1	NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.	
2	RPTS MORRISON	
3	HIF107160	
4		
5		
6	FROM EDGE TO CORE: PERSPECTIVE	
7	ON INTERNET PRIORITIZATION	
8	TUESDAY, APRIL 17, 2018	
9	House of Representatives	
10	Subcommittee on Communications and	
11	Technology	
12	Committee on Energy and Commerce	
13	Washington, D.C.	
14		
15		
16		
17	The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:15 a.m., in	
18	Room 2322 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Marsha Blackburn	
19	[chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.	
20	Members present: Representatives Blackburn, Lance, Shimkus,	
21	Latta, Guthrie, Olson, Bilirakis, Johnson, Long, Flores, Brooks,	
22	Collins, Walters, Costello, Walden (ex officio), Doyle, Welch,	
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com	

23 Clarke, Loebsack, Ruiz, Dingell, Eshoo, Engel, Matsui, McNerney, and Pallone (ex officio). 24 Staff present: Jon Adame, Policy Coordinator, 25 26 Communications and Technology; Daniel Butler, Staff Assistant; 27 Robin Colwell, Chief Counsel, Communications and Technology; Kristine Fargotstein, Detailee, Communications and Technology; 28 Sean Farrell, Professional Staff Member, Communications and 29 Technology; Adam Fromm, Director of Outreach and Coalitions; 30 31 Elena Hernandez, Press Secretary; Tim Kurth, Deputy Chief 32 Counsel, Communications and Technology; Lauren McCarty, Counsel, Communications and Technology; Austin Stonebraker, Press 33 Assistant; Evan Viau, Legislative Clerk, Communications and 34 Technology; Hamlin Wade, Special Advisor, External Affairs; Jeff 35 36 Carroll, Minority Staff Director; Jennifer Epperson, Minority FCC 37 Detailee; David Goldman, Minority Chief Counsel, Communications and Technology; Jerry Leverich, Minority Counsel; Jourdan Lewis, 38 Minority Staff Assistant; Dan Miller, Minority Policy Analyst; 39 Andrew Souvall, Minority Director of Communications, Outreach and 40 41 Member Services; and C.J. Young, Minority Press Secretary.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

42 Mrs. Blackburn. The Subcommittee on Communications and 43 Technology will now come to order. You notice that we are starting just a couple of minutes late. 44 45 We understand that the Environment hearing downstairs started a 46 couple of minutes and we are trying to accommodate the chairman of the full committee and the ranking member of the full committee 47 to get up here for their opening statements, and I recognize myself 48 49 for five minutes for an opening statement. 50 Good morning everyone, and to our witnesses thank you for 51 being here and welcome. We are here to talk about prioritization. 52 Not just paid prioritization -- all prioritization online. Despite what some of my colleagues sometimes seem to think, 53 54 prioritization is not a dirty word. The internet, in fact, is 55 based on it. 56 In the net neutrality conversation there is a common misconception that the internet is one big highway where all the 57 cars travel at the same speed and we cannot allow for any fast 58 lanes to exist without causing a big traffic jam for everybody 59 60 else. 61 It is something like this picture that we are going to put 62 up on the screen. It ran into a jam. 63 [Laughter.] **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

64 Mrs. Blackburn. Yes, we are in need of some prioritization Okay. No, that's the wrong picture. See if we can --65 here. 66 okay. 67 Our witnesses today know that this could not be further from 68 the truth and the next picture we are going to put up in fact is probably a lot closer to reality but is still an oversimplified 69 70 idea of the internet. Different connections, agreements, 71 prioritization, depending on the needs. 72 And the amazing new capabilities that we will experience on next-generation networks will be realized not only through 73 74 innovation in the chips and the servers and the infrastructure, but also through even more efficient and effective 75 76 prioritization. 77 I would also point out that in real life, all sorts of 78 interactions are prioritized every day. Many of you sitting in this room right now paid a line-sitter to get priority access to 79 80 this hearing. 81 In fact, it is commonplace for the government itself to offer 82 priority access to services. If you have ever used Priority Mail, 83 you know this to be the case. 84 And what about TSA pre-check? It just might have saved you 85 time as you traveled today. If you define paid prioritization **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

as simply the act of paying to get your own content in front of
the consumer faster, prioritized ads or sponsored content are the
basis of many business models online, as many of our members
pointed out during the Facebook hearing last week.

Prioritization is sometimes crucial from a public policy 90 Just as we all want the ambulance and the fire truck 91 standpoint. 92 to be prioritized over the rest of the traffic on the highway, 93 there is a need for voice packets to be prioritized over data packets to make sure that your 911 calls get through first and 94 95 there are lots of other examples where we can all agree that 96 certain data and certain applications should be prioritized on 97 the network.

98 One of our witnesses is pioneering a technology to provide 99 real-time audio support to the visually impaired, describing the 100 surroundings and the nonverbal interactions taking place around 101 the user.

102Other examples that our witnesses will discuss today include103telemedicine and autonomous vehicles. Prioritization of data on104the network is not unique or uniquely harmful.

105 It may be an uphill climb, but what we are trying to do with 106 this hearing is to be -- to leave aside the simplistic "fast lane" 107 talking points and kick off a more realistic discussion on the

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

108 subject.

109 My net neutrality bill left out the old language banning all 110 paid prioritization because I believe that we need a more nuanced 111 approach and a more thorough and thoughtful discussion.

For the government to consider a ban on any prioritization on the internet, paid or unpaid, we need a better understanding of what specific harmful conduct we are trying to address and a better understanding of how to leave the door open for the beneficial prioritization that's necessary to keep the internet as we know it working and to bring even more benefits to consumers.

118 Now I recognize the ranking member, Mr. Doyle, for five 119 minutes for an opening statement.

Mr. Doyle. Thank you, Madam Chair, for holding this hearing and thank you to the witnesses for appearing before us. I'd like to in particular thank Matt Wood, a proud Pittsburgher, for being here today.

124 This subcommittee is once again discussing net neutrality 125 and the fallout from Chairman Pai's repeal of the 2015 open 126 internet order.

127 This short-sighted act has created an uncertain landscape 128 where innovators and entrepreneurs trying to develop new 129 services, applications, and devices can be taxed, tolled, or

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

130 || blocked at any time by an ISP.

Prioritization practices that were once required to meet the standard of reasonable network management as judged by federal experts and network engineering, telecommunications, and competition policy at the FCC will now be determined by an ISP's bottom line.

As I've talked to companies large and small that developed deployed new applications in the wake of the 2015 net neutrality rules, their message was clear -- that the certainty created by the rules was stoking investment and giving certainty to investors and that consumers were benefitting from these new offerings.

A number of companies I talked with were working to deploy services that directly competed with ISP's own offering at lower prices, bringing what we can all agree is a much needed competition to a stagnant marketplace.

I am deeply concerned that as we move forward in a world without the open internet rules, ISPs will once again act in anti-competitive ways intended to tamp down competition and consolidate their old over their consumers.

We have already seen ISPs zero rate data from their own services and their affiliates while forcing users to either limit usage on competing apps or pay costly overage fees.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

152 If we look at the history of the internet before net 153 neutrality, we find a number of instances where ISPs use their 154 market position to stifle innovation and prevent competitors from 155 bringing new products to market, all while coming to Congress and 156 the government arguing that they were only thinking about the 157 consumer.

Today, it seems we are adding another chapter to that book. Today, we are talking about the prioritization of the internet content.

161 If the testimony of a number of our witnesses is to be 162 believed, paid prioritization can bring great benefits to the 163 internet. They claim that the coming flood of data can only be 164 dealt with by prioritizing it and creating incentives and 165 opportunities for websites and edge providers to pay to get their 166 packets to consumers before their competitors.

Well, frankly, I don't believe it. We have heard these
arguments before. The truth is giving ISPs the ability to play
gatekeeper only benefits the ISPs and their shareholders and it
significantly hurts innovators and consumers.

171 More than that, it fundamentally undercuts the level playing 172 field and open marketplace that defines the internet economy. 173 Now, I have a bill that has 160 co-sponsors in the House with

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

174 companion legislation with bipartisan support in the Senate to 175 fix this mess. Our CRA would reinstate the 2015 open internet rules and 176 177 restore the FCC to its expert oversight role over ISP network 178 practices. When you look at the polling on this issue, these rules have 179 overwhelmingly bipartisan support with a vast majority of 180 181 Democrats, Republicans, and Independents, and I hope to work with 182 my friends on the other side of the aisle to make this bill 183 bipartisan as well. 184 Madam Chair, I'd also like to raise a process issue leading up to today's hearing. Mr. Bennett, who was first to submit his 185 testimony, amended his submission yesterday afternoon in 186 187 meaningful ways. 188 I am concerned that many of the changes to Mr. Bennett's written submission were of a substantive and factual nature and 189 190 that is of great concern to us. 191 I don't believe the committee should get into the practice 192 of allowing such last-minute changes. When we have witnesses do 193 this, the committee process breaks down and it also -- it leads 194 to many of us just questioning whether the testimony will be 195 credible.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

10

196	I'd also like to note that baseball season is starting here				
197	in Congress. I had my team out on the field for the first time				
198	today and, like baseball, these markets cannot function without				
199	clear rules and a ref to call balls and strikes.				
200	The word is that ISPs want us to live in one where there is				
201	no referee and where there are no reals. The game only ends when				
202	the other team and all the fans go home because they are just sick				
203	of watching one team playing by their own rules.				
204	I don't want to live in that world and neither do the American				
205	people.				
206	Madam Chair, I'd like to ask unanimous consent to have the				
207	following documents into the record: letters from InCompass, the				
208	American Academy of Pediatrics, the National Association of				
209	Realtors, and the Center for Connected Health Policy.				
210	Mrs. Blackburn. Without object.				
211	[The information follows:]				
212					
213	*********INSERT 1********				

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

11

214	Mr. Doyle. Thank you very much, and I yield back.				
215	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman yields back.				
216	The chairman of the full committee, Mr. Walden, you're				
217	recognized for five minutes.				
218	The Chairman. I thank the chairman.				
219	Thank you all for being here. We appreciate your expert				
220	testimony as we try to wade into this issue and get to the facts.				
221	This subcommittee in particular has had has long led the				
222	way in exercising oversight over the internet. As we will hear				
223	today, the internet looks nothing like it did when it was first				
224	fully commercialized back in 1995.				
225	Back then, networks were in their nascent stage and network				
226	management presented a different set of problems. But today,				
227	with users sending over a 100 exabytes of data per month, networks				
228	have had to continually adapt to manage congestion and will need				
229	to do so even more adeptly and efficiently in the future.				
230	The development of these networks and their ability to handle				
231	the ever growing traffic demands users place on them is truly and				
232	innovative feat and not one that consumers often think about				
233	because when you turn on your computer or unlock your phone, the				
234	network the internet just works.				
235	Because it appears so simple, it's easy for consumers to				

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

12

think about the internet connections being managed by their ISP -- their internet service provider -- from one end to the other and for years consumers were told the internet was an information superhighway, giving the false impression that all internet traffic is moving the same direction on an equal plane at the same time.

We even use the word traffic to describe the movement of information and data across the internet but it's actually a lot more complicated than that.

The internet is not a highway where there can be so-called fast and slow lanes. The internet is actually a network of networks with many layers managing the data that flows across it.

There are applications layers that establish the connection and encrypt data. There is the transport layer that prepares data for transport and there is the network layer which identifies the packet routing sequence.

252 Within these layers there are many different players aside 253 from your ISP involved in managing traffic. Devices, software, 254 wi-fi routers, and content delivery networks, or CDNs, can all 255 load, manage, and relay traffic in different ways.

256 We will hear from our witnesses today a more in-depth 257 explanation of how the internet actually works, not just talking

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

13

258 points, and the role prioritization plays in operating networks. But in a basic sense, prioritization has nothing to do with 259 traffic speed. Rather, it's putting certain bits over others to 260 261 ensure that all packets arrive to their destination on time. 262 A complete ban on prioritization would not permit this and 263 would not allow some services and applications to operate smoothly. In other words, prioritization currently exists 264 265 across the internet architecture and it necessary to ensure the 266 internet functions properly.

It's also worth noting that while we have heard a lot from our friends at the edge providers about how prioritization is bad for business, those operating at the edge pay to prioritize traffic every day through the use of various interconnection agreements including CDN.

In order to facilitate high demand applications like video
streaming, many of the most popular content providers don't send
data over the public internet.

275 Rather, they directly interconnect with the CDN, allowing 276 the edge providers' traffic to be prioritized to provide a better 277 user experience.

278 It's estimated that by 2021 CDNs will carry 71 percent of 279 global internet traffic. Today is not the first time this

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

14

280 committee has considered how to best legislate the issue of 281 prioritization. 282 I released a draft -- I released draft legislation last 283 Congress that would establish rules of the road to ensure the 284 internet remains open to all. 285 Similarly, Chairman Blackburn introduced her Open Internet 286 Preservation Act at the end of last year. Rather than waste our 287 efforts on partisan legislation like the CRA, we hope our 288 colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join our effort to 289 development legislation that will provide lasting solutions to 290 some of the outstanding questions regarding internet traffic 291 management. 292 What exactly do we mean and what harms are we trying to 293 address in restricting internet prioritization, whether paid or 294 unpaid, whether the content's affiliated or not. 295 So I agree with Chairman Blackburn that in order to move 296 forward along -- toward a long overdue legislative solution, we 297 need to be able to have this conversation in a nuanced in-depth 298 manner and figure out a common ground. 299 So I look forward to hearing from all the witnesses. I would 300 just tell you we have another hearing going on downstairs so a 301 lot of members have to bounce back and forth. But we do have your **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

15

302	prepared testimony and we appreciate your participation in this				
303	very important discussion about the future of the internet.				
304	With that, Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.				
305	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman yields back.				
306	Mr. Pallone, you're recognized for five minutes.				
307	Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Madam Chair.				
308	The internet is a powerful engine of economic growth and a				
309	potent platform for free speech. With a working broadband				
310	connection, anyone can work from home, sell their own products				
311	online, and connect with companies a world away.				
312	And in the past few years we have seen how the internet can				
313	help everyday launch a worldwide political movement. But the				
314	power of the internet is rooted in the principles of net				
315	neutrality.				
316	These principles are simple and well understood. Broadband				
317	companies cannot pick internet winners and losers by blocking or				
318	slowing down content or charging extra for fast lanes.				
319	It's a question of fairness and there are no loopholes.				
320	Until the Trump administration took over the FCC, even the				
321	broadband providers themselves supported these principles,				
322	including a flat ban on fast lanes.				
323	The largest providers told us time and again that they agreed				
	NEAL R. GROSS				

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

16

324 that paid prioritization should be prohibited. They said that 325 they had no intention of charging anyone extra for faster speeds. 326 But recently those voices have gone silent and that silence 327 presents a real threat to small businesses and speech online. 328 Where there was once agreement on a prohibition on fast lanes, 329 some now want to add loopholes to net neutrality. The reasoning 330 is convoluted and confusing. They argue that somehow allowing 331 broadband providers to charge small companies extra for internet 332 fast lanes is good for small business. But that makes no sense 333 and no one's buying it.

