

**Congress of the United States**  
**Washington, DC 20515**

May 14, 2014

**494**

The Honorable Thomas Wheeler  
Chairman  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Chairman Wheeler,

As you develop a proposal to oversee access to the Internet, we urge you to adopt strong and enforceable open Internet rules that proactively protect Internet users from unfair practices, including the blockage of lawful traffic or discrimination among content providers by Internet Service Providers (ISPs). The rules must preserve the Internet as the open platform that it is today by recognizing our nation's communications providers as common carriers. Without strong protections, the Internet could devolve into a closed platform in which those who pay the most can overwhelm other views and ideas.

We agree with your previous statements and those from President Obama that expressed similar concerns. ISPs will continue to explore ways to boost revenue by imposing discriminatory charges that will decrease the openness of the Internet. There is ample evidence that protecting the open Internet against such threats is critical for users and businesses alike. However, reports indicate that the current FCC proposal creates an Internet fast lane that would prioritize some Internet traffic and allow ISPs to discriminate against everyone else. The FCC cannot protect the open Internet by allowing discrimination.

We urge the FCC to use its clear authority under Title II of the Communications Act to reclassify the transmission component of broadband Internet access as a telecommunications service. Recognizing our nation's communications providers as common carriers under the law is common sense. Reclassification would also complement the Commission's efforts to promote innovation, competition and investment in universally available, reliable and affordable broadband infrastructure.

Over one million people have already gone on the record in support of reclassification. We urge the FCC to consider this support for strong, enforceable open Internet rules as it moves forward with the rulemaking process.

Sincerely,



**Keith Ellison**  
Member of Congress



**Earl Blumenauer**  
Member of Congress



**André D. Carson**  
Member of Congress



**David N. Cicilline**  
Member of Congress



**Donna F. Edwards**  
Member of Congress



**Alan Grayson**  
Member of Congress



**Mike Honda**  
Member of Congress



**Marcy Kaptur**  
Member of Congress



**John Lewis**  
Member of Congress



**Raul M. Grijalva**  
Member of Congress



**Michael E. Capuano**  
Member of Congress



**John Conyers, Jr.**  
Member of Congress



**Peter DeFazio**  
Member of Congress



**Sam Farr**  
Member of Congress



**Rush Holt**  
Member of Congress



**Jared Huffman**  
Member of Congress



**Barbara Lee**  
Member of Congress




**Zoe Lofgren**  
Member of Congress



**Alan Lowenthal**  
Member of Congress



**Betty McCollum**  
Member of Congress



**Jim McDermott**  
Member of Congress



**Jim McGovern**  
Member of Congress



**Jerrold Nadler**  
Member of Congress



**Eleanor Holmes Norton**  
Member of Congress



**Beto O'Rourke**  
Member of Congress



**Mark Pocan**  
Member of Congress



**Charles B. Rangel**  
Member of Congress



**Tim Ryan**  
Member of Congress




**John Sarbanes**  
Member of Congress



**Jan Schakowsky**  
Member of Congress



**Bobby Scott**  
Member of Congress



**José E. Serrano**  
Member of Congress




**Carol Shea-Porter**  
Member of Congress



**Mark Takano**  
Member of Congress



**John F. Tierney**  
Member of Congress



**Pete Visclosky**  
Member of Congress

CC: Mignon Clyburn, Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission

Jessica Rosenworcel, Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission

Ajit Pai, Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission

Michael O'Reilly, Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF  
THE CHAIRMAN

June 30, 2014

The Honorable Earl Blumenauer  
U.S. House of Representatives  
1111 Longworth House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Blumenauer:

Thank you for writing to express your concerns regarding the need to reinstate rules to preserve an open Internet for all Americans. I share your sense of urgency on this matter. For this reason, I moved with dispatch to initiate a proceeding to consider new open Internet rules to replace those that were vacated by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals in the *Verizon* case. As you know, the *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* (“*Notice*”) adopted by the Commission in May 2014 begins that process. Therein, we ask a number of questions about the rules we need to adopt, as well as the appropriate legal foundation for such rules. Your letter touches on some of the most important issues presented in the *Notice*, and I will ensure that it is included in the record of the proceeding and considered as part of the Commission’s review.

The Commission has struggled for over a decade with how best to protect and promote an open Internet. While there has been bipartisan consensus, starting under the Bush Administration with Chairman Powell, on the importance of an open Internet to economic growth, investment, and innovation, we find ourselves today faced with the worst case scenario: we have no Open Internet rules in place to stop broadband providers from limiting Internet openness. The *status quo* is unacceptable. The Commission has already found, and the court has agreed, that broadband providers have economic incentives and technological tools to engage in behavior that can limit Internet openness and harm consumers and competition. As such, the Commission must craft meaningful rules to protect the open Internet, and it must do so promptly. I can assure you that I will utilize the best tools available to me to ensure the Commission adopts effective and resilient open Internet rules. Unless and until the Commission adopts new rules, as you point out, broadband providers will be free to block, degrade, or otherwise disadvantage innovative services on the Internet without threat of sanction by the FCC.

With respect to the legal foundation of the rules, I believe that the Section 706 framework set forth by the court provides us with the tools we need to adopt and implement robust and enforceable Open Internet rules. Nevertheless, as you specifically urge in your letter, the Commission is also seriously considering moving forward to adopt rules using Title II of the Communications Act as the foundation for our legal authority. The *Notice* seeks comment on the benefits of both Section 706 and Title II, including the benefits of one approach over the other, to ensure the Internet remains an open platform for innovation and expression.

