controlled by the government. This is why speeds are so much faster - because the ISP can afford to give faster service and still make money. I cannot now afford to let my customers go 20 - 50 or 100 meg.

I would simply go broke as my income from the fees I charge my customers - 30 for 3 mg 35 for 6m or 45 for 12 mg would never equal my bandwidth bills and I would simply be out of business in a month or two.

Figure out how to lower the backbone bandwidth cost and your speeds will be allowed to jump in quantum leaps.

---

## WIRELESS INFRASTRUCTURE FOR RURAL COMMUNITIES

Submitter: Chip Carman

"In our rural area of diverse geography and low-density AT&T already picked the low-hanging fruit, Comcast went into the densest area, and along the highway is a cellphone corridor. The stimulus funds would allow our rural area to create a wireless telco-grade infrastructure for broadband that is an open-network, technology independent, allow us to buy bandwidth for the network at wholesale prices, allow WISP's to sell the bandwidth at considerably lower prices than bringing in AT&T T1's, and probably create

competitive environment to lower prices. Such a system is successfully operating in Cambria County, Penn."

---

## COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

"Accountability and community feedback would be a must for an undertaking like this. As of right now I live in Mississippi approximately 1 mile from town. I can't get dsl,cable,or hi speed wireless, and satellite is too expensive. I truly would love to see any form of hi speed affordable internet come my way. I have checked with the phone company several times and it just isn't available. 4 years ago there was supposed to be something coming in 1 year."

---

## BROADBAND MAP MUST INCLUDE CONSUMER INVOLVEMENT

Submitter: Brenda van Gelder

"The broadband mapping and inventory initiatives of the NTIA and FCC, being funded by taxpayer dollars, need to include a mechanism for consumer/ end user participation and feedback. The map cannot and should not be simply another mechanism for the carriers to filter and massage the way broadband data is presented and what data is made available, protecting their own self interest and harming consumers in the process.

One means of doing this is to include a built-in speedtest with the map, so that those in areas that have some form of broadband can verify what speeds they are actually getting and document that as part of the mapping/ inventory process. For an example of how this would work, see Virginia Tech's Community Broadband Map at [ecorridors.vt.edu/maps/broadbandmap.php](http://ecorridors.vt.edu/maps/broadbandmap.php) and please enter your location (anywhere in the world) and run a speedtest to help add more data so that robust analyses can be conducted regarding broadband quality, pricing, and availability."

---

## FIBER IS A UTILITY. MAKE IT NATIONAL. MAKE IT FAST.

Ian Danforth

"The interstate system brought this country together. Built by government, for the people, at a time of need and maintained through taxes. Free, open, indispensable.

Fiber to every home will do the same again. History is shouting this lesson and the people are begging for this change. All you have to do is listen.

Say No to AT&T. Say No to Comcast. You don't need them and the people don't want them.

Sometimes you absolutely have to land a bomber in the middle of nowhere, but in the rest of the time people get a great big road to use. Sometimes you absolutely need to coordinate massive amounts of data from around the country, but in the meantime the people win.

Please. Dream Large. Act Boldly."

---

## WIMAX: MESH NETWORKS: EACH HOME A ROUTER AND SWITCH

Submitter: Richard Ferrers

"When we can't get fibre to the home, let's join homes together with wimax. With 1-2km radius, let's make each home a network exchange, passing messages on through the network. Each new home connected, connects all those around it. Let's start talking to our neighbours. Then connect those neighbourhoods to the world."

---

## CLEANUP THE FCC

"I worked for the telcoms for years. Corrupt does not even come close to describing the situation. To further the problem, the FCC is made up of former and future telcom employees. A simple rule excluding anyone from employment at the FCC and a rule forbidding any FCC employee from working for those they are charged with policing would be a good start. If they want to prosecute, they should let us know where we can dump evidence. I know I am not the only one with a collection of email backups."

---

## "START WITH WHITESPACES, GO TOWARD 100% OPEN SPECTRUM"

Submitter: Fred McTaker

"New radio technologies like MIMO, OFDM, UWB, WiFi, Mesh Networking, Ethernet, Cognitive Radio, and Cellular communications in general show that radio spectrum can be most effectively utilized in a localized on-demand basis, and that no monopoly on any given spectrum is necessary for effective use by any given device or service. Monopolies in all forms limit competition and market efficiencies. Thus our current system of radio spectrum monopoly grants makes wireless Internet access needlessly limited and expensive. Whitespace data use is a first step in the right direction, but the end goal should be ending all radio spectrum monopolies within our lifetimes."