334 Small businesses oppose having to pay extra for fast lanes.
335 So do telemedicine companies, disabled veterans groups,
336 self-driving car companies, churches, nonprofit, and the list
337 goes on.

Net neutrality advocates have spoken loud and clear. We want everyone to have a faster internet, not just the chosen few who can afford to pay extra, and that's why Democrats on this committee introduced the LIFT America Act to bring faster broadband to everyone.

The only ones who want broadband providers to charge money for fast lanes are the broadband providers and despite these latest attempts to muddy the water and create confusion, banning

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

17

346 paid prioritization is not a new issue.

The FCC solved this problem when it passed net neutrality in 2015. At that time, the FCC correctly banned these fast lanes with the exception of certain specialized services like health care.

The FCC got it right in 2015 and the Trump FCC got it wrong when it killed net neutrality last year, and that's why I support the legislation introduced by Ranking Member Doyle that would restore the well-crafted and balanced 2015 protections and I encourage any of my colleagues who support real net neutrality to sign on to Ranking Member Doyle's CRA as well.

The CRA is the best way to put net neutrality back in place and support small businesses, and I'd like to yield the remaining time to Ms. Eshoo.

360 Ms. Eshoo. I thank our ranking member and good morning, 361 everyone, and to the witnesses. Welcome, and thank you for being 362 here.

We are now a decade into the fight to protect net neutrality, and throughout that time there have been many arguments from those who oppose it -- that it will kill jobs, it would harm investment, or hurt the free press.

367

All of these have been refuted each and in turn. This is

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

18

368	actually, I think, a very simple issue. It's about fairness and				
369	equal access to an essential resource, the internet.				
370	The 2015 open internet order created the strongest most				
371	reliable rules to protect that level playing field for innovation.				
372	The courts and the FCC both acknowledged that net neutrality was				
373	critical to the virtuous cycle that has enabled the internet to				
374	act as a tool of growth, of innovation, of investment, and of free				
375	expression.				
376	That same FCC found that paid prioritization is inherently				
377	harmful to that fruitful cycle that fuels education, jobs, and				
378	our economy.				
379	Yet now we have the same companies who proclaim in full-page				
380	newspaper ads that they support net neutrality. But they are				
381	pushing for an exception for prioritization.				
382	This is about money. This is about money. We should just				
383	all acknowledge that and have a debate about it. But it's all				
384	about money.				
385	We may be a decade down the road but it's about the same thing				
386	that it always has been about and that is who controls the onramps				
387	to the internet, being able to pick winners or losers, and that's				
388	based on pay to play. It is about money.				
389	I don't blame companies for wanting to make money. That's				
	NEAL R. GROSS				

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

19

390	what they are in the business to do. But we have an obligation				
391	to the public and I think that's what this debate is about.				
392	So I look forward to hearing from the witnesses and I think				
393	everyone knows exactly where I stand on this.				
394	[Laughter.]				
395	Ms. Eshoo. I yield back. Thank you.				
396	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady yields back. Mr. Pallone				
397	yields back, and this concludes our member opening statements.				
398	I will remind the committee that each member's opening				
399	statement will be made a part of the permanent record for the				
400	committee.				
401	We thank your witnesses for being here today and you all are				
402	going to have the opportunity to give your opening statements,				
403	followed by a round of questions from our members.				
404	Our panel today, Mr. Richard Bennett, founder of High Tech				
405	Forum; Mr. Peter Rysavy am I saying that properly?				
406	Mr. Rysavy. Rysavy.				
407	Mrs.Blackburn. Rysavy. President of Rysavy Research; Mr.				
408	Paul Schroeder, director of public policy and strategic alliances				
409	at Aira Tech Corporation; and Matt Wood, policy director at Free				
410	Press.				
411	We appreciate each of you for being here today and for				
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com				

20

412 providing your testimony.

413 Mr. Bennett, we begin with you. Please, each one of you as 414 you speak, turn your microphones on and, Mr. Bennett, you are 415 recognized for five minutes for an opening statement.

21

416 STATEMENTS OF RICHARD BENNETT, FOUNDER, HIGH TECH FORUM; PETER
417 RYSAVY, PRESIDENT, RYSAVY RESEARCH, LLC; PAUL W. SCHROEDER,
418 DIRECTOR, PUBLIC POLICY AND STRATEGIC ALLIANCES, AIRA TECH
419 CORPORATION; MATT WOOD, POLICY DIRECTOR, FREE PRESS

- 420
- 421 STATEMENT OF MR. BENNETT

Mr. Bennett. Good morning, Chairman Blackburn, and hello
to Chairman Walden, Ranking Member Doyle, and Ranking Member
Pallone, and members of the committee, especially Ms. Eshoo, whose
district I used to live in and who gave me a really hard time the
first time I testified before this committee but I probably
deserved it.

Prioritization has been part of the internet's design from the beginning in that there is a type of service field in the internet protocol header, and it's been refined through integrated services, a standard design in the 1990s, then differentiated services, so not by itself anything controversial about prioritization.

And I think it's fair to say that while it was controversial for a time, it's come to be recognized there is a consensus sort of support that, done correctly, prioritization is beneficial to applications.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

22

So we have reached this consensus, I think, after about 15
years of debate around what we call net neutrality now, that it's
legitimate for ISPs, CDNs, transit networks, and purpose built
networks like WebEx to accelerate time-sensitive traffic.

If you go back to the original paper that Chairman Wheeler wrote on net neutrality, he points out that the internet is inherently biased against real-time applications as a class and biased in favor of content applications and I think if we are not careful about how we treat paid prioritization we can make that bias worse, and that's something we should try to avoid.

I think we also -- going back to the consensus question, we also believe that competition is a good thing. We want tech policies that increase that.

451 So prioritization and the related technologies such as 452 resource reservation, traffic shaping, and dynamic path selection 453 have not only become commonplace but I think they are widely 454 regarded as essential to certainly the real-time applications 455 part of the internet.

The -- and this is good, because no matter how much capacity networks have, we can also always make their operation more efficient if we apply optimization techniques and we -- there are certain problems that we solve without optimization that you can't

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

really build your way out of simply by throwing more capacity at

23

461 the problem. 462 It's like trying to solve, you know, throwing money at 463 problems that you don't really understand. 464 And I think we appreciate that prioritization mechanisms 465 such as the IEEE 802.11(e) standard that I helped design are 466 beneficial to real-time applications such as voice in the same 467 way that LTE bearers are. 468 The fact that one is provided free on a closed enterprise 469 network and the other is sold as part of a bundle that includes 470 carrier grade voice I think is -- doesn't really impact on their 471 These are useful things. We found that with -- by utilitv. prioritizing voice and wi-fi we get four times as many voice calls 472 473 through a wi-fi network. 474 But it's hard to explain the continual increases in broadband 475 speed we have seen in the U.S. over the last 10 years -- speed 476 improves 35 percent per year -- without giving some credit to the 477 expectation of profit. 478 The fact that web speeds have stagnated over this same 479 period, even declining in 2016, suggests something is wrong with 480 the web's financial model and I think you, the committee, explored 481 that last week.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

460

24

482 But leaving the consumer broadband market questions aside, 483 paid prioritization internet optimization is very important to 484 enterprises that have to connect, say, branch offices to 485 headquarters. 486 The traditional way to do that was to leases, and in some cases still is widely done. People lease business data services 487 lines like a T-1 for \$300 a month and only gives you 1.5 megabits 488 489 per second. 490 But with prioritization you could actually -- with the proper management you could actually use a public common internet 491 492 connection to connect the branch office to the headquarters. 493 And so now you're getting 50 to 250 megabits per second for 494 less than \$100 per month. But this only works -- you can only 495 have that cost savings if you're -- if someone is prioritizing 496 the traffic on the pipe. So let's bear in mind that while there are fees for these 497 498 things, the alternatives are also -- can also be quite costly. 499 So it's important, I think, to recognize the internet is no 500 longer just a research network. The internet is the network. Ιt 501 has replaced all the other -- I mean, not quite completely but 502 in the next few years all the other networks are going to be 503 subsumed by the internet.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

504	So we can't apply the sort of oh, like, research network				
505	standards to the internet. We have to recognize that the				
506	fundamental the fundamental requirement is that it serves all				
507	the needs of all the used cases of all the people who connect to				
508	it.				
509	And I think whatever it takes to do that is fine, you know,				
510	given the proper oversight.				
511	[The prepared statement of Mr. Bennett follows:]				
512	*********INSERT 2*******				

	within may be i speaker. A link	ninary, unedited transcrip naccurate, incomplete, or to the final, official transcr	misattributed to the ript will be posted on
	the Committee's	website as soon as it is avail	able. 26
513	Mrs. Blackb	urn. The gentleman yields	back.
514	Mr. Rysavy.	There we go.	
	(202) 234-4433	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701	www.nealrgross.com

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 27 515 STATEMENT OF MR. RYSAVY 516 517 Mr. Rysavy. Chairman Blackburn -- is this on? Ranking 518 Member Doyle, and other distinguished members of the 519 subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to testify at this important hearing. 520 521 I am president of Rysavy Research, an analyst in the wireless 522 industry with more than 25 years of experience. When I started, 523 the hot new wireless technology was 1G. 524 I am an expert in wireless technology. I've worked with many 525 dozens of firms and have published more than 175 reports and 526 articles. My testimony is on 5G. 527 5G will start to be deployed as early as this year -- end 528 of this year -- and will become the dominant wireless technology 529 through the 2020s. It is being designed and developed by organizations, individuals from all over the world, and will 530 employ sophisticated mechanisms to handle different kinds of 531 532 traffic flows. 533 This is critical because 5G is being designed to address a 534 much wider range of use cases than prior generations of 535 technology. 536 Many of the applications envisioned for 5G are of a control **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 (202) 234-4433 www.nealrgross.com

28

537 nature and that means they need minimal delay and high 538 reliability. These types of applications, whether it's controlling drones 539 540 in real time or robots or sending emergency messages to autonomous vehicles, will depend on traffic prioritization. 541 542 5G's reliance on traffic prioritization should not be viewed 543 as problematic for internet traffic that will not be prioritized. 544 Traffic differentiation and prioritization is not a zero sum game. 545 You can prioritize certain traffic flows without adversely affecting other users' applications. The goal in managing 546 547 network traffic is to maximize the quality of experience across the entire subscriber base. 548 549 5G needs QoS management not only for traffic prioritization 550 to support mission critical applications but also enable a 551 fundamental architectural component called network slicing. 552 Again, is being designed and developed for cellular 553 operators to deploy on a global basis. Network slicing, 554 implemented through virtualization, will allow an operator to 555 provide different services with different performance 556 characteristics customized for the specific use cases involved 557 such as those needing low latency enhanced reliability. 558 Even with new spectrum and expected peak through-puts that **NEAL R. GROSS**

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

29

559	will exceed a gigabit per second, 5G networks will still have to				
560	manage latency, reliability, massive numbers of connections, and				
561	a mix of stationary and mobile users.				
562	Capacity alone is not the solution. The United States has				
563	assumed global leadership in 4G. It enjoys deep LTE 4G				
564	penetration, leading smart phone platforms and the vibrant				
565	application ecosystem. But globally, countries and companies				
566	are investing in and concentrating on what will come next with				
567	5G.				
568	Constraining 5G with rules that restrict traffic management				
569	necessary for the traffic flows anticipated with 5G applications				
570	could threaten U.S. leadership in mobile technology and				
571	deployment.				
572	Thank you.				
573	[The prepared statement of Mr. Rysavy follows:]				
574					
575	*********INSERT 3*******				

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

576	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman yields back.			
577	Mr. Schroeder, you are recognized for five minutes and I will			
578	give you a warning at 30 seconds. How's that?			

579 STATEMENT OF MR. SCHROEDER

580

581Mr. Schroeder. Thank you very much. Good morning. I582think the microphone is on.

583 Thank you, Chairman Blackburn, members of the subcommittee. 584 Very pleased to be with you this morning. My name is Paul 585 Schroeder and I am here on behalf of Aira, a San Diego-based 586 technology company.

587 Our groundbreaking service provides instant access to visual information for people who are blind or visually impaired. 588 As 589 such, our service relies on the transmission of streaming video from the network edge through mobile up to the internet without 590 interruption at ultra-low -- high speeds to ensure ultra-low 591 592 latency connection between the blind individual and the remotely 593 located sighted assistant who is providing information based on 594 the video feed.

595 We leverage mobile communications as well as innovative 596 technologies such as the smart glasses that I am wearing, and yes, 597 there is a camera in the middle of these glasses that is connected 598 to an agent as we speak.

599 We also use GPS and other sensors, augmented reality, and 600 are incorporating machine learning. Besides the technology,

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

32

601 Aira's success really depends on our human agents.

They are highly trained, they are paid, they are held to a confidentiality requirement, and they do undergo background checks before they serve as an agent.

605 Our customers -- we call them explorers -- pay for access 606 to a fixed number of minutes per month. We are, though, working 607 with agencies such as the Department of Veterans Affairs to ensure 608 that blind veterans have access to this critical service.

I also want to note that Congressman Peters and Congressman
Rutherford have been very helpful in leading a bipartisan effort
to ensure that the VA is paying attention to these new
technologies.

This week, Aira has designated the congressional office buildings as free Aira zones. This was a choice we made because there is a large group of individuals who are blind visiting this week and we know that this will help them navigate the halls of Congress more effectively.

We encourage others to do this, and I do want to note for Chairman Blackburn your home state airport of Memphis was the first one to join the Aira Airport Network, paying for the minutes of Aira users at Memphis airport in order to get around the airports more effectively.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

33

623 Yesterday, two of our Aira explorers ran the Boston Marathon using Aira. Now, most of us, blind or sighted, probably aren't 624 going to run a marathon. But the test of a low latency available 625 626 network was put to the test at the marathon, and many of us will 627 have opportunities to test that in other environments, for example, hustling through an airport trying to find the gate for 628 629 our airplane, checking out bus signs in a crowded bus garage to 630 figure out the one that we need, quickly looking at a chart or 631 slide in a meeting or a classroom, or maybe a congressional 632 hearing, in order to get the information from that slide as a 633 person who's blind, putting information into these kiosks that are popping up everywhere in order to order or confirm a 634 635 reservation, and, of course, reading a medication label to ensure 636 that we are actually taking the right medication.