With respect to the substance of the rules, the proposals and questions in the *Notice* are designed to elicit a record that will give us a foundation to adopt strong, enforceable rules to protect the open Internet and prevent broadband providers from harming consumers or competition. I am especially sensitive to your concerns about arrangements that would prioritize certain traffic and allow ISPs to discriminate against other traffic. Let me be crystal clear: there must only be one Internet. It must be fast, robust and open for everyone. The *Notice* addresses this issue head-on, even asking if paid prioritization should be banned outright. It also proposes clear rules of the road and aggressive enforcement to prevent unfair treatment of consumers, edge providers and innovators. Small companies and startups must be able to reach consumers with their innovative products and services, and they must be protected against harmful conduct by broadband providers.

The *Notice* also includes a number of proposals designed to empower consumers and small businesses who may find themselves subject to harmful behavior by a broadband provider. For example, the Court of Appeals did uphold our existing transparency rule, and the *Notice* proposes to strengthen that rule to require that networks disclose *any* practices that could change a consumer's or a content provider's relationship with the network. The *Notice* proposes the creation of an ombudsperson to serve as a watchdog and advocate for start-ups, small businesses and consumers. And the *Notice* seeks comment on how to ensure that all parties, and especially small businesses and start-ups, have effective access to the Commission's dispute resolution and enforcement processes.

This *Notice* is the first step in the process, and I look forward to comments from all interested stakeholders, including members of the general public, as we develop a fulsome record on the many questions raised in the *Notice*. To that end, in an effort to maximize public participation in this proceeding, we have established an Open Internet email address – [openinternet@fcc.gov](mailto:openinternet@fcc.gov) – to ensure that Americans who may not otherwise have the opportunity to participate in an FCC proceeding can make their voices heard. In addition, to ensure sufficient opportunity for broad public comment, we have provided a lengthy comment and reply period through September 10, 2014, that will allow everyone an opportunity to participate.

Again, I appreciate your deep interest in this matter and look forward to continued engagement with you as the proceeding moves forward.

Sincerely,



Tom Wheeler



OFFICE OF  
THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON

June 30, 2014

The Honorable Michael Capuano  
U.S. House of Representatives  
1414 Longworth House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Capuano:

Thank you for writing to express your concerns regarding the need to reinstate rules to preserve an open Internet for all Americans. I share your sense of urgency on this matter. For this reason, I moved with dispatch to initiate a proceeding to consider new open Internet rules to replace those that were vacated by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals in the *Verizon* case. As you know, the *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* (“*Notice*”) adopted by the Commission in May 2014 begins that process. Therein, we ask a number of questions about the rules we need to adopt, as well as the appropriate legal foundation for such rules. Your letter touches on some of the most important issues presented in the *Notice*, and I will ensure that it is included in the record of the proceeding and considered as part of the Commission’s review.

The Commission has struggled for over a decade with how best to protect and promote an open Internet. While there has been bipartisan consensus, starting under the Bush Administration with Chairman Powell, on the importance of an open Internet to economic growth, investment, and innovation, we find ourselves today faced with the worst case scenario: we have no Open Internet rules in place to stop broadband providers from limiting Internet openness. The *status quo* is unacceptable. The Commission has already found, and the court has agreed, that broadband providers have economic incentives and technological tools to engage in behavior that can limit Internet openness and harm consumers and competition. As such, the Commission must craft meaningful rules to protect the open Internet, and it must do so promptly. I can assure you that I will utilize the best tools available to me to ensure the Commission adopts effective and resilient open Internet rules. Unless and until the Commission adopts new rules, as you point out, broadband providers will be free to block, degrade, or otherwise disadvantage innovative services on the Internet without threat of sanction by the FCC.

With respect to the legal foundation of the rules, I believe that the Section 706 framework set forth by the court provides us with the tools we need to adopt and implement robust and enforceable Open Internet rules. Nevertheless, as you specifically urge in your letter, the Commission is also seriously considering moving forward to adopt rules using Title II of the Communications Act as the foundation for our legal authority. The *Notice* seeks comment on the benefits of both Section 706 and Title II, including the benefits of one approach over the other, to ensure the Internet remains an open platform for innovation and expression.

With respect to the substance of the rules, the proposals and questions in the *Notice* are designed to elicit a record that will give us a foundation to adopt strong, enforceable rules to protect the open Internet and prevent broadband providers from harming consumers or competition. I am especially sensitive to your concerns about arrangements that would prioritize certain traffic and allow ISPs to discriminate against other traffic. Let me be crystal clear: there must only be one Internet. It must be fast, robust and open for everyone. The *Notice* addresses this issue head-on, even asking if paid prioritization should be banned outright. It also proposes clear rules of the road and aggressive enforcement to prevent unfair treatment of consumers, edge providers and innovators. Small companies and startups must be able to reach consumers with their innovative products and services, and they must be protected against harmful conduct by broadband providers.

The *Notice also* includes a number of proposals designed to empower consumers and small businesses who may find themselves subject to harmful behavior by a broadband provider. For example, the Court of Appeals did uphold our existing transparency rule, and the *Notice* proposes to strengthen that rule to require that networks disclose *any* practices that could change a consumer's or a content provider's relationship with the network. The *Notice* proposes the creation of an ombudsperson to serve as a watchdog and advocate for start-ups, small businesses and consumers. And the *Notice* seeks comment on how to ensure that all parties, and especially small businesses and start-ups, have effective access to the Commission's dispute resolution and enforcement processes.

This *Notice* is the first step in the process, and I look forward to comments from all interested stakeholders, including members of the general public, as we develop a fulsome record on the many questions raised in the *Notice*. To that end, in an effort to maximize public participation in this proceeding, we have established an Open Internet email address – [openinternet@fcc.gov](mailto:openinternet@fcc.gov) – to ensure that Americans who may not otherwise have the opportunity to participate in an FCC proceeding can make their voices heard. In addition, to ensure sufficient opportunity for broad public comment, we have provided a lengthy comment and reply period through September 10, 2014, that will allow everyone an opportunity to participate.

Again, I appreciate your deep interest in this matter and look forward to continued engagement with you as the proceeding moves forward.