---

## PREVENT COMPANIES LIKE COMCAST AND QWEST FROM DELAYING MUNI FIBER BUILDOUTS.

"I live in Salt Lake City where we do not actually have UTOPIA fiber available to us because the city voted against it. Those of us who are smart know that the real reason it was voted against was because Comcast and Qwest threw enough money at major players to vote against the bonds to lay the fiber in this city because they knew that if UTOPIA came to Salt Lake it would be all over for Comcast and Qwest. Look at the city of Layton. People are jumping onto UTOPIA as quick as they can!

Comcast and Qwest also severely delayed the buildout of UTOPIA in the cities that voted for the bonds by taking UTOPIA to court for everything they could think of. They did this for so long that that many people lost interest or lost faith in the courts. They still prevent progress by denying access to the poles they own.

I remember reading articles about companies like Verizon and Cox doing the same thing in other states. We need to stop giving these companies this freedom to stop or delay buildouts of municipal fiber networks. If I had enough money to fund UTOPIA in Salt Lake, I'd jump on it in a heartbeat but I know that I would be facing at least a 2 or 3 year battle in courts with Qwest and Comcast. Take away the power these companies have. If they're not going to take us on the path to true broadband access then these companies should step aside!"

---

## THE BOONIES NEED HIGH SPEED INTERNET NOW!

Submitter: Bob Pagani

These days I live on the coast in Oregon. Once you get off the Main Road, Internet access is limited to dial-up. Neither the phone company nor the cable company can be bothered to wire those of us who live on a non-main road.

In 2009, providing high-speed Internet access to rural areas should be as high a priority as Rural Electrification was in the 1930's. As things stand, we live in a two-tiered country when it comes to Internet access. This needs to change. Internet access will only become more important in the coming years. America can and should provide ALL its citizens with equal access to this vital resource."

---

### IDENTIFY RURAL AREAS NOT ONLY UNDERSERVED BUT COMPLETELY UNSERVED

"There are currently wide areas of our country, with admittedly sparse population density, but populated nonetheless, that are currently completely unserved by even basic voice-grade telephone service - no landline, no cellular, no wireless VOIP. I, and my neighbors, live in one such area in the mountains of West Texas. We cannot call the ambulance, the sheriff, our families. An easy solution to our service situation would be a mesh of wireless broadband and VOIP. I believe it is very important to identify areas that have no service whatsoever and at least put some effort into basic telco services."

---

### HIGH-SPEED INTERNET FOR RURAL AREA

"I live just outside of Ames Iowa (population 52,000). I live 1-2 miles from the edge of the city limits. I have talked to Qwest about DSL, they will not provide service to the more than 150 houses within a mile of the closest telephone box. Mediacom (the local cable company) does not provide cable internet services outside of city limits. ICS and Prairie iNet (local rural/high-speed wireless) do not have any options that will cover my area, which is ridiculous, since they are rural providers. I am currently stuck with dialup, or satellite internet (when it works, and has a bandwidth limit). Because of this, we need to make sure that EVERYONE can get high-speed, even if it's only one provider. It all comes down to the money, and the companies do not want to spend it to get the rural customers."

---

### RE-INSTATE LINE SHARING

"Re-instate line sharing, for both telco and cable companies. The original ILEC arguments against line sharing focused on the argument that competition should be 'facilities based' and why shouldn't competitors be required to build out their own infrastructure instead of the ILECs having to share theirs. This, of course, ignored the inconvenient fact that the ILECs got where they are by government granted monopolies and access to local government rights of way. It also ignored the absolutely crazy idea that anyone that wants to compete should run another set of wires to a customer's home. In Europe and Japan, where line sharing was enforced, there is robust competition with faster speeds and lower prices; in addition, competitors to the ILECs are now in the position of being able to build their own infrastructure

and many are laying fiber. Part of the reason the U.S. is ranked so low in broadband among developed countries is the failure to enforce the provisions of the 1996 telecom law.

For what it's worth, I live 6-7 miles outside the Washington, DC beltway in Maryland (not exactly the boonies) and have only ONE choice of broadband provider - comcast cable."

---

## "TWO MILES FROM WALMART - 44,480 MILES TO BROADBAND"

Submitter: The Wine Whisperer

"We can hear US 101 from where we live. It's two miles to WalMart and yet, when it comes to broadband access, we might as well live in the boonies. No DSL, no cable... satellite is only choice. \$400 for hardware and \$70/month for ok speed but a 375mb per 24 hour period usage limit. A limit which A; no way of knowing when the 24 hour period starts (there's no stated 'start time' according to tech support) and B; if you exceed the limit (which have no way of knowing when you're getting close because the 'usage report' is always 2-3 hours behind) you are punished with being slowed down to bad dialup speed for 24 hours. This is really helpful for trying to grow our small business!"

