

Attachment—Additional Questions for the Record

**Subcommittee on Communications and Technology
Hearing on
“A Safe Wireless Future: Securing our Networks and Supply Chains”
June 30, 2021**

Mr. Jason S. Boswell, Head of Security Network Product Solutions, Ericsson North America

The Honorable Cathy McMorris Rodgers (R-WA)

1. This Committee has a history of bipartisanship when it comes to enhancing network security. We worked together to pass the Secure and Trusted Communications Networks Act to get Huawei out of our networks, and just last year worked to pass the USA Telecommunications Act to promote the deployment of OpenRAN compatible technology.

While OpenRAN shows promise to increase vendor diversity, we also recognize that this is a new concept. Mr. Boswell, at the hearing we discussed H.R. 4032, the OpenRAN Outreach Act, which would establish a government office to provide technical assistance to smaller companies interested in deploying OpenRAN compatible technologies.

- a. What role do you think the government should play in the development and deployment of OpenRAN compatible technology?

RESPONSE: Congresswoman, you are correct, Open RAN does show promise. You are also correct that it is a new concept. There is still much work to be done before these potential promises are realized. In its nascent stage, work is still incomplete in many areas, and challenges remain, including with regard to network security.

In determining what role, if any, the government should play in the development and deployment of Open RAN compatible technology, Ericsson believes that the guiding principle should be technical neutrality. The government should not pick winners and losers. Carriers should decide what technology is best for them based on the unique needs of their individual network architectures. History has demonstrated the best way to maximize the benefits of new technologies is to promote a competitive marketplace and let market forces work. It is important that the U.S. government support a technology neutral environment that promotes innovation, allowing the private sector to lead and the market to determine the “winners.” The best price/performance ratio should carry the day. History attests to the wisdom of market-led technological advance. U.S. leadership in technology in 4G and 5G has been achieved via technologically neutral policies, without any government mandates that tipped the scales.

As I said in my written testimony, regarding policy to facilitate Open RAN's development and deployment, Ericsson itself sees no barrier to deploying Open RAN solutions. Ericsson's Cloud RAN is a major step on the journey to a secure Open RAN solution that meets the needs of U.S. critical infrastructure. It allows operators to run Ericsson RAN software using commercial off the shelf hardware and the third-party cloud stack (e.g., platforms provided by IBM/Red Hat, Linux, HPE, Intel, and many others). We can find nothing that would impede Ericsson or any other vendor from competing in the marketplace for Open RAN products and services today.

There are, however, steps the government is appropriately taking to encourage the development of more open network architectures generally. The government should encourage increased transparency and security of Open RAN deployments. We commend the FCC's recent announcement that it will create two additional innovation zones in collaboration with the National Science Foundation.

Additionally, it is appropriate for the government to encourage U.S. industry participation in standards development organizations (e.g., 3GPP, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Internet Engineering Task Force) to assure industry-led forums remain the principal organizations for standards development. I note that H.R. 3003, the "Promoting United States Wireless Leadership Act of 2021," which recently was passed by the full House of Representatives is designed to encourage such participation.

2. Last October, Sweden enacted a 5G equipment sales ban against Chinese companies Huawei and ZTE, following suit with actions taken by the United States to secure our networks from foreign bad actors.

Just last month, the Stockholm Administrative Court upheld this action. Over the past several months, it has been reported that your CEO has lobbied against this ban in Sweden, which runs counter to the actions taken by the United States to push allied countries to remove this equipment from their networks.

Given the topic of our hearing, I am concerned that Ericsson, one of the top trusted vendors in the United States, appears to be taking a different position on Huawei than the U.S. government.

- a. How does Ericsson engage with Huawei when discussing cybersecurity or developing standards for equipment? Do you agree that Huawei equipment poses a national security threat when in networks?

RESPONSE: We do not engage with Huawei on cybersecurity issues. With respect to Ericsson's work in standards bodies, like all companies involved with global standards, we work with dozens or even hundreds of companies across different standards organizations. Whether any specific equipment poses a national security threat in networks is a decision for government intelligence experts, not private companies. I will say that when governments have conducted security assessments, Ericsson has been designated as a trusted and secure supplier.

The Honorable Bob Latta (R-OH)

1. H.R. 4028, introduced by Representative Long, directs NTIA to identify critical components of our communications networks that we may be overly dependent on and come up with a whole of government strategy to help diversify and improve the economic competitiveness of trusted vendors. What steps are Ericsson taking already to diversify, and do you have any recommendations for how the Federal government can be a better partner?

RESPONSE: We agree that the having a healthy competitive ecosystem of trusted vendors is critical. We believe that trusted vendors, like Ericsson are competitive, both in the U.S. and globally. In fact, I'm proud to say that Ericsson is now the leading global vendor of 5G Radio Access Network (RAN) equipment. And we face stiff competition from other trusted vendors. With regard to diversification, Ericsson has taken steps to diversify its supply chain by moving manufacturing closer to our customers. Here in the U.S., this strategy led us to open a \$100 million 5G smart factory in Texas last year, the first large scale 5G factory in the U.S. We are manufacturing Advanced Antenna System radios at the factory to enable 5G deployments in the U.S. This factory is just one example of Ericsson's commitment to the U.S. as I discussed in my testimony. We have successfully managed the 40-year evolution of wireless technology from 2G to 5G of mobile in the U.S. and the U.S. has enjoyed the economic benefits as a result of this leadership. We hope that the government will continue to recognize this significant and continuing contribution. We encourage the government to maintain technical neutrality when considering telecommunications policies and to continue to include trusted vendors, like Ericsson, when considering programs to support U.S. leadership in 5G and beyond.

The Honorable Bill Johnson (R-OH)

1. The U.S. is actively deploying 5G, which has more secure architecture than legacy services in 2G, 3G, and even 4G. I understand that Ericsson recently reported approximately 580 million 5G subscriptions will be active by the end of 2021 —while North America is second among regions adopting 5G, most of those 2021 adoptees are in Northeast Asia, including China. How can the United States encourage faster deployment of secure 5G services?
 - a. While it was not part of our hearing, you may have seen that I've sponsored H.R. 1056, the Wireless Broadband Competition and Efficient Deployment Act, which exempts collocations of wireless facilities from the requirement to prepare an environmental or historic preservation review. Would legislation like this help to speed up the upgrading of existing infrastructure to deploy 5G?

RESPONSE: Yes. Legislation like H.R. 1056 would help accelerate the upgrading of existing infrastructure to deploy 5G. The historic and/or environmental review process can add an additional 90 days to the application process. In many states the process to review simple antenna installations on existing infrastructure is nearly the same as if a developer was building a new apartment complex. We agree that if an installation involves erecting a new tower or placing

ground equipment outside an already-analyzed parcel, a review is appropriate. But forcing operators to go through the environmental process on an already-analyzed parcel is redundant and adds unnecessary time to the deployment process. As for historic areas, we agree that new installations on buildings in a designated historic zone need to match the style of the building, and the industry works hard to make sure the installation on a historic building is not obtrusive.