Sincerely,



Tom Wheeler



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF  
THE CHAIRMAN

June 30, 2014

The Honorable Andre Carson  
U.S. House of Representatives  
2453 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Carson:

Thank you for writing to express your concerns regarding the need to reinstate rules to preserve an open Internet for all Americans. I share your sense of urgency on this matter. For this reason, I moved with dispatch to initiate a proceeding to consider new open Internet rules to replace those that were vacated by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals in the *Verizon* case. As you know, the *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* (“*Notice*”) adopted by the Commission in May 2014 begins that process. Therein, we ask a number of questions about the rules we need to adopt, as well as the appropriate legal foundation for such rules. Your letter touches on some of the most important issues presented in the *Notice*, and I will ensure that it is included in the record of the proceeding and considered as part of the Commission’s review.

The Commission has struggled for over a decade with how best to protect and promote an open Internet. While there has been bipartisan consensus, starting under the Bush Administration with Chairman Powell, on the importance of an open Internet to economic growth, investment, and innovation, we find ourselves today faced with the worst case scenario: we have no Open Internet rules in place to stop broadband providers from limiting Internet openness. The *status quo* is unacceptable. The Commission has already found, and the court has agreed, that broadband providers have economic incentives and technological tools to engage in behavior that can limit Internet openness and harm consumers and competition. As such, the Commission must craft meaningful rules to protect the open Internet, and it must do so promptly. I can assure you that I will utilize the best tools available to me to ensure the Commission adopts effective and resilient open Internet rules. Unless and until the Commission adopts new rules, as you point out, broadband providers will be free to block, degrade, or otherwise disadvantage innovative services on the Internet without threat of sanction by the FCC.

With respect to the legal foundation of the rules, I believe that the Section 706 framework set forth by the court provides us with the tools we need to adopt and implement robust and enforceable Open Internet rules. Nevertheless, as you specifically urge in your letter, the Commission is also seriously considering moving forward to adopt rules using Title II of the Communications Act as the foundation for our legal authority. The *Notice* seeks comment on the benefits of both Section 706 and Title II, including the benefits of one approach over the other, to ensure the Internet remains an open platform for innovation and expression.

With respect to the substance of the rules, the proposals and questions in the *Notice* are designed to elicit a record that will give us a foundation to adopt strong, enforceable rules to protect the open Internet and prevent broadband providers from harming consumers or competition. I am especially sensitive to your concerns about arrangements that would prioritize certain traffic and allow ISPs to discriminate against other traffic. Let me be crystal clear: there must only be one Internet. It must be fast, robust and open for everyone. The *Notice* addresses this issue head-on, even asking if paid prioritization should be banned outright. It also proposes clear rules of the road and aggressive enforcement to prevent unfair treatment of consumers, edge providers and innovators. Small companies and startups must be able to reach consumers with their innovative products and services, and they must be protected against harmful conduct by broadband providers.

The *Notice also* includes a number of proposals designed to empower consumers and small businesses who may find themselves subject to harmful behavior by a broadband provider. For example, the Court of Appeals did uphold our existing transparency rule, and the *Notice* proposes to strengthen that rule to require that networks disclose *any* practices that could change a consumer's or a content provider's relationship with the network. The *Notice* proposes the creation of an ombudsman to serve as a watchdog and advocate for start-ups, small businesses and consumers. And the *Notice* seeks comment on how to ensure that all parties, and especially small businesses and start-ups, have effective access to the Commission's dispute resolution and enforcement processes.

This *Notice* is the first step in the process, and I look forward to comments from all interested stakeholders, including members of the general public, as we develop a fulsome record on the many questions raised in the *Notice*. To that end, in an effort to maximize public participation in this proceeding, we have established an Open Internet email address – [openinternet@fcc.gov](mailto:openinternet@fcc.gov) – to ensure that Americans who may not otherwise have the opportunity to participate in an FCC proceeding can make their voices heard. In addition, to ensure sufficient opportunity for broad public comment, we have provided a lengthy comment and reply period through September 10, 2014, that will allow everyone an opportunity to participate.

Again, I appreciate your deep interest in this matter and look forward to continued engagement with you as the proceeding moves forward.

Sincerely,



Tom Wheeler



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF  
THE CHAIRMAN

June 30, 2014

The Honorable David Cicilline  
U.S. House of Representatives  
128 Cannon House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Cicilline:

Thank you for writing to express your concerns regarding the need to reinstate rules to preserve an open Internet for all Americans. I share your sense of urgency on this matter. For this reason, I moved with dispatch to initiate a proceeding to consider new open Internet rules to replace those that were vacated by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals in the *Verizon* case. As you know, the *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* (“*Notice*”) adopted by the Commission in May 2014 begins that process. Therein, we ask a number of questions about the rules we need to adopt, as well as the appropriate legal foundation for such rules. Your letter touches on some of the most important issues presented in the *Notice*, and I will ensure that it is included in the record of the proceeding and considered as part of the Commission’s review.

The Commission has struggled for over a decade with how best to protect and promote an open Internet. While there has been bipartisan consensus, starting under the Bush Administration with Chairman Powell, on the importance of an open Internet to economic growth, investment, and innovation, we find ourselves today faced with the worst case scenario: we have no Open Internet rules in place to stop broadband providers from limiting Internet openness. The *status quo* is unacceptable. The Commission has already found, and the court has agreed, that broadband providers have economic incentives and technological tools to engage in behavior that can limit Internet openness and harm consumers and competition. As such, the Commission must craft meaningful rules to protect the open Internet, and it must do so promptly. I can assure you that I will utilize the best tools available to me to ensure the Commission adopts effective and resilient open Internet rules. Unless and until the Commission adopts new rules, as you point out, broadband providers will be free to block, degrade, or otherwise disadvantage innovative services on the Internet without threat of sanction by the FCC.