For those of us who are blind or visually impaired using Aira,
we need instant access to this information. We need a network
that is reliable and a network that has low latency because our
video is able to stream upward from the mobile edge.

We are particularly pleased to note our partner, AT&T, has
offered dynamic traffic management to Aira to ensure that our
users have the low latency network and reliable connectivity that
they need and our agents need as well.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

645 I am pleased to say this morning I am joined by an agent --646 Amy, are you there? 647 Agent. I am. Good morning, Paul. 648 Mr. Schroeder. Oh, I left the speaker by the phone. Do you 649 want to do a very quick description of the room, please? 650 Absolutely. I see three rows of a desk and that have Agent. white wood on the bottom of them and then a darker mahogany on 651 652 the top of the desk and they are separated by an aisle in the middle 653 and the very back of the room has a single panel of speakers. Ι 654 see the chairwoman is in the very middle of the room. A gentleman 655 to her left is waving at me. 656 [Laughter.] 657 Agent. American flags that are flanking the center --658 Mrs. Blackburn. Thirty seconds. 659 -- three windows directly across --Agent. 660 Mr. Schroeder. I am going to have you hold up and we'll come 661 back to you if there's a question for the agent. 662 We are investing in artificial intelligence as well so that 663 we can bring automation to our service and we are, of course, 664 looking forward to the emergence of 5G, which will help our low 665 latency network and service be even stronger. 666 Finally, I just want to say we encourage policymakers to **NEAL R. GROSS**

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

667	support policies and programs that will promote and expand			
668	reliable access to visual information such as what Aira is			
669	providing as a right to those of us who are blind or visually			
670	impaired.			
671	Thank you.			
672	[The prepared statement of Mr. Schroeder follows:]			
673				
674	**************************************			

	within may be in speaker. A link t	ninary, unedited transcrip naccurate, incomplete, or a to the final, official transcr	misattributed to the ipt will be posted on
	the Committee's v	website as soon as it is avail	able. 36
675	Mrs. Blackbu	arn. The gentleman yields	back.
676	Mr. Wood, fi	ve minutes.	
	(202) 234-4433	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701	www.nealrgross.com

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 37 677 STATEMENT OF MR. WOOD 678 679 Mr. Wood. Chairman Blackburn and Ranking Member Doyle, and 680 members of the subcommittee, thank you for having me here today 681 to testify. 682 Free Press is a nonpartisan nonprofit with 1.4 million members and we were founded 15 years ago to elevate people's voices 683 684 in policy decisions that shape our media. 685 Today, we believe that achieving racial justice and social 686 justice require equitable access to technology and information. 687 That's why we work on net neutrality. We supported the strong rules recently and wrongly repealed 688 689 by the FCC and we support Congressman Doyle's resolution to 690 restore them, and we are not alone. 691 Hundreds of members have co-sponsored that resolution in the 692 Thousands of businesses and organizations and House and Senate. 693 state and local officials support it, too. 694 Millions of people have made their voices heard, first, at 695 the FCC and then in these halls, opposing that repeal and calling 696 on you to pass the CRA. 697 That's not surprising because, as Mr. Doyle noted, poll after 698 poll shows the net neutrality rules enjoy tremendous popular **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

38

699 support across party lines.

700One poll last summer showed that 72 percent of Republicans701supported the 2015 rules. Another taken before the FCC's702December vote found that 83 percent of all respondents oppose that703repeal.

Free Press supports restoring the entire 2015 order because we need more than three bright lines to preserve the open internet. We need FCC authority to prevent new forms of discrimination and also to address digital divides, protect privacy, and promote competition.

Yet some people claim that paid prioritization bans are harmful and they say that ISPs should be able to charge new kinds of fees and that internet users and businesses would benefit from such new charges.

713 They also say this would help with last mile congestion 714 without explaining its scope or accounting for the ways the 715 networks already deal with that.

As a general matter, prioritizing rather than building
capacity to solve any last mile congestion over a sustained period
would let ISPs profit from artificial scarcity.

719 It would let them charge more to get through the bottleneck720 rather than building a bigger path. So paid prioritization is

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

39

721 not just a solution in search of a problem; it's a toll booth in 722 search of a traffic jam.

723 ISPs' own data shows that under Title 2, both broadband 724 investment and deployment speeds increased markedly in rural and 725 urban areas alike.

Despite that evidence, some still insist that strong rules made ISPs invest too little. Now, funnily enough, we are told that the rules may make ISPs invest too much by requiring them to build both excess capacity instead of prioritizing their way out of congestion.

731 Whatever the investment incentives of the paid
732 prioritization ban, discarding this rule would cause a radical
733 change to the internet.

That ban prohibited ISPs favouring traffic only in exchange
for payment from a third party or to benefit an ISPs affiliates
such as video or voice offers.

737 In other words, it not ban the kinds of user-directed and
738 application-driven traffic management techniques praised by
739 others here today.

Those kinds of practices leave ISPs' customers in control
when it comes to choosing how to use those connections and those
customers already can and do choose to buy faster speed tiers when

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

40

743 they so desire.

They could even buy what's called a quality of service tier to use on applications of their choosing and at times of their own choosing.

747 Long-standing network protocols also can and do make these 748 kinds of choices neutrally. ISPs don't need to inspect our 749 internet traffic as they transmit or to second guess how to treat 750 it.

The paid priority rule banned none of these network
management techniques. It applied only if the ISP tried to make
a content provider pay extra just to reach broadband customers
or just to cut in line ahead of other traffic.

People already pay for their connections. The websites and apps they visit should not suddenly ask -- be asked to do so, too. So if I visit marshablackburn.com or mikedoyleforcongress.com on my home connection, those websites don't have to pay my ISP to reach me.

Let me be clear. I am not here to defend bid edge providers
from such payments. I represent internet users. But letting
gatekeeper ISPs impose new tolls would distort the choices users
have and ISPs undoubtedly would get together with those largest
edge providers to set the terms and prices for any such advantages.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

41

765 It would be inefficient for every edge provider to have to 766 strike such deals with every ISP in the country and signing up 767 for such deals means they'd be double charged for data that ISP 768 subscribers already paid to receive.

Academics can speculate that in a different kind of access market such new fees might reduce subscriber costs. They still do not explain why ISPs facing so little competition would have any incentive to lower their retail prices.

773 So when ISPs executives talk about paid prioritization they 774 don't describe it as a way to reduce revenues or to replace the 775 source for those revenues. They talk about it as a chance to 776 increase their revenues.

That's why the notion that new ISP fees might benefit internet users and reduce their prices brings to mind a joke I've heard on several occasions. But with all due respect to the originator of that joke, I think that the most terrifying words in the language may be, "I am from the cable company. I am here to save you money."

783 Thank you very much and I look forward to your questions.784 [The prepared statement of Mr. Wood follows:]

785

786

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

42

787	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman yields back.
788	This concludes the testimony from our witnesses. We thank
789	you for that, and we will now move to our questions and answers.
790	I will begin and recognize myself for five minutes.
791	Mr. Bennett, I want to come to you first. I want to discuss
792	a tweet from Matthew Prince, the CEO of Cloudflare, from last
793	November.
794	This exchange occurred on the day the FCC made its Restoring
795	Internet Freedom order available to the public. Someone tweeted
796	a wish that a tech billionaire would buy out the local ISP where
797	Chairman Pai lives and throttle his internet access in retaliation
798	for reversing the previous commission's order.
799	Matthew Prince tweeted in reply, "I could do this in a
800	different but equally effective way." He went on to say he had
801	sent a note to his general counsel to see if Cloudflare could
802	throttle Pai's access without breaking any laws.
803	This tweet certainly raises a number of questions and, in
804	fact, it gave us the idea for this hearing. Was Matthew Prince
805	right, and if so, how could he have done this?
806	Mr. Bennett. Thank you for the question, Chairman
807	Blackburn.
808	I think the I remember that exchange. I got involved in
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON D.C. 20005-3701

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

43

809 it myself, actually. The reason that -- and I think what it 810 illustrates is how the construction of the internet, the structure 811 of the architecture has changed since the sort of founding days 812 of even really since Tim Wu came up with the idea for net 813 neutrality.

So instead of it being a system that consists of users 814 attached, you know, with their computers and mobile devices to 815 816 an infrastructure that's provided only by internet service 817 providers, the infrastructure is actually -- there's a lot going on in the infrastructure today that didn't used to be there in 818 819 the very beginning and content delivery networks have been mentioned several times and that's one example. 820 It's --821 technically, content delivery networks are edge services but it 822 turns out that all parts of the edge are not equal. So if you 823 put a content delivery network on a portion of the edge close to 824 the end user, then you, by that very act of simply locating the 825 data there, you have moved the data to the head of a line that 826 other suppliers of information that could be, say, on an average 827 of half a nation away would have to -- would have to join at the 828 back -- you know, CDNs put you at the front.

829 So Cloudflare has a number of -- they're actually quite 830 innovative products the company has. So it's sort of a -- it's

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

44

831 hard to -- I am not completely a fan but some of the things they're
832 doing I think are very beneficial.

833 When -- one of the -- I think their primary product is the 834 DDoS protection mechanism so that, you know, sites can be subject 835 to denial of service attacks if they are on the wrong side of popular opinion on certain topics and Cloudflare came up with a 836 8.37 way to protect sites that are being hammered with denial of service 838 attacks by simply putting a really high bandwidth kind of firewall 839 in front of the site that could absorb the denial of service attack 840 and allow the website to continue to function.

841 Of course, there are -- that doesn't always work the way it's 842 planned. The -- I used to be a visiting fellow at the American 843 Enterprise Institute and we published a blog called Tech Policy 844 Daily, and we used Cloudflare's free service to protect the blog 845 from denial of service attacks. AIE's the kind of organization 846 that's sort of a target for a lot of that sort of anti-social 847 behavior.

But I ran into a situation once where I was unable to access the blog -- a post that I would written for the blog from my home in Colorado due to a misconfiguration of the Cloudflare. The Cloudflare had changed some IP addresses. They hadn't

852 told the people at AIE, and so the AEI server, which was not

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

45

actually owned or controlled by Cloudflare -- it was just behind
the Cloudflare firewall -- was unreachable to me. But people in
D.C. could see it just fine. So it's, like, they were saying why
is this a problem.
Mrs. Blackburn. Let me interject and ask you one more

question on this. You talked about the CDNs, and as we look at an individual user's access to certain content, who else within this ecosystem would have the opportunity to control that access or to control the speed of the individual's access?

Mr. Bennett. Well, the CDNs dump so much traffic on the internet I think, as it's covered in the background memo for the hearing, that they're actually in a position to affect the rate at which non-CDN users can get their jobs done.

866 Mrs. Blackburn. Okay. My time has expired.

867 Mr. Doyle.

868 Mr. Doyle. Thank you.

A number of witnesses mentioned that 5G will precipitate the need for greater prioritization. If we dramatically increase the capacity of the network service, do we also need to dramatically increase our ability to manage the scarcity of it?

873 Mr. Wood. I think not. Congestion doesn't solve every 874 problem, I heard other witnesses say, but it can solve a lot of

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

46

875	them, and as I noted in my testimony, certain kinds of
876	prioritization actually do happen already. The question really
877	is who's being made to pay for that.
878	Mr. Doyle. You know, a number of witnesses also said in
879	their testimony they talked about the benefits of ISPs
880	prioritizing certain kinds of traffic over others for instance,
881	live video, telemedicine, and online games.
882	But what happens when you take the choice away from consumers
883	of which packets get to them first and ISPs are allowed to decide
884	which applications and application providers will have optimized
885	access to consumers and which ones won't?
886	I mean, to me it seems like the ISPs get to pick who wins
887	and who loses. What do you think?
888	Mr. Wood. Thank you, Congressman.
889	Yes, we agree. We think retaining that user choice and the
890	rights that users have is very important. And so you're right,
891	that certain kinds of traffic might have different network needs
892	at different times.
893	It should really be up to the user to choose not only which
894	kinds of traffic they might wish to pay for or prioritize but also
895	the source of that traffic. So will all video applications be
896	treated the say way that's a very tough question to answer when
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

47

897 we are leaving that all within the ISPs' control. Mr. Doyle. You know, let's talk a little bit about 898 899 competition. If ISPs were allowed to implement paid 900 prioritization for services such as telemedicine or other 901 services, do you think that would increase or decrease the number of competitive offerings in that space? 902 Essentially, do you think small rural health practices or 903 904 small startups would want to compete against large health systems 905 and the ISPs themselves or other large institutional players? 906 Mr. Wood. Yes, Congressman. Thank you. 907 I think it would decrease the amount of competitors further 908 upstream, if you will. There's some notion that paid priority 909 could be used to level the playing field, I suppose, and let the 910 small businesses compete with the large businesses. 911 I can't see how that would work. I think that if there were 912 paid prioritization allowed, then naturally the companies with 913 the deepest pockets and the providers with the biggest bank 914 accounts would pay for that prioritization. 915 It wouldn't be used to level the playing field. It would 916 just be used to tilt it even further. 917 Mr. Doyle. You know, a number of witnesses here today have 918 alleged that the open internet order severely restricted the types **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

48

919 of network management an ISP could engage in.

They also alleged that certain types of specialized service offerings such as telemedicine work prohibit it. Further, they claim that prioritization is necessary to ensure the quality of certain services, services, it seems to me, that might be best served using business data services, which I see are claimed to be too expensive.

What do you make of that?

926

Mr. Wood. Well, there's a lot there. I do think that the
open internet order of 2015 did allow for reasonable network
management. It was the term of art used for several of the rules.
So even for blocking or for throttling, there were network
management exceptions.

For a prioritization, there was no such exception but, of course, as I noted this morning, the ban only applied to third party payments or those done -- prioritization done to benefit an affiliate of the internet service provider.