---

## PROVIDE AT LEAST ONE REGIONAL ALTERNATIVE TO DIAL-UP EVERYWHERE. PLEASE!

"I live a quarter mile from the major east-west road in Southern Vermont. I have had to pay for satellite internet (\$70/month, a pathetic 120KB/s down, 20KB/s up, 300MB rolling 24hr usage cap) for four years now because my only alternative is dial-up! No one has spent a cent on any rural internet initiative here. The feds should concentrate on getting a minimum level of internet service available for EVERYONE in the U.S. before worrying about giving even more options to the folks who can already choose between cable and DSL."

---

## ALLOW LOCAL GOVERNMENTS EQUAL ACCESS

Submitter: Ted Lemon

"Currently, in any market that \*might\* someday be a lucrative market for a commercial ISP, corporate ISPs can work to stop broadband deployment by the local government. At the same time, these ISPs frequently do not offer competitive service. Essentially, they wind up being monopolies enforced by the government against itself.

If local government, with the support of the people, wants to deploy broadband infrastructure, they should be allowed to do so. There should be no right under any circumstances for commercial providers to sue them to stop this deployment.

If commercial providers think they can provide service for less, they should simply compete with local government. Just as they should not be allowed to stop local government from deploying broadband, so local government should not be allowed to use their law-making power to stop commercial ISPs from putting in their own services.

The point is that in some environments, the community is prepared to deploy broadband, and the ISP is not. The only place where the community can realistically convene to do this is the local government. This should be permitted, and not penalized."

---

## HOW ABOUT INCENTIVIZING POWERLINE COMPANIES TO DEPLOY FIBER TO THE HOME OR DATA OVER POWERLINES?

"They have done this in Japan, and we can all see how successful Japan has been in fiber deployment. Having power utility companies deploy fiber to the home seems kind of weird at first but a) if you make it a profitable venture for them, it seems like a good idea, as they already have connections to every home, and b) it can be a part of the big upgrade to a 'Smart Grid', using the fiber to communicate power flows in real time from all meters to the utility companies."

---

## "FIBER EVERYWHERE ISN'T REALISTIC, BUT!"

Submitter: Shane Owens

"Having started a CLEC and seeing firsthand how it is to compete with the Incumbent Carriers I feel the best solution is to remove the infrastructure from their control and place it under the control of a publicly funded entity. Similar to the post 'Enforced Separation Between Infrastructure and Service Providers', however some leeway must be given to Cable companies unfortunately. Fact is they spent their own money to lay cable where as the vast majority of the copper cables in the ground were laid with public funding. Fiber everywhere isn't feasible because many small towns are 30+ miles to the next closest town and may only have a population of 300 people if that. There is no cost justification for this type of build. This new entity needs to be setup to maintain all infrastructure cables currently in the ground, new builds should be done with fiber and any upgrades or augments should also be done with fiber. Eventually the copper would go away by attrition. This also puts all providers on a level playing field as far as cost structure. Verizon for example charges more for a wholesale copper loop (\$21.13-\$39.05) to a CLEC in Illinois than they charge to a retail customer for dial tone in some markets (\$16 per tariff). You will never get competition to go to those markets because it is impossible to break even at any price that is sellable do to the limited population of the town, and Verizon won't put in DSL because the population is too small. This is all from firsthand experience. However if Verizon had to pay the same price for a UNE loop (fiber or copper) that a CLEC had to pay you would see a boom in competitive carriers and service being offered. That is the only way to make competition fair in rural markets.

Even today most incumbent carriers are locked in their old way of thinking and not able to see beyond the service offerings of the early to mid 90's. I have an ATT DSL line here at the office that is connected to the CO at ADSL2+ speeds and trained up at 17Mbps down and just over 1Mbps up, but I can only purchase a 6Mbps package because that's all that is available in the product catalog. My house I can only get the 3Mbps DSL package because 'That's all your line will support', but if I purchase UVerse (still DSL) I can get an 18Mbps package. Both these services come out of the same CO so why the disparity?"

---

## RE: HOW DID JAPAN DO IT?

Submitter: fullback

"A consortium of private companies formed Japan Internet Exchange Co., Ltd. as a major infrastructure provider, augmenting infrastructure provided by academic and ISPs. The Japanese government did not pay for the infrastructure - private companies did and do.

The pioneer of the Internet in Japan was a Canadian friend of mine named Roger Boisvert, who founded a companies IIKK and GOL in Tokyo. He convinced the Japanese government in 1993 to authorize his company to operate as the first Internet Service Provider in the country. I was one of his first customers. He built the first network and insisted on nothing less that perfection in technology, reliability and service. He was an extraordinarily generous and selfless man who cared more about his employees and customers than his own finances.