With respect to the legal foundation of the rules, I believe that the Section 706 framework set forth by the court provides us with the tools we need to adopt and implement robust and enforceable Open Internet rules. Nevertheless, as you specifically urge in your letter, the Commission is also seriously considering moving forward to adopt rules using Title II of the Communications Act as the foundation for our legal authority. The *Notice* seeks comment on the benefits of both Section 706 and Title II, including the benefits of one approach over the other, to ensure the Internet remains an open platform for innovation and expression.

With respect to the substance of the rules, the proposals and questions in the *Notice* are designed to elicit a record that will give us a foundation to adopt strong, enforceable rules to protect the open Internet and prevent broadband providers from harming consumers or competition. I am especially sensitive to your concerns about arrangements that would prioritize certain traffic and allow ISPs to discriminate against other traffic. Let me be crystal clear: there must only be one Internet. It must be fast, robust and open for everyone. The *Notice* addresses this issue head-on, even asking if paid prioritization should be banned outright. It also proposes clear rules of the road and aggressive enforcement to prevent unfair treatment of consumers, edge providers and innovators. Small companies and startups must be able to reach consumers with their innovative products and services, and they must be protected against harmful conduct by broadband providers.

The *Notice* also includes a number of proposals designed to empower consumers and small businesses who may find themselves subject to harmful behavior by a broadband provider. For example, the Court of Appeals did uphold our existing transparency rule, and the *Notice* proposes to strengthen that rule to require that networks disclose *any* practices that could change a consumer's or a content provider's relationship with the network. The *Notice* proposes the creation of an ombudsperson to serve as a watchdog and advocate for start-ups, small businesses and consumers. And the *Notice* seeks comment on how to ensure that all parties, and especially small businesses and start-ups, have effective access to the Commission's dispute resolution and enforcement processes.

This *Notice* is the first step in the process, and I look forward to comments from all interested stakeholders, including members of the general public, as we develop a fulsome record on the many questions raised in the *Notice*. To that end, in an effort to maximize public participation in this proceeding, we have established an Open Internet email address – [openinternet@fcc.gov](mailto:openinternet@fcc.gov) – to ensure that Americans who may not otherwise have the opportunity to participate in an FCC proceeding can make their voices heard. In addition, to ensure sufficient opportunity for broad public comment, we have provided a lengthy comment and reply period through September 10, 2014, that will allow everyone an opportunity to participate.

Again, I appreciate your deep interest in this matter and look forward to continued engagement with you as the proceeding moves forward.

Sincerely,



Tom Wheeler



OFFICE OF  
THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON

June 30, 2014

The Honorable John Conyers  
U.S. House of Representatives  
2426 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Conyers:

Thank you for writing to express your concerns regarding the need to reinstate rules to preserve an open Internet for all Americans. I share your sense of urgency on this matter. For this reason, I moved with dispatch to initiate a proceeding to consider new open Internet rules to replace those that were vacated by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals in the *Verizon* case. As you know, the *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* (“*Notice*”) adopted by the Commission in May 2014 begins that process. Therein, we ask a number of questions about the rules we need to adopt, as well as the appropriate legal foundation for such rules. Your letter touches on some of the most important issues presented in the *Notice*, and I will ensure that it is included in the record of the proceeding and considered as part of the Commission’s review.

The Commission has struggled for over a decade with how best to protect and promote an open Internet. While there has been bipartisan consensus, starting under the Bush Administration with Chairman Powell, on the importance of an open Internet to economic growth, investment, and innovation, we find ourselves today faced with the worst case scenario: we have no Open Internet rules in place to stop broadband providers from limiting Internet openness. The *status quo* is unacceptable. The Commission has already found, and the court has agreed, that broadband providers have economic incentives and technological tools to engage in behavior that can limit Internet openness and harm consumers and competition. As such, the Commission must craft meaningful rules to protect the open Internet, and it must do so promptly. I can assure you that I will utilize the best tools available to me to ensure the Commission adopts effective and resilient open Internet rules. Unless and until the Commission adopts new rules, as you point out, broadband providers will be free to block, degrade, or otherwise disadvantage innovative services on the Internet without threat of sanction by the FCC.

With respect to the legal foundation of the rules, I believe that the Section 706 framework set forth by the court provides us with the tools we need to adopt and implement robust and enforceable Open Internet rules. Nevertheless, as you specifically urge in your letter, the Commission is also seriously considering moving forward to adopt rules using Title II of the Communications Act as the foundation for our legal authority. The *Notice* seeks comment on the benefits of both Section 706 and Title II, including the benefits of one approach over the other, to ensure the Internet remains an open platform for innovation and expression.

With respect to the substance of the rules, the proposals and questions in the *Notice* are designed to elicit a record that will give us a foundation to adopt strong, enforceable rules to protect the open Internet and prevent broadband providers from harming consumers or competition. I am especially sensitive to your concerns about arrangements that would prioritize certain traffic and allow ISPs to discriminate against other traffic. Let me be crystal clear: there must only be one Internet. It must be fast, robust and open for everyone. The *Notice* addresses this issue head-on, even asking if paid prioritization should be banned outright. It also proposes clear rules of the road and aggressive enforcement to prevent unfair treatment of consumers, edge providers and innovators. Small companies and startups must be able to reach consumers with their innovative products and services, and they must be protected against harmful conduct by broadband providers.

The *Notice* also includes a number of proposals designed to empower consumers and small businesses who may find themselves subject to harmful behavior by a broadband provider. For example, the Court of Appeals did uphold our existing transparency rule, and the *Notice* proposes to strengthen that rule to require that networks disclose *any* practices that could change a consumer's or a content provider's relationship with the network. The *Notice* proposes the creation of an ombudsperson to serve as a watchdog and advocate for start-ups, small businesses and consumers. And the *Notice* seeks comment on how to ensure that all parties, and especially small businesses and start-ups, have effective access to the Commission's dispute resolution and enforcement processes.