So all kinds of applications could receive network
management. You mentioned specialized services and other kinds
of dedicated capacity. Those were fully allowed by the 2015 order
and, again, even when there is a use case for prioritization on
the open internet without going to a specialized service or

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 49 941 dedicated capacity, there are protocols and methods for doing that 942 today. They just simply don't require the edge provider to pay on 943 944 top of what the broadband user is already paying for their service. 945 Mr. Doyle. Right. Mr. Wood, the ban on paid prioritization or pay to play, that 946 was a fundamental part of net neutrality and throughout the 947 948 proceeding to eliminate neutrality protections Chairman Pai repeatedly said that the 2015 net neutrality order was a departure 949 950 from the past. 951 Yet, as far back as the 1970s the commission had identified 952 the potential harmful effects that could result when just a 953 handful of gatekeepers could control consumers' access to the 954 internet. 955 Has the internet always been open and free? 956 Mr. Wood. We certainly think so. In the old days, you might 957 call it, broadband providers were Title 2 providers. Your 958 dial-up service worked over a phone line and that phone company 959 was subject to nondiscrimination rules. 960 So although the legal ground for net neutrality has shifted 961 somewhat over the last decade as different administrations have 962 tried to do it in different ways, the protections have always been **NEAL R. GROSS**

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

963 there and we think the 2015 version did the best job of restoring 964 the protections we've always had. 965 Mr. Doyle. So why were quardrails needed when the FCC opened 966 its proceeding that resulted in the recently overturned net 967 neutrality protection? 968 Mr. Wood. I am sorry. You said why were quardrails needed? 969 Mr. Doyle. Yes. 970 I am not sure I completely understand the Mr. Wood. 971 But we do think that restoring the protections -question. 972 keeping the protections we've always had was the right move. Ι 973 am not sure what quardrails you're referring to in the new 974 proceeding. 975 Mr. Doyle. No, in the recently overturned proceeding. 976 Mr. Wood. Yes. Well, I mean, again, these are fundamental 977 rights that we think deserve protection and always have had it 978 in some form or another and so that's why we are looking to restore 979 it now. 980 Mr. Doyle. I see my time has expired. 981 Thank you, Madam Chair. 982 Mrs. Blackburn. Gentleman yields back. 983 Mr. Shimkus, you're recognized for five minutes. 984 Mr. Shimkus. Thank you, Madam Chairman. **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

51

985	Great hearing, interesting issue, contentious views. I
986	want to start with Mr. Schroeder and I want to, one, thank you
987	for being here, and secondly, I was watching your hands. Were
988	you reading Braille or how was how did you read to us your
989	testimony? What was going on down there?
990	Mr. Schroeder. Yes. Microphone is it on?
991	Mr. Shimkus. It's on. You're good.
992	Mr. Schroeder. Yes, I was. I am reading off of a small
993	Braille device. It's essentially a Braille computer that has my
994	summarized testimony.
995	Mr. Shimkus. Great. And where is the lady who's assisting
996	you through your glasses and the video? Where is actually she
997	physically located?
998	Mr. Schroeder. Amy is in San Diego currently.
999	Mr. Shimkus. Great. Great. So
1000	Mr. Schroeder. I am taking the headphone out so she can talk
1001	if you have a question for her.
1002	Mr. Shimkus. I hope that you have a good working
1003	environment, Amy.
1004	[Laughter.]
1005	Mr. Schroeder. You know, one of the things we found when
1006	our agents and Amy was our lead agent and the person that
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
	(202) 234-4433 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

52

1007	developed a lot of the training that the agents now go through
1008	she is a company employee in San Diego.
1009	But our agents love Aira, as you can imagine. They are paid,
1010	as I mentioned. It's largely home-based employment and as long
1011	as they've got a good internet connection they are able to provide
1012	the support for Aira users and there's a lot of satisfaction, I
1013	know, among our agents and the kind of work that they do from the
1014	tedious work of getting somebody through an airport or the very
1015	exciting work of actually being able to work with somebody who's
1016	touring Paris.
1017	Mr. Shimkus. Yes. In your testimony then you can put
1018	her you can put her down.
1019	[Laughter.]
1020	Mr. Shimkus. I don't think I've got questions for
1021	Mr. Schroeder. I'm putting you down, Amy.
1022	Mr. Shimkus. Yes. In your testimony you talked about your
1023	relationship with AT&T and then the Aira accessibility of
1024	government buildings this week or while there are numerous people
1025	who have impaired vision that's on the Hill.
1026	And so it's tied into this hearing. Why do you think you
1027	were invited here to testify?
1028	Mr. Schroeder. I think Aira has an interesting case to make.
	NEAL R. GROSSCOURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.(202) 234-4433WASHINGTON, D.C.20005-3701www.nealrgross.com

53

We've been clear from the beginning we don't really -- as you know if you looked at our company references, we don't really have -we haven't stated a position on this particular topic.

But Aira has a very interesting case to make regarding prioritization and as I noted it's an upstream priority. So typically when we talk about this issue of prioritized content and access to content it's usually ensuring that users have access to content and the discussion tends to revolve around making sure that the content goes downstream in an orderly fashion.

1038 We are the other side of that case. We need to send video 1039 upstream and, as you know, you know, often upload speeds don't 1040 match download speeds.

1041 And so our critical case to make is that our service can't 1042 work if it's not -- if we don't have priority low latency access. 1043 I think we talk about 80 milliseconds is what we try to achieve 1044 or better of latency because if somebody is out and about moving 1045 they really do need that instant video feedback that the agent 1046 can then provide -- that that video in the opposite direction of 1047 what we usually talk about in these -- in these networking --1048 Mr. Shimkus. Yes. It's excellent testimony and you can 1049 just see someone trying to cross a busy street and then being --1050 feedback is delayed. That's a dangerous proposition to be -- to

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

54

1051	be had.
1052	I just think it's it really does speak to it's not as
1053	simple as people like to portray this debate.
1054	And I want to go to Mr. Rysavy.
1055	Mr. Rysavy. Rysavy.
1056	Mr. Shimkus. Rysavy. You say it's not a zero sum game.
1057	Explain that. Because that's the whole debate. You know, net
1058	neutrality there's winners and losers Mr. Wood articulates
1059	that very but you say it's not. You can't put it in that
1060	in that
1061	Mr. Rysavy. It is absolutely not a zero sum game.
1062	Mr. Shimkus. And explain that.
1063	Mr. Rysavy. The reason is that different applications have
1064	different requirements. If I am trying to send a short message
1065	to an autonomous vehicle that there's a pedestrian in the road
1066	around the corner that the car can't see, that traffic does not
1067	have to adversely affect a video streaming application that
1068	already has a buffer and already has tolerance for delay in how
1069	it receives its packets.
1070	Mr. Shimkus. So and then someone else mentioned it's it's
1071	really not a highway. It's a network of networks.
1072	Mr. Rysavy. Yes.
	NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

55

1073	Mr. Shimkus. And so there's other and Mr. Bennett, in
1074	your testimony you talk about how you can manipulate a portion
1075	of the network to actually slow up the process where the, quote,
1076	unquote, "pie" may get the original one.
1077	Great hearing, Madam Chairman. I wish I had more time but
1078	I don't, and I yield back.
1079	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman yields back.
1080	Let's see. So Ms. Eshoo, five minutes.
1081	Ms. Eshoo. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.
1082	Again, thank you to the witnesses. I have to say that from
1083	the first three, I haven't heard any of you just clearly address
1084	why you think paid prioritization is a good idea.
1085	We just heard the exchange with Mr. Shimkus and the witness
1086	about different uses of the internet but it didn't have you
1087	didn't bring up why one case or another should have paid
1088	prioritization.
1089	So you know where I am but I think that your job is to try
1090	to dissuade me or bring new facts to the table and, most frankly,
1091	I didn't hear them.
1092	I think that paid prioritization really needs to be examined
1093	for exactly what it is. There are many uses on the internet.
1094	But, you know, I think that we are going to here at the committee
	NEAL R. GROSSCOURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.(202) 234-4433WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701www.nealrgross.com

56

1095 we have many members including myself that are fighting very hard 1096 for rural areas in our country to receive broadband. Some are 1097 underserved. Others are not served as they should be. 1098 Put paid prioritization on top of that. How fair is that 1099 to those people? You know, the idea is to move it faster, quicker, 1100 fairer, expand it so that there's more information to the many 1101 in a democracy. 1102 So to Mr. Wood, can you explain the distinction between --1103 because this term is being thrown around -- specialized services 1104 and paid prioritization? 1105 And also, you refer to your, in your testimony, to new forms 1106 of discrimination and I think that that is -- you know, that could 1107 crop up and if you can expand on that a little I would appreciate 1108 it. 1109 Thank you, Congresswoman. Mr. Wood. Sure. 1110 Specialized services is a term that the FCC has used over 1111 the last several years. You might think of it as dedicated 1112 access. And so I don't know Aira's business model completely but 1113 a purchaser of a device might not actually be using that device on their own broadband network. 1114 1115 The device might bring the broadband with it, if you will, 1116 and that's a way, if there is a need for prioritization and even

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

57

1117 for the application waiver --Ms. Eshoo. And that was included in the 2015 rule, right? 1118 1119 Mr. Wood. It was, and 2010 as well, and this is the kind 1120 of thing we've always seen with --1121 Ms. Eshoo. And the court upheld that. 1122 Mr. Wood. That's true. 1123 Ms. Eshoo. Very importantly, the courts upheld that. 1124 I am sorry, go ahead. Mm-hmm. 1125 Mr. Wood. And then as to new forms of discrimination, we 1126 just believe that the kinds of things Chairman Blackburn was 1127 describing -- for example, distortion further into the network 1128 or especially at interconnection points, as they're called, where 1129 the last mile broadband network receives all this traffic that 1130 their users are subscribing for -- the users are requesting and 1131 if it can't get to them due to some sort of blockage further up 1132 the line or if there is some kind of new form of discriminatory 1133 treatment towards the broadband providers and users, we would like 1134 the FCC to have the ability to assess that and determine the 1135 statute is unreasonable discrimination to assess whether a tactic 1136 or a technique is actually benefiting users or hurting them. 1137 Ms. Eshoo. Is there anything that you know of that you can 1138 think of that makes the case for paid prioritization plausible **NEAL R. GROSS**

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

58

1139 or acceptable?

1140 Mr. Wood. I mean, as I said, some people might postulate 1141 that it would save money for the broadband providers' customers. 1142 We just haven't seen that happen, and when you have so few choices 1143 among broadband providers --

1144 Ms. Eshoo. Well, how do you save money if you're paying 1145 more?

1146 Mr. Wood. Well, you wouldn't be saving money. I think that 1147 you know, sometimes there's a notion that if the edge provider 1148 pays the user won't have to, and what we think of this as is more 1149 double charging.

1150 The broadband provider's customer continues to pay for 1151 their access and then the two-sided market, or the handout in the 1152 other direction, says now the edge provider pays as well.

1153So as I said, I don't think that the ISPs think of this as1154a way to save money.

Ms. Eshoo. Yes, it's about as clear as fog. Yes.
Well, I just -- I wish I heard a very clear case from the
wonderful first three witnesses on why paid prioritization is a
very good thing for anyone using the internet and I haven't heard
it.

I admire the different services that you have referred to

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1160

59

1161 and all of that but I think that we've got some fog in this hearing 1162 and paid prioritization is paid prioritization. 1163 I don't find anything foundational and positive about it. 1164 Thank you to all of you, and I yield back. 1165 Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady yields back. 1166 Mr. Latta, you're recognized. 1167 Mr. Latta. Well, thank you very much, Madam Chair, and 1168 thanks for our witnesses. As my friend from Illinois said, this 1169 has been a very interesting hearing. I appreciate you all being 1170 here to give your testimony today. 1171 Mr. Bennett, if I could start my questioning with you. What 1172 impacts of traffic management on different applications? are the 1173 And if all video conferencing applications such as Skype or 1174 Facetime were in the same traffic lane as general email traffic, 1175 how would that impact each service? 1176 Mr. Bennett. Thank you for the question. 1177 Oh, speak into the machine. The network operators have to 1178 manage a pool of resources and one of the -- one of the resources 1179 that's really critical is what engineers call latency. It's It's how long it takes a packet to get from one point to 1180 delav. 1181 another. 1182 Latency is -- low latency is a resource that networks never NEAL R. GROSS

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

60

1183 have an infinite supply of. There's -- it always has to be 1184 managed.

So it's very important for these video conferencing apps to have low latency because if they don't the picture breaks up, the -- you hear, like, drop outs in the audio channel, and the overall accuracy and the feeling of sort of presence of being as if you're in the same room with the person you're talking to, you can't achieve that without very low latency.

Latency doesn't make any difference to email applications. I mean, they're perfectly fine with, you know, and network time is like measured in units of, like, millionths and billionths of a second and email, you know, operates more at the level of, like, minutes and hours.

So, I mean, it doesn't really matter. So when we -- when we assign, effectively, low latency to an email packet that doesn't need it simply because we are sending packets in the order they were received or in some other sort of semi random order, we are wasting a resource.

And so it's actually -- I think it's a bit irresponsible to just sort of treat all traffic the same because that means we are ignoring the fundamental requirements that the users of those services have.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

61

1205 Mr. Latta. Thank you. 1206 Mr. Rysavy, if I could ask you -- in my district and across 1207 the country there's a great deal of interest in manufacturing and 1208 other sectors that we see increased efficiency from the Internet 1209 of Things. 1210 IOT will make -- will be name of next-generation sensors and 1211 automated equipment such as drones and robots that can provide 1212 real-time and HD video imaging, audio, and other 1213 bandwidth-intensive sensing, monitoring, automated processes. 1214 In a world without prioritization, can the Internet of Things 1215 become a reality? 1216 Mr. Rysavy. It would come to a very partial reality. The 1217 fact is that the application and quality of service requirements 1218 for different applications vary. 1219 So there may be some IOT applications that don't need 1220 prioritization. But to expand the number of applications to 1221 allow innovators the full range of everything that is possible, 1222 many of these techniques of quality of service management will 1223 be essential. 1224 Mr. Latta. Okay. Well, just a quick follow-up then, so 1225 what would that mean for overall U.S. competitiveness in 1226 manufacturing? NEAL R. GROSS

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

62

Mr. Rysavy. The more artificial restrictions that there are on what kind of applications can be deployed, the less competitive industry will be because you can be assured that other countries who wish to dominate in this space are not going to handicap their technologies.

1232 Mr. Latta. Okay.

1233 Mr. Bennett, going back, if I could, to you, we often hear 1234 about how ISPs prioritize packets that manage traffic congestion 1235 to complete a user-friendly experience.

However, we see edge providers pay to prioritize search results, advertising social network feeds, shopping options, et cetera. Given that this form of paid prioritization is happening every day, I would like to understand the impact that it has on consumers.

1241 Mr. Bennett. Thanks for the questions.

Yes, the -- we can see some of the impact of the prioritization of search results and how the market has changed for product search. For a very long time, Google was the dominant company in product search.

