

## **Additional Questions for the Record to Commissioner Michael O’Rielly**

### **The Honorable Brett Guthrie**

1. When it comes to describing the Commission’s work within global fora such as the ITU or others, what role do you believe the Commission should play as an influential voice on spectrum policy and connectivity? This could be in relation to other U.S. agencies and foreign policy makers or relative to domestic and foreign stakeholders.

Globally, the Commission has a vital role to play on spectrum policy and connectivity. I was fortunate to have attended the last ITU Plenipotentiary Conference in Busan, WRC-15 in Geneva and more recently the CITEL PCC.II meeting in Orlando, along with other international events. These conferences and ministerial meetings have driven home the importance of our nation and subsequently our region having a united front and strategy when it comes to spectrum policy generally and, specifically, as we approach international conferences, such as the next ITU Plenipotentiary Conference and WRC-19. My firsthand observations from these conferences solidified, in my mind, how difficult it can be to arrive at consensus decisions, especially when it comes to spectrum and the protectionist approach advocated by some nations. I also fully appreciate the need to start communications with other countries as early as possible so that we are effective in executing on our main priorities.

As far as the U.S. perspective, our priorities are generally aligned with creating a regulatory environment that provides our telecommunications industries the opportunity to innovate, obtain investment, and ensure continued growth for years to come. In part, that means reallocating underutilized spectrum bands globally for new wireless services. We also seek to promote the interests of our citizens, especially those who are unserved and in need of modern and robust connectivity in order to participate in the new digital economy. I recently penned an op-ed on needed changes to the structure and operations of the ITU. In the end, the United States must pursue the best course of action to meet its own spectrum needs. While I am hopeful that the ITU will be part of that process, there is much work ahead before that is a surety.

### **The Honorable Pete Olson**

1. As you are well aware, many telecom companies are looking to rollout 5G as a fixed wireless broadband service, which will compete directly with DSL, Cable, Satellite and Fiber. Can you please elaborate on what the addition of “Wireless Fiber” to the broadband marketplace means for the increasingly competitive marketplace?

As you note, many people refer to 5G as “Wireless Fiber” because it has the potential to offer consumers enormous increases in capacity, much faster speeds, and a significant reduction in latency to meet the demands of a broad range of applications, some of which are not even thought of today. To put this in perspective, the FCC’s latest Mobile Competition Report highlights industry developments from 4G LTE: data usage has soared to 13.7 trillion MB, a 42 percent increase from the prior year and a whopping 238 percent increase from just two years ago. On an individual basis, monthly consumer data use is up 39 percent since 2015 and over 50 percent of the American public has gone completely

wireless. But, I see this as just the beginning. Every day more and more consumers are flocking to wireless broadband and the mobile experience it provides despite the differences in speed. In other words, consumers, especially in the less affluent and younger populations, are willing to trade speed for flexibility. This is not too dissimilar to how consumers were willing in the early 2000s to trade wireline voice call quality for inferior wireless voice service that offered mobility. With wireless fiber, those speed differences will be even harder to distinguish, and it will be nearly impossible for the Commission to ignore the exciting benefits and new competitive marketplace options made possible in a 5G universe.

### **The Honorable Susan W. Brooks**

1. We need a balanced approach to spectrum policy, one that takes into account both big and small providers, urban and rural. I am particularly concerned about On-Ramp Indiana, Inc. (along with their customers such as Beck's Hybrids and their farm server customers), a constituent of mine that has been deploying rural broadband using CBRS spectrum in my district. They need to have a fair shot to compete in this upcoming auction, and have asked for just a couple of small license areas. Would you commit to working to find a balanced approach so that rural broadband providers like On-Ramp Indiana, Inc. can compete in the upcoming auction?

For over a year, I have been working with a vast array of stakeholders interested in CBRS spectrum to ensure that it is attractive to as many users and use cases as possible. Debate over the geographic license size has been the most contentious change contemplated from the past rules. Based on countless conversations and compromises, I have formulated recommendations on a way to modify our existing rules for PAL licenses and hope that this will be ready to be considered at an Open Meeting soon. I can commit to you that I believe the approach I have recommended to the Chairman is balanced and addresses all legitimate concerns raised throughout our process. Once the proposal is made public, I would be happy to brief you on it and answer any questions you may have on the potential impact to your state. No one is likely going to be entirely pleased with this outcome, but I believe it achieves a sound and just result.