This *Notice* is the first step in the process, and I look forward to comments from all interested stakeholders, including members of the general public, as we develop a fulsome record on the many questions raised in the *Notice*. To that end, in an effort to maximize public participation in this proceeding, we have established an Open Internet email address – [openinternet@fcc.gov](mailto:openinternet@fcc.gov) – to ensure that Americans who may not otherwise have the opportunity to participate in an FCC proceeding can make their voices heard. In addition, to ensure sufficient opportunity for broad public comment, we have provided a lengthy comment and reply period through September 10, 2014, that will allow everyone an opportunity to participate.

Again, I appreciate your deep interest in this matter and look forward to continued engagement with you as the proceeding moves forward.

Sincerely,



Tom Wheeler



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF  
THE CHAIRMAN

June 30, 2014

The Honorable Peter DeFazio  
U.S. House of Representatives  
2134 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman DeFazio:

Thank you for writing to express your concerns regarding the need to reinstate rules to preserve an open Internet for all Americans. I share your sense of urgency on this matter. For this reason, I moved with dispatch to initiate a proceeding to consider new open Internet rules to replace those that were vacated by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals in the *Verizon* case. As you know, the *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* (“*Notice*”) adopted by the Commission in May 2014 begins that process. Therein, we ask a number of questions about the rules we need to adopt, as well as the appropriate legal foundation for such rules. Your letter touches on some of the most important issues presented in the *Notice*, and I will ensure that it is included in the record of the proceeding and considered as part of the Commission’s review.

The Commission has struggled for over a decade with how best to protect and promote an open Internet. While there has been bipartisan consensus, starting under the Bush Administration with Chairman Powell, on the importance of an open Internet to economic growth, investment, and innovation, we find ourselves today faced with the worst case scenario: we have no Open Internet rules in place to stop broadband providers from limiting Internet openness. The *status quo* is unacceptable. The Commission has already found, and the court has agreed, that broadband providers have economic incentives and technological tools to engage in behavior that can limit Internet openness and harm consumers and competition. As such, the Commission must craft meaningful rules to protect the open Internet, and it must do so promptly. I can assure you that I will utilize the best tools available to me to ensure the Commission adopts effective and resilient open Internet rules. Unless and until the Commission adopts new rules, as you point out, broadband providers will be free to block, degrade, or otherwise disadvantage innovative services on the Internet without threat of sanction by the FCC.

With respect to the legal foundation of the rules, I believe that the Section 706 framework set forth by the court provides us with the tools we need to adopt and implement robust and enforceable Open Internet rules. Nevertheless, as you specifically urge in your letter, the Commission is also seriously considering moving forward to adopt rules using Title II of the Communications Act as the foundation for our legal authority. The *Notice* seeks comment on the benefits of both Section 706 and Title II, including the benefits of one approach over the other, to ensure the Internet remains an open platform for innovation and expression.

With respect to the substance of the rules, the proposals and questions in the *Notice* are designed to elicit a record that will give us a foundation to adopt strong, enforceable rules to protect the open Internet and prevent broadband providers from harming consumers or competition. I am especially sensitive to your concerns about arrangements that would prioritize certain traffic and allow ISPs to discriminate against other traffic. Let me be crystal clear: there must only be one Internet. It must be fast, robust and open for everyone. The *Notice* addresses this issue head-on, even asking if paid prioritization should be banned outright. It also proposes clear rules of the road and aggressive enforcement to prevent unfair treatment of consumers, edge providers and innovators. Small companies and startups must be able to reach consumers with their innovative products and services, and they must be protected against harmful conduct by broadband providers.

The *Notice* also includes a number of proposals designed to empower consumers and small businesses who may find themselves subject to harmful behavior by a broadband provider. For example, the Court of Appeals did uphold our existing transparency rule, and the *Notice* proposes to strengthen that rule to require that networks disclose *any* practices that could change a consumer's or a content provider's relationship with the network. The *Notice* proposes the creation of an ombudsman to serve as a watchdog and advocate for start-ups, small businesses and consumers. And the *Notice* seeks comment on how to ensure that all parties, and especially small businesses and start-ups, have effective access to the Commission's dispute resolution and enforcement processes.

This *Notice* is the first step in the process, and I look forward to comments from all interested stakeholders, including members of the general public, as we develop a fulsome record on the many questions raised in the *Notice*. To that end, in an effort to maximize public participation in this proceeding, we have established an Open Internet email address – [openinternet@fcc.gov](mailto:openinternet@fcc.gov) – to ensure that Americans who may not otherwise have the opportunity to participate in an FCC proceeding can make their voices heard. In addition, to ensure sufficient opportunity for broad public comment, we have provided a lengthy comment and reply period through September 10, 2014, that will allow everyone an opportunity to participate.

Again, I appreciate your deep interest in this matter and look forward to continued engagement with you as the proceeding moves forward.

Sincerely,



Tom Wheeler



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF  
THE CHAIRMAN

June 30, 2014

The Honorable Donna Edwards  
U.S. House of Representatives  
2445 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congresswoman Edwards:

Thank you for writing to express your concerns regarding the need to reinstate rules to preserve an open Internet for all Americans. I share your sense of urgency on this matter. For this reason, I moved with dispatch to initiate a proceeding to consider new open Internet rules to replace those that were vacated by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals in the *Verizon* case. As you know, the *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* (“*Notice*”) adopted by the Commission in May 2014 begins that process. Therein, we ask a number of questions about the rules we need to adopt, as well as the appropriate legal foundation for such rules. Your letter touches on some of the most important issues presented in the *Notice*, and I will ensure that it is included in the record of the proceeding and considered as part of the Commission’s review.