But nowadays more people begin product searches on Amazon than do it in Google, and I don't know exactly why that is happening but I think it's something -- it has something to do with the fact

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

63

1249 that when you do a Google search the first few answers you get are all paid ads, and they -- they're not always very relevant, 1250 you know, to what you're doing and they're certainly not as 1251 1252 trustworthy as the organic search. 1253 So prioritization, I think, in that sense the company should 1254 realize that they've actually hurt their market position by 1255 distorting their search results that way and by the fact that the 1256 Google search is just not as effective as it used to be. 1257 Mr. Latta. Well, thank you very much. 1258 Madam Chair, my time has expired. 1259 Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman yields back. 1260 Ms. Clarke, you're recognized for five minutes. 1261 Ms. Clarke. I thank you, Madam Chairwoman, and I thank our 1262 expert witnesses for their testimony here this morning. 1263 And given that I also serve on the Small Business Committee, 1264 I strongly believe and maintain that the rollback of net 1265 neutrality is going to have a hugely detrimental effect on small 1266 businesses, and I am not alone in this belief. 1267 Polling indicates that an overwhelming majority of 1268 respondents are concerned that the elimination of net neutrality 1269 could disadvantage small businesses by allowing big national 1270 chains to put their online services in a fast lane. **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

(202) 234-4433

64

1271	A number of small businesses in my district back in Brooklyn
1272	have been outspoken about this. Small businesses, like, take
1273	shape and staff base and I could co-sponsor the CRA to reinstate
1274	net neutrality in part due to their concerns.
1275	Given that, Madam Chairwoman, I would like to introduce a
1276	letter for the record and this record it opposes the FCC's
1277	rollback of net neutrality and it's signed by 800 small
1278	businesses.
1279	Mrs. Blackburn. Without objection.
1280	[The information follows:]
1281	
1282	*********INSERT 6*******
	NEAL R. GROSS
	COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

65

1283 Ms. Clarke. I thank you, Madam Chair.

1284 Mr. Wood, why are small businesses so concerned about the 1285 rollback of net neutrality and why is rolling back the ban on paid 1286 prioritization worrying these businesses?

1287 Mr. Wood. Thank you, Congresswoman.

I think it's pretty clear and simple. They don't want to have to pay extra to deliver their content to their customers. Now, it's not true that they're not paying. They pay a lot to get their content onto the internet and they pay their own broadband provider or sometimes they're even able to build their own connections.

What we are talking about here is then paying my ISP at home separate charge either to cut in line in front of somebody else or perhaps just to get the traffic to me in the first place and it's that extra and, frankly, new toll that I think has small businesses worried.

I saw the poll that I think you're referring to and it was something like four to one small businesses opposed to the repeal and worried about paid priority.

A large number of them are uncertain how it would affect their business so I find it funny that in the name of creating more certainty we've actually created great uncertainty for small

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

66

1305 businesses who thought this was unsettled.

But that's the kind of fear they're facing is are there going to be new tolls and new charges that I must pay just to get my content to my customers.

1309 Ms. Clarke. Very well.

1310I've also been a small advocate of diversity in traditional1311media companies and that's why, along with my colleagues, I've1312created the Multicultural Media Caucus here in the House.

1313The sad truth is that diverse voices are seldom truly1314represented in traditional media but that neutrality can in some1315ways help fix that problem.

1316 Mr. Wood, why is net neutrality important for groups that 1317 are not well represented in traditional media?

1318 Mr. Wood. Thank you, Congresswoman. I think it's for 1319 exactly that reason it does. It doesn't eliminate all barriers 1320 but it lowers the barriers to speaking in one's own voice and 1321 getting your story out there.

1322And so traditionally communities of color have not been well1323represented on the airwaves. The internet helps to change that.

Again, I think the notion that some who've tried to put forward in this hearing is that prioritization and paid prioritization could help them compete with the biggest content

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

67

1327 providers, and I just can't see how that would work.

I think if we did allow for paid prioritization then the traditional media companies would be the first in line and the highest bidders for such slots and that the less well known and well established media companies and voices would be pushed to the back of the line.

1333 Ms. Clarke. Very well, and I remain concerned about the 1334 impact paid prioritization can have on innovation and new ideas 1335 and on new products.

1336When a programmer in my district comes up with the next big1337idea, how can we help ensure her focus is on connecting with her1338users? And this question is to Mr. Wood and Mr. Schroeder.

Mr. Wood. I will go just because my mic's on.

I think this is how we can do it is by preserving the internet as it always has been where people pay their own broadband connection but then they're not asked to pay an additional toll just to reach the other side of that connection and we have each side of the conversation paying for their connectivity but not this extra toll where the ISP charges in both directions. Mr. Schroeder. I think as -- thank you for the question,

1347 Congresswoman.

1348

1339

I think for Aira we are a company that serves a rather small

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

68

and underserved customer base providing a unique service, right.
So people who are blind or visually compared constitute, you know,
maybe 23 million of the population.

1352The people who need our service don't really have an adequate1353technology-based solution. What most people would do is try to1354find a sighted assistant to provide some access to visual1355information and there isn't always a sighted assistant around and,1356frankly, there isn't always a competent sighted assistant around1357to provide access to information.

1358 Getting to our users has been a real challenge. But to 1359 answer maybe the question you didn't ask but for us, one of the 1360 limitations we worry about is and one of the things we've seen 1361 before we had access to the dynamic traffic management that AT&T 1362 offers on its essentially high-priority private network is that 1363 our users were not able to get their video through in a -- in a 1364 way that was -- that actually worked because there were too many 1365 lags, too many delays, and too many dropped calls. And so they 1366 weren't able to have access to competent assistance using the Aira 1367 model.

1368 Ms. Clarke. I thank you, Mr. Schroeder, and I yield back,1369 Madam Chair.

1370

Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady yields back.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

69

1371 Mr. Guthrie, five minutes.

1372 Mr. Guthrie. Thank you very much, Madam Chairwoman, and 1373 appreciate the hearing.

And this question is for Mr. Bennett, probably continuing on some of the same theme. I would like to discuss the debate over ISPs taking advantage of their gatekeeper position at the last mile connection points by prioritizing content delivery for those who pay the most or even holding content hostage and the counter position that they wouldn't have a viable business model if they did this.

I may be oversimplifying this but it seems to boil down to questions about relatively bargaining positions within edge providers and ISPs and who has the unique advantage in this regard.

1384 So the question, in the development of the internet as we 1385 know it today, has there been a need for or practice of paying 1386 for priority of content delivery over the last mile?

Mr. Bennett. It certainly hasn't been a widespread
practice, if it has existed at all. There have been certainly
a lot of claims that ISPs were holding certain content providers
hostage for payment.

1391 In 2014, Netflix accused the major ISPs of doing that to them1392 but it turns out the network that was actually slowing their

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

70

1393traffic down was their transit provider, Cogent. The ISPs1394didn't really have anything to do with it.

Mr. Guthrie. So if it exists, you don't know of it? Is that what you're saying?

1397 Mr. Bennett. It certainly hasn't been widespread. I mean, 1398 in fact, I would like to see more willingness on the part of ISPs 1399 to sell prioritized delivery to application providers that had real-time apps, you know, like video conferencing and they can't 1400 1401 really -- have never really seen much reason how that would benefit 1402 them to sell that service because it would actually make third 1403 parties able to do -- you know, provide voice and face time just 1404 as well as the native products sold by the -- by the ISPs. This 1405 is especially the case at the wireless ISPs.

1406 Mr. Guthrie. So who has the stronger bargaining position 1407 over the last mile and what if ISP with less than a million 1408 customers dealing with an edge provider that has tens of millions 1409 of customers for their platform services?

1410 Mr. Bennett. Well, if -- the day an ISP announces that it's 1411 not going to allow Netflix to use its network because, you know, 1412 it has some dispute and it's not getting the money, that's the 1413 day -- pretty much the day that you should short that ISP as they're 1414 -- nobody has that kind of -- the bargaining position that Amazon

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

71

1415 and Netflix and Google have.

1416Those are regarded as essential services by users of ISPs.1417There's no way the ISP can mess with them.

Mr. Guthrie. Because a lot of my ISPs at the last mile are local -- like, utilities, Bardstown City Cable is the ISP. Logan Telephone and Telegraph is the ISP for the last mile for a lot of the areas there that wouldn't have that kind of bargaining power that you're talking about.

1423In your testimony also you say sharing is inherent in the1424internet's design and go on to say access to shared resources of1425any kind implies the development and implementation of the sharing1426policy.

1427 Can you elaborate on what options network operators have to 1428 manage shared access to a scarce resource? In particular, how 1429 does class of service or smart queuing techniques alleviate 1430 congestion when network load increases to moderate or high levels? 1431 Mr. Bennett. Well, the purpose of class of service or type 1432 of service in IP is to identify to -- for the application to 1433 identify -- tell the network what kind of service it needs, if 1434 it's a low precedence or whether their focus is capacity or 1435 reliability.

1436

The trouble with that is that typically -- and that's used

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

72

1437 internally by ISPs once they're able to determine what application 1438 generated a particular traffic stream, which they can only do with 1439 -- they can do with a fair degree of accuracy but it's never going 1440 to be 100 percent, especially as new applications emerge that the 1441 ISP hadn't seen before and, like, how do I treat this -- do I treat it just like generic traffic and, you know, which is probably 95 1442 1443 percent or it could be as much as 95 percent of the internet, or 1444 do I give it some sort of specialized treatment and the specialized 1445 treatment could be, like, it needs to be more urgently delivered 1446 than generic traffic but it also could be less.

And so there's a case to be made for, like, actually -- if 1447 1448 we can recognize the unique performance characteristics of 1449 different streams and then bargain appropriately, for some 1450 streams they're going to save money because if it's like a patch 1451 distribution or something that can happen at 3:00 o'clock in the 1452 morning, it's, you know, doesn't make sense for the ISP to charge 1453 a whole lot for that. In fact, it kind of makes sense to give 1454 it away for free because it makes the network work better if all 1455 the computers are patched and up to date.

1456Mr. Guthrie.So who manages these techniques?I got about145710 seconds.

1458

Mr. Bennett. Yes. They're managed by network operation

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

73

1459	staff at the ISPs and the tricky part though is that the boundaries
1460	between different ISPs or different networks between an ISP
1461	and a transit network. And so they operate on the basis of
1462	agreements and they typically don't articulate the treatment of
1463	nonstandard
1464	Mr. Guthrie. Thank you. My time has expired. I yield.
1465	Mrs. Blackburn. Mr. McNerney, you're recognized five
1466	minutes.
1467	Mr. McNerney. I thank the chair and I thank the witnesses.
1468	As an engineer, I am deeply concerned and troubled by the
1469	FCC's decision to repeal the ban on paid prioritization and kick
1470	the scraps of net neutrality over to the Federal Trade Commission.
1471	Mr. Wood, does the FTC have the resources to enforce net
1472	neutrality?
1473	Mr. Wood. Thank you, Congressman.
1474	To my knowledge, they do not. They have an enforcement
1475	geared staff and I think they do a good job but have trouble keeping
1476	up with the current caseload that they have, my understanding.
1477	Mr. McNerney. I've heard they don't have any network
1478	engineers. Is that right?
1479	Mr. Wood. That's what I've heard as well, yes, Congressman.
1480	Mr. McNerney. Well, I am concerned that without an expert
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

74

1481	agency with network engineers on the case we might never know if
1482	there are violations of net neutralities.
1483	Back in 2007, we only discovered net neutrality violations
1484	due to the work of an engineer working at home on his own.
1485	Might this might it be difficult for the average consumer
1486	to recognize their broadband provider is violating net
1487	neutrality?
1488	Mr. Wood. Yes, Congressman, I think it could and in fact
1489	with nobody to watch over that process I do think that would be
1490	a problem.
1491	As we've heard, congestion can happen at different places
1492	in the internet and different parts of the network. The Netflix
1493	and Comcast disputes that Mr. Bennett referenced, a lot of people
1494	called their Comcast customer service representatives and said
1495	it's not coming through correctly and the first answer from the
1496	company was, "Maybe you should buy a faster speed tier," which
1497	wouldn't actually have solved the problem.
1498	So I think even the people who work in the network either
1499	for good faith reasons or marketing purposes might not be able
1500	to pinpoint where the problem is and then actually help the
1501	customer to solve it.
1502	Mr. McNerney. Thank you.
	NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

75

1503About veterans, in response to thousands of constituents who1504reached to me concerning their concerns about the elimination of1505net neutrality protections, I had a net neutrality town hall in1506my district to discuss their concerns.

1507 At the town hall, I heard from a veteran who was very worried 1508 about what this would mean for him and other veterans, including 1509 their access to health telenet services.

1510 Mr. Wood, given your experience with net neutrality, do you 1511 think veterans who need home telehealth services for in-home care 1512 should be concerned about the FCC's rollback of net neutrality? 1513 Mr. Wood. I do, Congressman.

1514 I think what they want is for the service to work and so as 1515 we've heard there could be different use cases, different types 1516 of prioritization that the network already does to make sure that 1517 all applications can reach their destination.

What I think veterans are worried about overseas is, I am already pay for my connection, which might be difficult to manage overseas -- my family is paying at home -- is there going to be a news hole or a new kind of charge to make sure that traffic can actually reach his destination, and I think that's where the concern comes from that this will be a new fee that's ultimately passed on to customers, even if it's the edge provider who is

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

76

1525 paying it in the first place.

1526Mr. McNerney.Mr. Schroeder, do you have similar concerns1527about access with net neutrality protections disappearing?

1528 Mr. Schroeder. For the purposes of Aira's technology, 1529 again, we are concerned that we have access to a cell network that 1530 can deliver our video upstream in a way that is reliable.

I don't know that the end of the open internet order would adversely or would have changed our business model significantly if -- whether or not that order was in place.

I do think it is critical that we ensure that our veterans have access to the kind of service that Aira is providing and I would say that, given the relatively underserved group that we are reaching out to, my sense is that that's not a group that probably gets priority under any structure.

And so without a company like Aira really pushing that issue and, in our case, having a good partner with AT&T in order to allow us to use a priority network, I am not sure that that service would be provided -- our business model and our service would be provided in a way that actually works for people in the real world as we have to make it work.

1545 Mr. McNerney. Has Aira come out in favor of the -- Mr. 1546 Doyle's CRA?

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

77

1547 Mr. Schroeder. We have not taken a position on any of the 1548 bills. 1549 Mr. McNerney. You referred to low latency several times in 1550 your testimony. Can you explain what that means? 1551 Mr. Schroeder. Yes. Low latency means a very -- a 1552 connection with no delays or minimal delays. And so in our case, 1553 as we said, our video needs to be able to move through at, you 1554 know, what we've estimated currently ideally for Mbps. 1555 We think, with the new glasses that I am wearing -- these 1556 are called Horizon -- by the way, they're actually made almost 1557 entirely in San Diego so it's all U.S.-based, we are proud to say 1558 -- that we may even need a little bit higher bandwidth in order 1559 to ensure that the quality of the video that these glasses are 1560 able to provide gets through. 1561 And the comment about busy streets and crossing streets, 1562 while Aira makes clear that we do not provide information to 1563 somebody in the midst of a street crossing because we want them 1564 to use their other skills, we do note that people need information 1565 very rapidly and very immediately including out on the street in 1566 order to avoid obstacles. 1567 Mr. McNerney. Okay. Thank you. 1568 I yield back. NEAL R. GROSS

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

78

1569	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman yields back.
1570	Mr. Olson.
1571	Mr. Olson. I thank the chair. Welcome to our four
1572	witnesses.
1573	This question is for the entire panel. Just go from your
1574	right to left. Just gives your thoughts on prioritization.
1575	My hometown of Houston Texas was hit by Hurricane Harvey
1576	really hard this past August hit us not once, hit us twice.
1577	Some parts of my district had 50 inches of rain almost five
1578	feet of rain in two days.
1579	The amazing efforts of the Houston law and local first
1580	responders before, during, and after Hurricane Harvey saved
1581	thousands of lives.
1582	With prioritization, isn't that important for our first
1583	responders? Shouldn't their traffic be prioritized in times of
1584	emergency?
1585	Mr. Bennett.
1586	Mr. Bennett. Yes, Congressman Olson, it certainly should.
1587	As part of the and as a former Houstonian who lived through
1588	Carla, quite sensitive to, you know, what went on down there
1589	recently.
1590	FirstNet is primarily it's sort of the value proposition
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON D.C. 20005-3701

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

79

1591 for FirstNet other than interoperability between first responders 1592 is the ability to get, what do they call it, prioritized quality 1593 -- preemption and priority.