He sold his business in 2001 and wanted to help other entrepreneurs as a venture capitalist. He was visiting Los Angeles in September, 2001 and was shot and killed in a robbery while on his way to a meeting."

---

## DON'T FORGET THE AREAS OF LOW POPULATION

Submitter: Bob Bookman

"I live in Alaska and although I only live 5 miles from Wasilla (and yes I can see Russia from there) I pay 140.00 a month for 768 down/up DSL. This lack of true broadband at reasonable prices is crushing to rural areas of our country. Most people I know are only able afford 128 down/up for 25 bucks a month, so they have no chance of participating in the real benefits of true broadband. It would be easy to end up with a new social class discrimination as we try to make broadband changes."

---

## EDUCATE THE PUBLIC ABOUT HOW THE REST OF THE WORLD USES THEIR INTERNET (BUT WE CAN'T)

"Reach out to foreign governments, individuals, and businesses to assemble a huge list of what good has been done by the levels of network coverage and bandwidth we propose to implement here in the United States; then run commercials (or let YouTube videos propagate through online and offline social networks) to show citizens what we're missing.

When everyone cares, everyone is motivated."

---

## LEGISLATE COMPETITION

Submitter: Gover

"A cable provider a thought provided excellent service with no downtime that I can recall and great speeds was bought out of the local market by Comcast because our city for some reason allows a monopoly on the cable lines.

Within 2 weeks the speed was at 75% of what it was before, I had experience more disconnections in that time than I had in 3 years of service with the other provider, and the wait-time for service calls went from days to sometimes multiple weeks or even months.

Of course the prices went up.

I would love to let capitalism work, and take my business elsewhere, but there's nothing else. City WiFi doesn't reach my home, I can't install a satellite dish because I rent, my phone lines are too old and far from the 'hub' or whatever for DSL to be effective.

Comcast could double the price tomorrow and it would be a choice between paying it or getting dial-up quality internet. That's a monopoly not capitalism."

---

## CONCERNED THAT GOVERNMENT SUBSIDY EQUALS OVERSIGHT

"What would happen if another Bush-like administration had the ability to censor our daily communication? What if the same group were unpopular and wished to stay in power?

We have seen government that is not in the best interest of the general population (or the future of human life on the planet, for that matter) I simply do not trust government and would like to see very basic guarantees, not unlike the Bill of Rights, included.

I frankly suspect communication subsidies are a carrot, given the current administration's use of the National Security cloak in spite of promises to the contrary."

that the fiber-layer adds to it's rolls that delivers a CONSISTENT benchmarked speed (Say, 100MBps), it not only gets 10 years of exclusive service to that residence (without being forced to sell it's lines!) but it also enjoys an increase in a tax break.

Third, offer pared down incentives for areas of the US most lacking broadband access."

---

## "REGULATE BROADBAND LINES, ADD UNIVERSAL ACCESS + UNIVERSAL CONNECTIVITY FEE"

Submitter: DR Fink

"This is what worked for adding copper phone lines to even the most remote US residents. Enforce universal access rights and uniform service fees, and add a fixed universal access fee to every broadband user's bill. The broadband providers would have to pay for the high initial cost of laying fiber to remote customers and not charge that individual customer for the setup charge. The broadband provider would be compensated, at cost, from the universal access fee pool. Only question is how to prevent chaotic, redundant, and overpriced disconnected overlay networks layout by competitors at broadband user's

"A massive infrastructure upgrade requires a two part solution: less regulation and funding for entrepreneurs.

1) Excessive regulation and costly government requirements frequently block newcomers, and sustain the entrenched monopoly/bureaucracy. Any new broadband plan must reduce government interference, at all levels, and pry open markets.

2) Provide funding to the 50 state universities to set up a technology incubator and venture funding channel. These groups would evaluate entrepreneurs and their business plans and channel the funding as the see fit (within guidelines and with transparency). This would accommodate regional differences

and needs, and the open process would encourage immediate peer review. The university would get equity stakes in the new companies, and pay the government back from its profits."

---

## OPEN E-RATE

"Open the e-rate funds to community colleges. K-12 has been funded for sufficient years to have adequately addressed existing needs. Open the funding stream to 2 year colleges to assist with funding broadband connectivity and recurring access fees. Also, establish a national RFP for schools to use to solicit bids for connectivity and access."

---

## MORE REGULATION ON CORRUPT BUSINESS PRACTICES

"I live in an apartment, and like most apartments, the cable is provided through a relatively no-name company that has an exclusive contract with the complex. On top of that, they charge almost twice what comparable plans from the local name-brand cable company.

Exclusive contracts should be forbidden, and standard pricing rates should be established. A company may go lower as a promotion or such, if they choose, but no one should be able to price gouge."