The Commission has struggled for over a decade with how best to protect and promote an open Internet. While there has been bipartisan consensus, starting under the Bush Administration with Chairman Powell, on the importance of an open Internet to economic growth, investment, and innovation, we find ourselves today faced with the worst case scenario: we have no Open Internet rules in place to stop broadband providers from limiting Internet openness. The *status quo* is unacceptable. The Commission has already found, and the court has agreed, that broadband providers have economic incentives and technological tools to engage in behavior that can limit Internet openness and harm consumers and competition. As such, the Commission must craft meaningful rules to protect the open Internet, and it must do so promptly. I can assure you that I will utilize the best tools available to me to ensure the Commission adopts effective and resilient open Internet rules. Unless and until the Commission adopts new rules, as you point out, broadband providers will be free to block, degrade, or otherwise disadvantage innovative services on the Internet without threat of sanction by the FCC.

With respect to the legal foundation of the rules, I believe that the Section 706 framework set forth by the court provides us with the tools we need to adopt and implement robust and enforceable Open Internet rules. Nevertheless, as you specifically urge in your letter, the Commission is also seriously considering moving forward to adopt rules using Title II of the Communications Act as the foundation for our legal authority. The *Notice* seeks comment on the benefits of both Section 706 and Title II, including the benefits of one approach over the other, to ensure the Internet remains an open platform for innovation and expression.

With respect to the substance of the rules, the proposals and questions in the *Notice* are designed to elicit a record that will give us a foundation to adopt strong, enforceable rules to protect the open Internet and prevent broadband providers from harming consumers or competition. I am especially sensitive to your concerns about arrangements that would prioritize certain traffic and allow ISPs to discriminate against other traffic. Let me be crystal clear: there must only be one Internet. It must be fast, robust and open for everyone. The *Notice* addresses this issue head-on, even asking if paid prioritization should be banned outright. It also proposes clear rules of the road and aggressive enforcement to prevent unfair treatment of consumers, edge providers and innovators. Small companies and startups must be able to reach consumers with their innovative products and services, and they must be protected against harmful conduct by broadband providers.

The *Notice* also includes a number of proposals designed to empower consumers and small businesses who may find themselves subject to harmful behavior by a broadband provider. For example, the Court of Appeals did uphold our existing transparency rule, and the *Notice* proposes to strengthen that rule to require that networks disclose *any* practices that could change a consumer's or a content provider's relationship with the network. The *Notice* proposes the creation of an ombudsman to serve as a watchdog and advocate for start-ups, small businesses and consumers. And the *Notice* seeks comment on how to ensure that all parties, and especially small businesses and start-ups, have effective access to the Commission's dispute resolution and enforcement processes.

This *Notice* is the first step in the process, and I look forward to comments from all interested stakeholders, including members of the general public, as we develop a fulsome record on the many questions raised in the *Notice*. To that end, in an effort to maximize public participation in this proceeding, we have established an Open Internet email address – [openinternet@fcc.gov](mailto:openinternet@fcc.gov) – to ensure that Americans who may not otherwise have the opportunity to participate in an FCC proceeding can make their voices heard. In addition, to ensure sufficient opportunity for broad public comment, we have provided a lengthy comment and reply period through September 10, 2014, that will allow everyone an opportunity to participate.

Again, I appreciate your deep interest in this matter and look forward to continued engagement with you as the proceeding moves forward.

Sincerely,



Tom Wheeler



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF  
THE CHAIRMAN

June 30, 2014

The Honorable Keith Ellison  
U.S. House of Representatives  
2244 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Ellison:

Thank you for writing to express your concerns regarding the need to reinstate rules to preserve an open Internet for all Americans. I share your sense of urgency on this matter. For this reason, I moved with dispatch to initiate a proceeding to consider new open Internet rules to replace those that were vacated by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals in the *Verizon* case. As you know, the *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* (“*Notice*”) adopted by the Commission in May 2014 begins that process. Therein, we ask a number of questions about the rules we need to adopt, as well as the appropriate legal foundation for such rules. Your letter touches on some of the most important issues presented in the *Notice*, and I will ensure that it is included in the record of the proceeding and considered as part of the Commission’s review.

The Commission has struggled for over a decade with how best to protect and promote an open Internet. While there has been bipartisan consensus, starting under the Bush Administration with Chairman Powell, on the importance of an open Internet to economic growth, investment, and innovation, we find ourselves today faced with the worst case scenario: we have no Open Internet rules in place to stop broadband providers from limiting Internet openness. The *status quo* is unacceptable. The Commission has already found, and the court has agreed, that broadband providers have economic incentives and technological tools to engage in behavior that can limit Internet openness and harm consumers and competition. As such, the Commission must craft meaningful rules to protect the open Internet, and it must do so promptly. I can assure you that I will utilize the best tools available to me to ensure the Commission adopts effective and resilient open Internet rules. Unless and until the Commission adopts new rules, as you point out, broadband providers will be free to block, degrade, or otherwise disadvantage innovative services on the Internet without threat of sanction by the FCC.

With respect to the legal foundation of the rules, I believe that the Section 706 framework set forth by the court provides us with the tools we need to adopt and implement robust and enforceable Open Internet rules. Nevertheless, as you specifically urge in your letter, the Commission is also seriously considering moving forward to adopt rules using Title II of the Communications Act as the foundation for our legal authority. The *Notice* seeks comment on the benefits of both Section 706 and Title II, including the benefits of one approach over the other, to ensure the Internet remains an open platform for innovation and expression.

With respect to the substance of the rules, the proposals and questions in the *Notice* are designed to elicit a record that will give us a foundation to adopt strong, enforceable rules to protect the open Internet and prevent broadband providers from harming consumers or competition. I am especially sensitive to your concerns about arrangements that would prioritize certain traffic and allow ISPs to discriminate against other traffic. Let me be crystal clear: there must only be one Internet. It must be fast, robust and open for everyone. The *Notice* addresses this issue head-on, even asking if paid prioritization should be banned outright. It also proposes clear rules of the road and aggressive enforcement to prevent unfair treatment of consumers, edge providers and innovators. Small companies and startups must be able to reach consumers with their innovative products and services, and they must be protected against harmful conduct by broadband providers.