1594 It's quality, preemption, and priority, so that first 1595 responders not only can get a connection during a -- during times 1596 of emergency, civilians want to use the networks and, you know, 1597 call people and let them -- let them know they're okay or they're 1598 not okay and call for help and all that. So there's a lot of pressure on the networks from facilities being down and high usage 1599 1600 and so but, you know, we definitely want first responders to have 1601 priority access.

1602Mr. Olson. Mr. Rysavy, your comments on priority access1603during times of natural disaster like Hurricane Harvey.

Mr. Rysavy. Thank you, Congressman, for the question.

Yes, absolutely, that's a perfect example of a situation where certain users such as the first responders do need access. But it's just an example of many because from there you might consider a surgeon doing remote surgery -- they might need prioritization as well. Thank you.

1610 Mr. Olson. Mr. Schroeder.

1611 Mr. Schroeder. I think emergencies provide two interesting 1612 examples of why Aira is so critical and why making sure that our

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1604

80

1613 information is getting through.

1614 The first one is a lot of the information that is provided 1615 during an emergency is inherently visual. There's maps and 1616 charts and graphics on television screens that indicate where one 1617 is supposed to go, what the storm pattern is, that sort of thing.

1618Without access to Aira, it is very difficult for a person1619to get that information in a reliable sense. When somebody is1620relocated, you can imagine a person who's blind. They're in an1621usually setting. Having access to Aira and a reliable visual1622assistant will allow that person to have better access to the1623shelter and have, of course, a better experience.

1624 Somebody might say that that's perhaps not critical. Ι 1625 would disagree. I think if somebody has relocated who's blind 1626 or visually impaired they certainly need to be able to access the 1627 information around them successfully just like anybody else who's 1628 been relocated to that area and Aira, having a -- ensuring that 1629 our video gets through, is another way that that person is able 1630 to have the information about where they are as well as things 1631 that they need to know related to surviving that emergency.

1632 Mr. Olson. Amen.

1633 Mr. Wood, your comments on prioritization during natural 1634 disasters.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

81

1635	Mr. Wood. Certainly. Thank you, Congressman.
1636	Yes, first responders deserve priority during disasters. I
1637	would say that was fully permitted under the 2015 rules that have
1638	now been repealed.
1639	And the last thing I would want is paid prioritization for
1640	first responders. I can't imagine having the ambulance or the
1641	fire department pay an additional toll on their way to the
1642	emergency.
1643	So I think that draws out the distinction we are talking about
1644	here.
1645	Mr. Olson. Good point.
1646	The final question for you, Mr. Bennett. Your testimony
1647	discussed internet optimization, and as you're well aware, we are
1648	at the beginning of a huge data boom, another massive data boom.
1649	Could you elaborate on possible tools that could be used in
1650	the future to help further efficiencies, to optimize the internet
1651	traffic, and also what role does AI play in the future?
1652	Mr. Bennett. AI is going to be essential, I think, to
1653	identifying traffic streams and mapping them to applications and
1654	determining what kind of service they need.
1655	It's something that the capability to do that has sort
1656	of increased an awful lot in network routers over the years and
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

82

	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON D.C. 20005-3701
1678	Mr. Engel. Yes.
1677	Have I seen them? Is that the question?
1676	Mr. Wood. Thank you, Congressman.
1675	in the FCC's docket?
1674	Mr. Wood, have you received any of these fake comments filed
1673	It seems like another attempt at sowing division.
1672	of Chairman Pai's role back of net neutrality.
1671	Americans' identities were stolen and used to comment in support
1670	prioritization and the other net neutrality protections,
1669	In the FCC's docket that rolled back the ban on paid
1668	democracy.
1667	of the things I asked him was about foreign influence on our
1666	When Mark Zuckerberg was before our committee last week, one
1665	Mr. Engel. Thank you, Madam Chair and Ranking Member.
1664	Mr. Engel, five minutes.
1663	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman yields back.
1662	I yield back. Thank you.
1661	Mr. Olson. My time has expired.
1660	of intelligence that networks have to have these days.
1659	I mean, it definitely leans toward the side of AI, the kind
1658	programming and AI.
1657	well, it's sort of hard to draw the line between sort of better

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

83

1679	Mr. Wood. I have seen some sampling of the 24 million
1680	comments, yes, and I know that there have been allegations about
1681	fake comments coming from foreign sources and from all sides.
1682	Mr. Engel. Do you think the FCC has done enough to address
1683	the fake comments in the record?
1684	Mr. Wood. No, I certainly don't. In fact, the attorney
1685	general of New York has tried to launch an investigation on behalf
1686	of New York State residents whose identities were stolen and
1687	inappropriately used in the proceeding.
1688	And I think it's fair to say the answer they've gotten from
1689	the FCC has been something of a shoulder shrug to this point. So
1690	I don't think the FCC has either used all of its own tools or
1691	cooperated strongly enough with other law enforcement agencies
1692	who want to look into this.
1693	Mr. Engel. What else should they have done?
1694	Mr. Wood. Well, I mean, I think it's a good question. We
1695	want to have maximum participation in these public decision making
1696	processes.
1697	So I don't know if there's much they could have done to stop
1698	the inflow of any fake or fraudulent comments. I've heard that
1699	even several members of Congress had their names used, including
1700	their street addresses. So it wasn't just a matter of filling
	NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

84

1701 in a fake name.

I don't know what more they could have done at the beginning. But I do think they should have paused and considered what to do about the bad comments flowing into the record during the process and then maybe should have taken longer to consider what to do with them before voting.

1707 Mr. Engel. Would you anticipate legal challenges to the 1708 FCC's order repealing net neutrality based on the fake comments?

Mr. Wood. Well, we have actually filed suit. Something like 23 attorneys general, a dozen or more public interest organizations like ours, and internet companies as well, and also some local -- for example, Santa Clara County and the California Public Utilities Commission.

1714 I think that will be part of the case. I can't tell you 1715 how much it will be part of the arguments or the judge's response 1716 to it.

Mr. Engel. Mr. Wood, let me stick with you.

You testified that getting rid of paid prioritization would radically change the internet. You said that the ban only prevented ISPs from favouring traffic in exchange for payments from third parties or to benefit an ISP's affiliated video or voice offers. But it did not ban user-directed traffic.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1717

85

1723 So can you expand on that and explain a little more about 1724 how user directed traffic works? 1725 Mr. Wood. Certainly. I hope so. The internet protocols 1726 that already manage these kinds of different needs for different 1727 types of applications that goes on today. I think all the 1728 witnesses have spoken about it to some degree, and that kind of process was not prohibited by the paid prioritization ban. 1729 1730 All that the rule prohibited was having an edge provider or some other third party come in and try to alter that natural 1731 1732 balancing that goes on. 1733 If the balancing couldn't happen in what I would call a 1734 neutral fashion with the protocols just deciding which 1735 applications need priority at that particular point in time, then 1736 the user could also pay their broadband provider and we have more comfort with that because then the internet user remains in 1737 1738 control of how their connection is being used, so which content they can get and also which type of application and services they 1739 1740 might need to or choose to prioritize at a particular point in 1741 the day. 1742 Mr. Engel. Okay. Well, thank you very much. 1743 Thank you, Madam Chair. I yield back. 1744 Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman yields back. **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 86 1745 Mr. Bilirakis, five minutes. 1746 Mr. Bilirakis. Thank you, Madam Chair. Appreciate it. 1747 I thank the -- I want to thank the panel for their testimony 1748 as well. 1749 Mr. Schroeder, as stated in your testimony, the speed of your 1750 service is near instantaneous, and when you discuss how the 1751 service is used not only for work-related tasks but helping people 1752 navigate city streets, speed is, clearly, a requirement. Isn't 1753 that the case? 1754 Mr. Schroeder. Yes, Congressman Bilirakis. 1755 Mr. Bilirakis. It seems your partnership with AT&T is 1756 central to your service. Isn't that the case? 1757 Mr. Schroeder. It is a very important element, yes. 1758 Mr. Bilirakis. Can you describe how the user experience 1759 would be different if Aira did not have this partnership and had 1760 to compete equally with all other internet traffic? 1761 Mr. Schroeder. I can, because we rolled out the relationship 1762 with AT&T's Dynamic Traffic Management Network over the -- about 1763 over the last four to six months. 1764 Prior to that time, we got many complaints from our users 1765 and I am an Aira user myself and I also experienced many dropped 1766 calls, many significant delays in video, many instances where we **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

87

1767 had an audio connection with the agent but no video and they did their best using GPS and other sensor data that we were able to 1768 1769 get upstream. But the lag in video created not only trouble for 1770 our business model, because we are a service that people subscribe 1771 to, but more important created challenges for people who are blind who in the midst of needing a sign read to them, needing to make 1772 1773 a decision about which direction to go, needing to find that last -- we often -- you talk about the last mile. We often talk about 1774 1775 the last 20 feet, trying to find the right door. And oftentimes that's when the video would, unfortunately, kick out and so just 1776 1777 when you needed the information most. 1778 So we -- I know and I know our users experience what the 1779 network situation was like before we had access to a priority 1780 network and it was -- it was not a good experience. 1781 Mr. Bilirakis. So you just described the latency 1782 consequences? 1783 Mr. Schroeder. That's correct. 1784 Mr. Bilirakis. Yes. Okay. Very good. Thank you. 1785 Next question -- as a relatively new company, did you find 1786 it difficult to get a partner that would provide the 1787 prioritization services that your company needs to operate? 1788 Mr. Schroeder. You know, sometimes I am a little bit NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

88

embarrassed. Aira gets a lot of attention. I think a lot of
people find what we do to be quite remarkable and quite amazing.
We actually had no trouble finding interest among carriers
to work with Aira and to allow us to or to encourage us to work
with their cell networks.

1794 AT&T was the company that came through with the best 1795 partnership and really showed the most interest in giving us 1796 opportunity to work with their priority network as well as, as I mentioned in my testimony, providing support for getting Aira 1797 1798 into the hands of college students and in working with us in 1799 designing some of the technology that we are using, for example, 1800 to get access to prescription medication, which is one of the 1801 highest use cases that our Aira users often need to ensure that 1802 they're taking the right medicine.

1803 Mr. Bilirakis. That's great.

I want to commend you for working with our veterans as customers but also as employees. But I also want to give you an opportunity because I do have some time to describe how Aira works and how beneficial it is to your customers, if you please. And so if you can elaborate a little bit more on it because it is fascinating and it improves a person's quality of life.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1810

(202) 234-4433

Mr. Schroeder.

www.nealrgross.com

Thank you for that, Congressman Bilirakis.

89

1811 We -- and I appreciate your support as well. We do -- we have 1812 so many wonderful stories from our Aira users who use the service, 1813 of course, in critical ways like navigating the Boston Marathon, 1814 which trying to move among runners, as you can imagine, is a very 1815 dicey proposition, especially in the weather conditions they had 1816 yesterday, and it speaks to the need for having a very strong 1817 network with low latency available to them.

1818We've also had individuals who have spent a few hours working1819with an agent putting IKEA furniture together, and I don't know1820if I should mention a specific company. But I think we all know1821how challenging following some of those visual directions if you1822can see can be.

Many of our users have found Aira to be extraordinarily 1823 1824 helpful in navigating technology. There's a lot of great 1825 technology, such as what I am using here with this Braille device 1826 that makes information available to blind people. But it 1827 sometimes doesn't work. It sometimes breaks down, and when it 1828 breaks down we are suddenly -- we are confronted with a blank 1829 screen -- blank to us because we can't see it -- and being able to quickly grab an Aira agent via the smart glasses and application 1830 1831 allows us to have access to what is on that screen so we can 1832 hopefully save our work and be able to continue to be productive.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

90

1833	Oftentimes in the past I know the time is up but often
1834	time in the past it would take several minutes or maybe hours to
1835	find somebody sighted to come and help figure out what was on that
1836	computer screen. Now we've got that instantaneous with Aira.
1837	Mr. Bilirakis. Well, thank you very much. And I know it's
1838	very beneficial to our constituents. I appreciate it, and I yield
1839	back, Madam Chair.
1840	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman yields back. Mr. Flores.
1841	Mr. Flores. Thank you, Madam Chair.
1842	Madam Chair, I would ask to enter into the record a article
1843	written today by Roslyn Layton of AEI that's called
1844	"Prioritization: Moving Past Prejudice to Make the Internet
1845	Policy Based on Fact."
1846	Mrs. Blackburn. Without objection.
1847	[The information follows:]
1848	
1849	********COMMITTEE INSERT 7********
	NEAL R. GROSS
	COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

1850 Mr. Flores. Thank you. 1851 Mr. Bennett, talking about 5G for a minute, the next leap 1852 in technology for wireless, does China have a ban on pay 1853 prioritization? 1854 Mr. Bennett. Not as far as I know. The telecom carriers 1855 in China are state-owned enterprises. 1856 Mr. Flores. Right. 1857 Mr. Bennett. And they're pretty much able to --1858 Mr. Flores. How about Japan? 1859 Mr. Bennett. Japan I don't think -- I don't think it does. 1860 Mr. Flores. They don't? And South Korea? Do they have a 1861 ban on pay prioritization? 1862 Mr. Bennett. No, definitely not. South Korea offers all 1863 kinds of gradations of internet. 1864 Mr. Flores. So we talked about discrimination against rural 1865 communities. Let's assume this fact pattern for a minute. You 1866 have got an ISP that has an internet pipe going into a rural 1867 community. 1868 That rural pipe drives or carries the traffic for a new 5G network that we have in that rural community but that it's a 1869 1870 limited size pipe. 1871 So you're going to have 5G traffic. You're going to have NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

91

92

1872 RS traffic going over it. You're going to have FirstNet going 1873 over it, hospitals, schools, and then on a Saturday night 80 1874 percent of the traffic is going to be coming through because of 1875 video. 1876 What happens -- if you don't have paid prioritization what 1877 happens to everybody's traffic under that scenario? 1878 Mr. Bennett. Well, if you don't prioritize then what 1879 happens is when network load increases and latency increases and 1880 it's sort of every app is affected to some degree, and the more 1881 sensitive apps are affected more seriously. 1882 Mr. Flores. Okav. 1883 Mr. Bennett. So I think one -- one of the implications is 1884 that for rural users is if you can't get consistently low latency 1885 for Skype, then you're going to have to keep on paying for an old 1886 timey telephone connection because your Skype is just never going 1887 to be reliable. 1888 Mr. Flores. And Mr. Schroeder, what would that do to your 1889 Aira users if you're in that community without a paid -- again, 1890 there's no paid prioritization. Mr. Schroeder. Yes. We do have users in the rural areas 1891 1892 and there is often a struggle to ensure that we've got good network 1893 access for those individuals. That is something that we **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

93

1894	certainly look forward to further network development.
1895	Mr. Flores. And so Mr. Woods talked a lot about
1896	discrimination against different populations that because of a
1897	paid prioritization. It sounds to me like the opposite is true.
1898	If you have a ban on paid prioritization, it would
1899	discriminate against your population of sight limited and also
1900	veterans. Does that make sense?
1901	Mr. Schroeder. We don't know
1902	Mr. Flores. Again, using the same example.
1903	Mr. Schroeder. Congressman, we don't know whether that's
1904	true or not. But we suspect what we do know is that having
1905	access to a reliable network is critical and in this case we are
1906	able to use a priority network for that purpose. So that is
1907	helping.
1908	Mr. Flores. Okay. And so but if you didn't have access to
1909	that paid priority network then you wouldn't be able to have that
1910	service with the low latency?
1911	Mr. Schroeder. Our service certainly suffered prior to that
1912	access.
1913	Mr. Flores. Okay.
1914	Mr. Bennett, in order to offset that again, you have got
1915	this community, it's got a new 5G network, it's got limited
	NEAL R. GROSSCOURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.(202) 234-4433WASHINGTON, D.C.20005-3701www.nealrgross.com

94

1916	last-mile capability who pays to expand the capacity?
1917	Mr. Bennett. In the absence of anyone else coming up with
1918	the desire to do that, it's going to be the carrier.
1919	Mr. Flores. Okay. And so then
1920	Mr. Bennett. Who is going to pass the cost on to the
1921	consumer.
1922	Mr. Flores. Right. So essentially, every if you don't
1923	have paid prioritization then everybody pays to offset the latency
1924	issues that are introduced because of a ban on pay prioritization.
1925	Is that correct?
1926	Mr. Bennett. Absolutely, just as today the people who don't
1927	use Netflix pay for the capacity upgrades that enable others to
1928	use Netflix.
1929	Mr. Flores. Okay. So, again, the cost is being socialized
1930	for the people that want to use lots of band width across the entire
1931	population, even those who don't use the band width.
1932	That doesn't sound fair to me. I mean, we have a population
1933	that pays for priority TSA pre-check, pays for toll lanes, pays
1934	to use UPS instead of the mail service or pays for priority mail.
1935	It seems to me like folks ought to pay for their fair share.
1936	Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time. Thank
1937	you.

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

95

1938	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman yields back.
1939	Mrs. Brooks, you're recognized five minutes.
1940	Mrs. Brooks. Thank you, Madam Chair.
1941	I would like to just clear up and make sure we are all on
1942	the same page relative to FirstNet FirstNet, obviously, being
1943	the network that has been created most recently to ensure the
1944	public safety has the ability to communicate and gets priority
1945	in the case of emergencies and disasters and is now just beginning
1946	to be built out across the country and so forth.
1947	But there a ban on paid prioritization involving FirstNet,
1948	is there not? I am a little bit confused.
1949	Mr. Bennett.
1950	Mr. Bennett. There's not. FirstNet is a separate is a
1951	special purpose network that's separate from the regular or is
1952	sort of a supplement to the regular mobile network.
1953	But the preemption of the or the relocation of the old Title
1954	2 regulations by that were enacted by Chairman Wheeler means
1955	that there is no ban on paid prioritization for anyone.
1956	Mrs.Brooks. Okay. And so how is it that we can ensure that
1957	FirstNet, for instance, will receive that priority in the in
1958	an instance of a disaster?
1959	Mr. Bennett. Well, FirstNet is designed to do that. So if
	NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

96

1960 it doesn't do that then it's failed to meet its primary goal, which is quality, preemption, and prioritization. 1961 So the -- but the thing that worries me about FirstNet is 1962 1963 because it does so many things that fall outside the realm of what 1964 the traditional net neutrality advocates have demanded. 1965 What's to prevent one of them, Mr. Wood's organization or 1966 some similar organization, from simply filing a suit against 1967 FirstNet for violating net neutrality? 1968 Mrs. Brooks. Mr. Wood, you brought this up a little bit. 1969 Can you please comment on this? Because I do want to make sure 1970 that we all are on the same page when it comes to the importance 1971 in the preemption of FirstNet. 1972 Can you please comment? 1973 Mr. Wood. Certainly, Congresswoman. 1974 I think my earlier answer was that yes, emergency services 1975 deserve priority. They could have had that under the rules that 1976 have now been repealed. 1977 Mr. Bennett is correct that they don't face any such rules 1978 today because there are no rules in place at the moment, or at least there won't be when the rule changes take effect here in 1979 1980 the next few weeks. 1981 But, again, I think what we keep missing is the distinction **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

97

1982	prioritization and paid prioritization. And so, again, the last
1983	thing I would want is for first responders to have to pay to
1984	prioritize their traffic during times of emergency. They were
1985	able to prioritize for any kind of public safety or emergency use
1986	case under the old rules and I think that's what should continue
1987	now.
1988	Mrs. Brooks. But that's not being contemplated right now,
1989	is it?
1990	Mr. Wood. I think what's being contemplated is FirstNet is
1991	actually designed to be a prioritized network for first responders
1992	and that would not have violated the 2015 rules that have now been
1993	repealed. It's not a violation of anything now. It's nothing
1994	that we would fight against.
1995	We have three lawyers, so we are not really in the business
1996	of filing more lawsuits than we need to.
1997	Mrs. Brooks. Okay. So you have no plans on filing any
1998	lawsuits?
1999	Mr. Wood. Certainly not.
2000	Mrs. Brooks. Okay.
2001	Mr. Bennett. Could I
2002	Mrs. Brooks. Yes, Mr. Bennett.
2003	Mr. Bennett. Can I add something to that?
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
I	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

98

2004 Mrs. Brooks. Yes. Mr. Wood says that paid prioritization is not 2005 Mr. Bennett. 2006 part of FirstNet. But first responders pay to be part of 2007 FirstNet. 2008 They pay to use -- it's not a free service, right. It's --2009 so it's partially paid for by the -- by fees that states and 2010 municipalities give up to be part of that network. And so then 2011 once they've paid those fees then they get all the prioritization 2012 they need. 2013 Mrs. Brooks. So how will a ban on paid prioritization 2014 implicate FirstNet, Mr. Bennett? 2015 I am not sure that it would for the use of the Mr. Bennett. 2016 primary channel. But first responders -- FirstNet is designed 2017 actually use band width that's available over regular commercial 2018 networks as well when -- you know, when it needs to. 2019 And so I think there are -- there could be scenarios in that 2020 secondary usage of the other channels that could subject FirstNet, 2021 certainly, to a challenge. 2022 Mrs. Brooks. Very briefly, Mr. Rysavy, shifting gears a 2023 minute, can you comment on how 5G will inherently prioritize 2024 traffic to handle a wider range of applications than 4G? 2025 Mr. Rysavy. Thank you for the question, Congresswoman. **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

99

2026	5G is being designed with a very sophisticated quality of
2027	service architecture with which traffic flows can be managed not
2028	only for priority but also for latency, possibility of packet
2029	laws, guaranteed band width and so forth. So you really need to
2030	manage all of those aspects to be able to provide services example
2031	the type of performance that they need.
2032	Mrs. Brooks. Thank you. My time is up. I yield back.
2033	Mrs. Blackburn. Gentlelady yields back.
2034	Mr. Doyle just told me that baseball players get priority.
2035	[Laughter.]
2036	Mrs. Blackburn. And so he favors priority.
2037	Mr. Doyle. Good ones. Good ones that are on the committee.
2038	Mrs. Blackburn. So you are you're recognized.
2039	Mr. Ruiz. Given that I am the only other Democratic member
2040	here and that I've had my share of splinters collected, sitting
2041	on the bench, I appreciate that, Coach Doyle.
2042	Thank you. As a physician I think we have obligation to make
2043	sure that we are using the internet and technology to help improve
2044	the public's health.
2045	The FCC's 2015 net neutrality protections actually came up
2046	with a very targeted way to ensure specialized services like
2047	telehealth and public safety technology are allowed to thrive.
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON D.C. 20005-3701

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

100

2048	But I am concerned that the current FCC has done the opposite
2049	by abandoning any protections that prohibit big corporations from
2050	paying for their services to be prioritized over these telehealth
2051	type services.
2052	So with that in mind, I would like to introduce a letter for
2053	the record from the American Medical Informatics Association that
2054	expresses these concerns.
2055	Mrs. Blackburn. Without objection.
2056	[The information follows:]
2057	
2058	**************************************
2059	Mr. Ruiz. So my question my first question is for Mr.
2060	Wood. It's very simple. Is there anything in the FCC's most
2061	recent net neutrality order that will ensure guarantee hospitals,
2062	community health clinics, and local police departments won't just
2063	get pushed into slower lanes because they can't afford to bid
2064	against the big mega corporations down the road?
2065	Mr. Wood. Thank you, Congressman.
2066	Not to my knowledge. I know that the current order basically
2067	took away all of the traffic management rules and guidelines and
2068	left it to the ISPs. It has some transparency obligations that
2069	they face but nothing that would speak to their ability to either
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

101

2070 charge for priority or not.

2071 Mr. Ruiz. Yes. So there are no safeguards to guarantee 2072 that these vital public health services are protected and not 2073 marginalized profit motive?

2074 Mr. Wood. That's right. To my knowledge, there are no 2075 safeguards and basically this FCC has washed its hand of the 2076 business and said that they are not going to have any rules 2077 whatsoever when it comes to what ISPs try to prioritize or not.

2078 Mr. Ruiz. Okay. And what would you do to ensure those 2079 safeguards?

2080 Mr. Wood. Well, we have supported the Congressional Review 2081 Act resolution of this approval to restore the 2015 order. We 2082 feel it's important to restore the entirety of the rules that were 2083 lost but also the FCC's ability to investigate if something like 2084 that were to occur. So sometimes this is talked about in a 2085 competition framework and that matters.

But we would certainly want to FCC to have the ability to investigate if it were a certain kind of telemedicine or health application being discriminated against even if that were not to favor another telemedicine application but simply were a bad choice made by the cable or phone company.

2091

Mr. Ruiz. Okay. And as a lawyer that follows net

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

102

2092 neutrality closely, can you explain what it means that the FCC's 2093 originally net neutrality protections treated telehealth as a 2094 specialized service? What does that mean?

2095 Mr. Wood. Well, it means that they were allowed to be 2096 treated as specialized services. I would note that I think many 2097 telehealth applications can and do run over the open internet.

2098 So it's not the case that every health application or every 2099 medicine application even has to be treated as a specialized 2100 service.

I don't know if the word has a lot of meaning for folks. I sometimes think of it as dedicated capacity. And so if you have an application that does not suit -- does not fit well on the open internet, it needs additional protections, then it could be treated as a specialized service, again, usually paid for by the person who has the arrangement with the ISP.

2107 So not necessarily this additional kind of toll where they're 2108 paying twice, both for their own connectivity and for priority 2109 in the last mile but simply arranging their own kind of delivery 2110 privately.

2111 Mr. Ruiz. One of the biggest challenges that we have is in 2112 rural America where you don't have population centers that can 2113 access the infrastructure for broadband and other things even for

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

103

2114 commercial use. These are exactly the locations where we want 2115 to promote telehealth because they need access to doctors and 2116 health care services. 2117 Do you think it's a valid concern that without the strong 2118 net neutrality protections we might undermine innovation in the 2119 medical space and elsewhere? 2120 Mr. Wood. I do, Congressman. 2121 I think that the genius of the internet has been that 2122 application makes can come up with their ideas and not have to 2123 pay an additional toll to bring them to market or to get them 2124 through that last mile to the user. 2125 And so when you do have a small ISP -- I have the same 2126 concerns, not just that the small ISP might serve as a bottleneck 2127 but if they were really were at a bargaining disadvantage with 2128 the biggest edge providers, then perhaps that content would be 2129 prioritized rather than the small application makers or 2130 innovators. 2131 Mr. Ruiz. We are starting to see a lot of tech medicine type 2132 opportunities for people in rural areas that haven't been served for mental health services. 2133 2134 And so now you're seeing folks on their phones or their pads, 2135 their computers being able to actually have counselling for the **NEAL R. GROSS**

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

104

2136	first time and be connected with other addiction services groups
2137	to provide social support networks to get the care that they need.
2138	And so I am just concerned that this is going to inhibit that
2139	progress that is being made out there.
2140	Thank you very much.
2141	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman yields back.
2142	Mr. Johnson, five minutes.
2143	Mr. Johnson. Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you,
2144	gentlemen, for joining our panel today.
2145	Mr. Schroeder, a lot of parties paying attention to this
2146	hearing have pushed the idea that we don't need to worry about
2147	whether an application like Aira could avoid a paid prioritization
2148	ban in the future since past net neutrality attempts have always
2149	included an exception for specialized services.
2150	Setting aside the problem that past performance does not
2151	predict future results, that is actually incorrect. The 2015
2152	open internet order specifically rejected the, quote,
2153	"specialized services," unquote, carve out, providing instead an
2154	exception for services that are not broadband internet access
2155	service unless they service that as not broadband internet access
2156	service as provided in a manner that undermines the purpose of
2157	the open internet rules.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

105

2158	Now, do you understands what that means? Because nobody
2159	else understands what that means.
2160	Mr. Schroeder. No, Congressman. The way you phrased it I
2161	can't untangle that thicket.
2162	Mr. Johnson. Yes. Well, nobody else can either. So Mr.
2163	Rysavy, your thoughts on this would that definition give you
2164	any confidence that some of these services we are talking about
2165	would meet the FCC's approval?
2166	Mr. Rysavy. Congressman, thank you for asking.
2167	No, not at all. The exception for specialized services is
2168	ill defined and certainly does not foster innovation or any
2169	confidence in moving forward with such applications.
2170	Mr. Johnson. All right. Well, thank you.
2171	You know, the devil is in the details. This is one we need
2172	to make sure we get right or a paid prioritization restriction
2173	could do some real harm.
2174	Mr. Wood, moving on to you, you seem to indicate in your
2175	testimony that broadband was considered a Title 2 service until
2176	the Bush FCC tinkered with its classifications.
2177	What you didn't mention, though, was that the Obama FCC
2178	agreed with that classification of broadband as an information
2179	service and left it there in its first attempt at net neutrality
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

106

2180 rules in 2010 and even the 2015 open internet order acknowledged 2181 the long track record here.