The *Notice* also includes a number of proposals designed to empower consumers and small businesses who may find themselves subject to harmful behavior by a broadband provider. For example, the Court of Appeals did uphold our existing transparency rule, and the *Notice* proposes to strengthen that rule to require that networks disclose *any* practices that could change a consumer's or a content provider's relationship with the network. The *Notice* proposes the creation of an ombudsperson to serve as a watchdog and advocate for start-ups, small businesses and consumers. And the *Notice* seeks comment on how to ensure that all parties, and especially small businesses and start-ups, have effective access to the Commission's dispute resolution and enforcement processes.

This *Notice* is the first step in the process, and I look forward to comments from all interested stakeholders, including members of the general public, as we develop a fulsome record on the many questions raised in the *Notice*. To that end, in an effort to maximize public participation in this proceeding, we have established an Open Internet email address – [openinternet@fcc.gov](mailto:openinternet@fcc.gov) – to ensure that Americans who may not otherwise have the opportunity to participate in an FCC proceeding can make their voices heard. In addition, to ensure sufficient opportunity for broad public comment, we have provided a lengthy comment and reply period through September 10, 2014, that will allow everyone an opportunity to participate.

Again, I appreciate your deep interest in this matter and look forward to continued engagement with you as the proceeding moves forward.

Sincerely,



Tom Wheeler



OFFICE OF  
THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON

June 30, 2014

The Honorable Sam Farr  
U.S. House of Representatives  
1126 Longworth House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Farr:

Thank you for writing to express your concerns regarding the need to reinstate rules to preserve an open Internet for all Americans. I share your sense of urgency on this matter. For this reason, I moved with dispatch to initiate a proceeding to consider new open Internet rules to replace those that were vacated by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals in the *Verizon* case. As you know, the *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* (“*Notice*”) adopted by the Commission in May 2014 begins that process. Therein, we ask a number of questions about the rules we need to adopt, as well as the appropriate legal foundation for such rules. Your letter touches on some of the most important issues presented in the *Notice*, and I will ensure that it is included in the record of the proceeding and considered as part of the Commission’s review.

The Commission has struggled for over a decade with how best to protect and promote an open Internet. While there has been bipartisan consensus, starting under the Bush Administration with Chairman Powell, on the importance of an open Internet to economic growth, investment, and innovation, we find ourselves today faced with the worst case scenario: we have no Open Internet rules in place to stop broadband providers from limiting Internet openness. The *status quo* is unacceptable. The Commission has already found, and the court has agreed, that broadband providers have economic incentives and technological tools to engage in behavior that can limit Internet openness and harm consumers and competition. As such, the Commission must craft meaningful rules to protect the open Internet, and it must do so promptly. I can assure you that I will utilize the best tools available to me to ensure the Commission adopts effective and resilient open Internet rules. Unless and until the Commission adopts new rules, as you point out, broadband providers will be free to block, degrade, or otherwise disadvantage innovative services on the Internet without threat of sanction by the FCC.

With respect to the legal foundation of the rules, I believe that the Section 706 framework set forth by the court provides us with the tools we need to adopt and implement robust and enforceable Open Internet rules. Nevertheless, as you specifically urge in your letter, the Commission is also seriously considering moving forward to adopt rules using Title II of the Communications Act as the foundation for our legal authority. The *Notice* seeks comment on the benefits of both Section 706 and Title II, including the benefits of one approach over the other, to ensure the Internet remains an open platform for innovation and expression.

With respect to the substance of the rules, the proposals and questions in the *Notice* are designed to elicit a record that will give us a foundation to adopt strong, enforceable rules to protect the open Internet and prevent broadband providers from harming consumers or competition. I am especially sensitive to your concerns about arrangements that would prioritize certain traffic and allow ISPs to discriminate against other traffic. Let me be crystal clear: there must only be one Internet. It must be fast, robust and open for everyone. The *Notice* addresses this issue head-on, even asking if paid prioritization should be banned outright. It also proposes clear rules of the road and aggressive enforcement to prevent unfair treatment of consumers, edge providers and innovators. Small companies and startups must be able to reach consumers with their innovative products and services, and they must be protected against harmful conduct by broadband providers.

The *Notice* also includes a number of proposals designed to empower consumers and small businesses who may find themselves subject to harmful behavior by a broadband provider. For example, the Court of Appeals did uphold our existing transparency rule, and the *Notice* proposes to strengthen that rule to require that networks disclose *any* practices that could change a consumer's or a content provider's relationship with the network. The *Notice* proposes the creation of an ombudsman to serve as a watchdog and advocate for start-ups, small businesses and consumers. And the *Notice* seeks comment on how to ensure that all parties, and especially small businesses and start-ups, have effective access to the Commission's dispute resolution and enforcement processes.

This *Notice* is the first step in the process, and I look forward to comments from all interested stakeholders, including members of the general public, as we develop a fulsome record on the many questions raised in the *Notice*. To that end, in an effort to maximize public participation in this proceeding, we have established an Open Internet email address – [openinternet@fcc.gov](mailto:openinternet@fcc.gov) – to ensure that Americans who may not otherwise have the opportunity to participate in an FCC proceeding can make their voices heard. In addition, to ensure sufficient opportunity for broad public comment, we have provided a lengthy comment and reply period through September 10, 2014, that will allow everyone an opportunity to participate.

Again, I appreciate your deep interest in this matter and look forward to continued engagement with you as the proceeding moves forward.

Sincerely,



Tom Wheeler



OFFICE OF  
THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON

June 30, 2014

The Honorable Alan Grayson  
U.S. House of Representatives  
430 Cannon House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Grayson:

Thank you for writing to express your concerns regarding the need to reinstate rules to preserve an open Internet for all Americans. I share your sense of urgency on this matter. For this reason, I moved with dispatch to initiate a proceeding to consider new open Internet rules to replace those that were vacated by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals in the *Verizon* case. As you know, the *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* (“*Notice*”) adopted by the Commission in May 2014 begins that process. Therein, we ask a number of questions about the rules we need to adopt, as well as the appropriate legal foundation for such rules. Your letter touches on some of the most important issues presented in the *Notice*, and I will ensure that it is included in the record of the proceeding and considered as part of the Commission’s review.