It spelled out all the history and tied the determination that broadband was an information service all the way back to the computer inquiries that the FCC had decided over 50 years ago. The commission was very specific that it was changing its mind and disavowing all the previous precedent to reclassify

2187 broadband into a Title 2 telecommunication service.

2188 So do you disagree with the determination by Chairman Wheeler 2189 that before 2015 broadband had always been an information service? 2190 Mr. Wood. I don't know that he said it precisely that way 2191 but I do disagree with that phrasing.

2192 Before 2015, you mentioned the first Obama administration 2193 attempted at neutrality rules. Like the rules that were adopted 2194 at the tail end of the Bush administration, those were struck down 2195 in court. So there's a reason that we went back to the drawing 2196 board and talked about it again.

The dispute here is not so much whether broadband was an information service but whether internet access was and there are two parts of that. There's the connection that gets you online. Then there's the service or the content you interact with once you're there.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

107

2202 So there has been some historical dispute about whether 2203 something like AOL, for example, was an information service. Ι 2204 would say that it was. It was allowing you to browse the internet, 2205 but only once you got to that site using your phone connection. 2206 And what we say is that from -- really, before 2002 all 2207 internet access, that physical connection was Title 2. The FCC 2208 started to change that and said that access over a cable line could 2209 be considered an information service and that's when the attempts 2210 to prevent discrimination on those lines started to fall down in 2211 So that's why the FCC returned to what we see as the court. 2212 rightful legal definition. 2213 Mr. Johnson. Got you. Okav. 2214 Mr. Bennett, most of us subscribe to mass market retail 2215 broadband. This means that rather than each of us having a 2216 dedicated pipe to just our home, we are sharing bandwidth with 2217 all of our neighbours who also subscribe to that same service. 2218 So if everyone on my street is streaming videos in the evening 2219 to broadband speeds, I am getting might be slower than I would 2220 experience at another time when not as many users are on the 2221 connection. 2222 So here's my question to you. What happens if there's an

2223 emergency that I need to call 911 on my voice over IP-enabled

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

108

		l
2224	phone?	
2225	Since that call goes over my broadband connection at some	
2226	point, will it also be caught up in that video congestion? Will	
2227	my 911 call be degraded so someone can watch a cat video?	
2228	Mr. Bennett. The short answer is yes.	
2229	Mr. Johnson. Okay. That's about all I can ask for.	
2230	Madam Chair, I yield back.	
2231	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman yields back.	
2232	Mrs. Walters, five minutes.	
2233	Mrs. Walters. Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you,	
2234	witnesses, for being here.	
2235	When talking to my constituents back home about tech issues,	
2236	one of the questions I've been asked is how prioritization could	
2237	impact them.	
2238	I know some of my colleagues have covered a couple of these	
2239	issues but I would like to ask a few questions that some of my	
2240	constituents have been asking me.	
2241	One thing that comes up is the issue of degradation and	
2242	internet traffic management. Some people have expressed	
2243	concerns that prioritizing certain traffic over other degrades	
2244	the traffic that is not prioritized.	
2245	Mr. Bennett, in your testimony you mentioned the	
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS	

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

109

2246 differentiated treatment of internet traffic report which, quote, 2247 "demonstrates that traffic differentiation is not a zero sum 2248 game." 2249 Could you explain what that means for the average internet 2250 consumer? 2251 Mr. Bennett. Yes, I can. 2252 I was a member of the committee that wrote that report. The 2253 point is that because applications are not all created equal, a 2254 sort of a theoretical or a literal degradation of a pack of --2255 an individual piece of information by a millionth of a second or 2256 so may qualify in a legal sense as a degradation. 2257 It's not a degradation that the consumer will perceive. And 2258 so given that we are placing so much importance on polling and, 2259 you know, which is sort of a question of measuring perception, 2260 the question is whether there's a perceptible degradation and in 2261 that sense prioritization is certainly provably empirically 2262 without a doubt unquestionably not a zero sum game. 2263 Mrs. Walters. Okay. Thank you. 2264 And Mr. Rysavy, in your testimony you talked about network 2265 slicing and its relationship to quality of service management. 2266 Can you explain the concept of network slicing in layman's terms 2267 and how it affects the average consumer? NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

110

2268	Mr. Rysavy. Network slicing thank you, Congresswoman,
2269	for the question.
2270	Network slicing is an architectural aspect of 5G.
2271	Basically, it's a way that the network will present different
2272	faces for different usages.
2273	So, in theory, an operator could develop a slice for
2274	autonomous vehicles, another slice for a factory automation, and
2275	so forth, and each of these will require a very specific quality
2276	of service requirements among which traffic prioritization is
2277	essential.
2278	What it translates to the user is that with network slicing
2279	they will see a wide range of new innovative services coming to
2280	market.
2281	Mrs. Walters. Thank you.
2282	And throughout this hearing, there's been a discussion about
2283	the different forms of prioritization and I think we can all agree
2284	that there are instances where certain traffic has to be
2285	prioritized over others, like the example that we've been hearing
2286	a lot lately is prioritizing 911 call over a cat video.
2287	Mr. Bennett, can you talk about types of bad prioritization
2288	including types we should actively prevent?
2289	Mr. Bennett. You know, I think any sort of negative
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

111

2290 prioritization that's intended to impair the performance of a 2291 competitive product to the carrier is something that should be 2292 looked at with suspicion. But I think it's sort of covered under 2293 general antitrust law.

I am not a lawyer like Mr. Wood is so I can't really justify that. But it's my sense the way it's been explained to me that the violations that we are concerned about are essentially already prohibited under sort of the general laws of regulating business in the U.S.

2299 Mrs. Walters. Mr. Wood, would you want to add anything to 2300 that?

Mr. Wood. I could. I think the antitrust could be a remedy for some competitors, say, if Comcast decided to block Netflix. I don't think it would be a very useful remedy in all instances, especially if there were smaller video providers who were suffering from that kind of blockage or deprioritization and I think all we have to do is look at cable TV where when you don't have some kind of common carrier mantra and framework.

You know, cable TV is not illegal under the antitrust standards. Cable providers do pick and choose which content to show you.

2311

The question is should we have no safeguards whatsoever and

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

112

2312 make the internet more like cable TV or should we have the same 2313 kind of two-way open transmission network we've had that lets 2314 people go to any site of their choosing.

2315 Mrs. Walters. And what should Congress consider doing to 2316 prevent these types of prioritization activities from occurring? 2317 And Mr. Bennett and then Mr. Wood, if you'd like to join in.

2318 Mr. Bennett. I would rather that Congress adopt a generally 2319 permissive attitude like there's been so much demonization and 2320 so much sort of emotional rhetoric and spin and framing in this 2321 discussion that I think we've just sort of -- we've gone way 2322 overboard on the side of caution.

2323 So let's let a few things happen. Let's allow some 2324 experiments like Aira to take place and examine the marketplace 2325 and then if something is going on then step in and correct, but 2326 preemptively allow people to innovate.

2327 Mrs. Walters. My time is up.

2328 Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady yields back.

2329 Mr. Costello for five minutes.

2330 Mr. Costello. Thank you.

2331 Mr. Rysavy, I enjoyed reading your testimony --

2332 Mr. Rysavy. Thank you.

2333

Mr. Costello. -- and found it very helpful. I want to cite

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

113

2334 something and ask you this question. Mission critical use case 2335 model type analysis that you provided, you speak -- you state, 2336 "This category of 5G application will depend on the ability to 2337 deploy traffic prioritization."

2338 Can you just briefly explain why prioritization will be 2339 necessary for 5g? Is it necessary and, if so, why?

Mr. Rysavy. Thank you for the question, Congressman.

Yes, prioritization is an absolutely essential aspect of 5G in enabling new use cases. The whole motivation for investing hundreds of billions of dollars in 5G networks is to expand what can be done with wireless technologies and being able to support mission critical applications is going to be a great expansion of capabilities compared to 4G.

2347 Mr. Costello. And along that line, and I think the 2348 terminology here -- I think everybody supports net neutrality, 2349 broadly speaking -- certain types of paid prioritization I think 2350 obviously do fall under FTC and are anti-competitive.

2351 When you speak about prioritization here, what you're 2352 speaking about is organizing slices based on the type of data and 2353 what it's used for. Is that correct?

2354 Mr. Rysavy. That is correct.

Mr. Costello. Is there a better for you to -- would you

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2340

2355

114

2356 embellish on that if need be or was that --

Mr. Rysavy. No, the whole -- the whole point is to recognize that different types of applications have different requirements. Some may need very high band width but can drop a lot of packets because it doesn't -- it won't impact the user experience. Others might be very low band width but the reliability of information carried might be absolutely crucial.

Mr. Costello. You go on to say, "But unprioritized and competing with other traffic the latency can be 10 times higher, for example," and then you go on. And what you're saying there, l believe, is that if we don't have prioritization that you will end up across the board generalized with slower data getting to -- from point A to point B. Is that correct?

2369 Mr. Rysavy. Yes. The point I am making is that if you have 2370 to treat every packet equally that you will end up degrading the 2371 average quality of experience across the base of applications. 2372 Essentially, prioritization is an extremely powerful tool 2373 for network management and to ban it really undermines the value 2374 of these networks, moving into the future.

2375Mr. Costello. Mr. Wood, what's your response to that?2376Mr. Wood. My button won't work.

I think it's just where we began, Congressman -- that we

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

115

2378	haven't called for a ban on prioritization done in a neutral
2379	fashion to make sure that applications work. We've called for
2380	a ban and the rules had a ban on paid prioritization, meaning that
2381	the edge provider, the app maker, whomever we want to think
2382	Mr. Costello. The one you have the content associated with
2383	it. But don't you agree that the FTC already has jurisdiction
2384	over that and is able to enforce?
2385	Mr. Wood. Well, the FTC might have jurisdiction or DOJ might
2386	if we could make it come to
2387	Mr. Costello. Well, they do or they don't, don't they?
2388	Mr. Wood. Well, they have jurisdiction over certain kinds
2389	of anti-competitive conduct. They don't have jurisdiction if my
2390	own home connection is suffering because I can't reach the
2391	content that I want, and I am focused on the internet user, not
2392	just this battle between Comcast and Netflix or any other two large
2393	providers.
2394	Mr. Costello. Isn't in the interest of the company to make
2395	sure that the user does have access?
2396	Mr. Wood. Well, I think what we are talking about today
2397	though shows that there are use cases for prioritization. So they
2398	have general interest in making sure that content is available
2399	but that they might then pick and choose which content is available
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

116

2400	at which terms for people who pay more.
2401	Mr. Costello. I had another question. This is tangential.
2402	I apologize. But the fake comments what is your I mean,
2403	what is a fake comment?
2404	Mr. Wood. Well, I think there are different kinds. One
2405	could describe as less valuable. We certainly think the petition
2406	
2407	Mr. Costello. But doesn't the FCC able to sift through that
2408	and determine what's valuable and what isn't?
2409	Mr. Wood. Well, I think they said they are not going to
2410	decide what is fake and what isn't. So, to me, something that
2411	is obviously fake or fraudulent is somebody using
2412	Mr. Costello. But what's fake?
2413	Mr. Wood. Somebody using somebody's else identification
2414	and name and address to put a comment in.
2415	Mr. Costello. But the content, it's isn't it about the
2416	content and not who says it?
2417	Mr. Wood. Well, I do think people have a right to not have
2418	things said in their name. So if somebody put a comment in for
2419	you supporting Title 2 you might care.
2420	Mr. Costello. People say that I fair point. But
2421	ultimately though the FCC would be looking at the content of the
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON D.C. 20005-3701 WANN DEalroross.com

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

117

2422	content, not who said it. Wouldn't that be accurate?
2423	Mr. Wood. I would hope they would look at the content but
2424	I think it matters who said it too because people have a right
2425	to speak in their own name and not have others speak for them or
2426	pretend to speak for them.
2427	Mr. Costello. But the FCC wouldn't decide something one way
2428	or the other just because a specific person said it or didn't say
2429	it. Wouldn't that be correct?
2430	Mr. Wood. That's right, and I think that they still have
2431	an obligation to make sure their record isn't tainted by people
2432	basically engaging in identity theft in order to make comments
2433	that are not actually their own.
2434	Mr. Costello. Sometimes I we probably wish people
2435	wouldn't taint our comments, too.
2436	Okay. Thank you. I yield back.
2437	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman yields back.
2438	Seeing that there are no further members
2439	Mr. Doyle. Madam Chair?
2440	Mrs. Blackburn. Yes, sir.
2441	Mr. Doyle. Can I ask unanimous consent in addition to the
2442	letters from pediatricians, telehealth experts, small
2443	businesses, and others supporting a ban of paid prioritization,
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE IN W

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2444	I have one additional letter from the Consumers Union that I would
2445	like to introduce onto the record.
2446	Mrs. Blackburn. Without objection.
2447	[The information follows:]
2448	
2449	**********INSERT 9********
	NEAL R. GROSS
	COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

2450	Mr. Doyle. Thank you.
2451	Mrs. Blackburn. Yes. You all have been gracious with your
2452	time and with getting your testimony in.
2453	Before we conclude I do want to submit for the record and
2454	ask unanimous consent to do so tweets of Cloudflare CEO Matthew
2455	Prince, a report by Richard Bennett, "Designed for Change," a
2456	report by BTAG, Daniel Lyon's article, your comments, Mr. Rysavy,
2457	a report by Mr. Rysavy, "How Wireless is Different" and an article
2458	by George Ford.
2459	[The information follows:]
2460	
2461	**************************************
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
	(202) 234-4433 (202) 234-443 (202) 234-443 (202) 234-443 (202) 234-443 (202) 234-443 (202) 234-443 (202) 234-443 (202) 234-443 (202) 234-443 (202) 234-444 (202) (202

2462	Mrs. Blackburn. I will remind our members that pursuant to	
2463	committee rules they have 10 days to submit questions in writing	
2464	to you and you all will have 10 days in which to respond.	
2465	There being no further business to come before the committee,	
2466	we are adjourned.	
2467	[Whereupon, at 12:26 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]	
2468		
2469		
2470		
2471		
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS	
	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com	