The Commission has struggled for over a decade with how best to protect and promote an open Internet. While there has been bipartisan consensus, starting under the Bush Administration with Chairman Powell, on the importance of an open Internet to economic growth, investment, and innovation, we find ourselves today faced with the worst case scenario: we have no Open Internet rules in place to stop broadband providers from limiting Internet openness. The *status quo* is unacceptable. The Commission has already found, and the court has agreed, that broadband providers have economic incentives and technological tools to engage in behavior that can limit Internet openness and harm consumers and competition. As such, the Commission must craft meaningful rules to protect the open Internet, and it must do so promptly. I can assure you that I will utilize the best tools available to me to ensure the Commission adopts effective and resilient open Internet rules. Unless and until the Commission adopts new rules, as you point out, broadband providers will be free to block, degrade, or otherwise disadvantage innovative services on the Internet without threat of sanction by the FCC.

With respect to the legal foundation of the rules, I believe that the Section 706 framework set forth by the court provides us with the tools we need to adopt and implement robust and enforceable Open Internet rules. Nevertheless, as you specifically urge in your letter, the Commission is also seriously considering moving forward to adopt rules using Title II of the Communications Act as the foundation for our legal authority. The *Notice* seeks comment on the benefits of both Section 706 and Title II, including the benefits of one approach over the other, to ensure the Internet remains an open platform for innovation and expression.

With respect to the substance of the rules, the proposals and questions in the *Notice* are designed to elicit a record that will give us a foundation to adopt strong, enforceable rules to protect the open Internet and prevent broadband providers from harming consumers or competition. I am especially sensitive to your concerns about arrangements that would prioritize certain traffic and allow ISPs to discriminate against other traffic. Let me be crystal clear: there must only be one Internet. It must be fast, robust and open for everyone. The *Notice* addresses this issue head-on, even asking if paid prioritization should be banned outright. It also proposes clear rules of the road and aggressive enforcement to prevent unfair treatment of consumers, edge providers and innovators. Small companies and startups must be able to reach consumers with their innovative products and services, and they must be protected against harmful conduct by broadband providers.

The *Notice* also includes a number of proposals designed to empower consumers and small businesses who may find themselves subject to harmful behavior by a broadband provider. For example, the Court of Appeals did uphold our existing transparency rule, and the *Notice* proposes to strengthen that rule to require that networks disclose *any* practices that could change a consumer's or a content provider's relationship with the network. The *Notice* proposes the creation of an ombudsperson to serve as a watchdog and advocate for start-ups, small businesses and consumers. And the *Notice* seeks comment on how to ensure that all parties, and especially small businesses and start-ups, have effective access to the Commission's dispute resolution and enforcement processes.

This *Notice* is the first step in the process, and I look forward to comments from all interested stakeholders, including members of the general public, as we develop a fulsome record on the many questions raised in the *Notice*. To that end, in an effort to maximize public participation in this proceeding, we have established an Open Internet email address – [openinternet@fcc.gov](mailto:openinternet@fcc.gov) – to ensure that Americans who may not otherwise have the opportunity to participate in an FCC proceeding can make their voices heard. In addition, to ensure sufficient opportunity for broad public comment, we have provided a lengthy comment and reply period through September 10, 2014, that will allow everyone an opportunity to participate.

Again, I appreciate your deep interest in this matter and look forward to continued engagement with you as the proceeding moves forward.

Sincerely,



Tom Wheeler



OFFICE OF  
THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON

June 30, 2014

The Honorable Raul Grijalva  
U.S. House of Representatives  
1511 Longworth House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Grijalva:

Thank you for writing to express your concerns regarding the need to reinstate rules to preserve an open Internet for all Americans. I share your sense of urgency on this matter. For this reason, I moved with dispatch to initiate a proceeding to consider new open Internet rules to replace those that were vacated by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals in the *Verizon* case. As you know, the *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* (“*Notice*”) adopted by the Commission in May 2014 begins that process. Therein, we ask a number of questions about the rules we need to adopt, as well as the appropriate legal foundation for such rules. Your letter touches on some of the most important issues presented in the *Notice*, and I will ensure that it is included in the record of the proceeding and considered as part of the Commission’s review.

The Commission has struggled for over a decade with how best to protect and promote an open Internet. While there has been bipartisan consensus, starting under the Bush Administration with Chairman Powell, on the importance of an open Internet to economic growth, investment, and innovation, we find ourselves today faced with the worst case scenario: we have no Open Internet rules in place to stop broadband providers from limiting Internet openness. The *status quo* is unacceptable. The Commission has already found, and the court has agreed, that broadband providers have economic incentives and technological tools to engage in behavior that can limit Internet openness and harm consumers and competition. As such, the Commission must craft meaningful rules to protect the open Internet, and it must do so promptly. I can assure you that I will utilize the best tools available to me to ensure the Commission adopts effective and resilient open Internet rules. Unless and until the Commission adopts new rules, as you point out, broadband providers will be free to block, degrade, or otherwise disadvantage innovative services on the Internet without threat of sanction by the FCC.

With respect to the legal foundation of the rules, I believe that the Section 706 framework set forth by the court provides us with the tools we need to adopt and implement robust and enforceable Open Internet rules. Nevertheless, as you specifically urge in your letter, the Commission is also seriously considering moving forward to adopt rules using Title II of the Communications Act as the foundation for our legal authority. The *Notice* seeks comment on the benefits of both Section 706 and Title II, including the benefits of one approach over the other, to ensure the Internet remains an open platform for innovation and expression.