## BINGHAM

William B. Wilhelm

Direct Phone: +1.202.373.6027 Direct Fax: +1.202.373.6001 william.wilhelm@bingham.com

July 16, 2012

### Via Electronic Filing

Marlene H. Dortch Secretary Federal Communications Commission 445 Twelfth Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: GN Docket No. 09-191, Preserving the Open Internet; WC Docket No. 07-52, Broadband Industry Practices; WC Docket No. 05-75, Verizon-MCI Transfer of Control; GN Docket No. 10-127, Framework for Broadband Internet Service; WC Docket No. 03-251, Line Sharing Order and NOI, and WT Docket No. 12-4, Verizon-SpectrumCo-Cox License Assignment

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On July 12, 2012, Vonage Holdings Corp's ("Vonage") Brendan Kasper, Senior Regulatory Counsel, and the undersigned counsel met with Louis Peraertz, Legal Advisor for Wireless, International, and Public Safety to Commissioner Mignon Clyburn.

Vonage discussed issues consistent with its previously filed comments in the above-referenced proceedings regarding the Commission's net neutrality order and the importance of prohibiting discrimination by network operators who have the incentive and capability to engage in anticompetitive practices, especially in light of recent changes in the wireless and wireline broadband industry.

In addition, Vonage discussed the May 6, 2012, announcement of Verizon Communications (an affiliate of Verizon Wireless) to discontinue offering standalone DSL to new customers and to freeze existing standalone DSL customers at their current DSL speeds outside of California. Any future DSL services, including a change in download or uplink speeds to those customers' DSL service, require the purchase of Verizon Communications' voice telephony services.

Vonage contends that, consistent with its prior jointly-filed ex parte comments, the discontinuance of standalone DSL services will lead to increased costs to consumers for

Beijing
Boston
Frankfurt
Hartford
Hong Kong
London
Los Angeles
New York
Orange County
San Francisco
Santa Monica
Silicon Valley

Washington

Bingham McCutchen LLP 2020 K Street NW Washington, DC 20006-1806

> T +1.202.373.6000 F +1.202.373.6001 bingham.com

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Letter from Sean McLaughlin, Executive Director, Access Humboldt, *et al.*, to Julius Genachowski, Chairman, FCC, GN Docket No. 09-191, Preserving the Open Internet; WC Docket No. 07-52, Broadband Industry Practices; WC Docket No. 05-75, Verizon-MCI Transfer of

Marlene H. Dortch July 16, 2012 Page 2

broadband services. Within the majority of regions served by Verizon Communications, cable companies, including Comcast Corp., Time Warner Cable Inc., Bright House Networks, LLC, and Cox Communications, are the only other wireline broadband providers. Accordingly, most consumers within the Verizon Communications regions have only two choices for wireline broadband services -- Verizon Communications (either DSL or FiOS) or a cable company. With the elimination of Verizon Communications' standalone DSL service and the cessation of additional deployment of FiOS service, most consumers in Verizon Communications' regions will be left with a single choice for wireline broadband services not tied to a voice telephony service, to the extent it is provided at all: their cable provider. Vonage asserts that a single provider of such services is not good for consumers or competition.

Vonage further notes that the timing of Verizon Communications' decision to terminate its future standalone DSL service occurred after Verizon Wireless's ("Verizon") announcement to enter into several agreements with Comcast Corp., Time Warner Cable Inc., Bright House Networks, LLC, and Cox TMI Wireless LLC ("CableCos") which, as Vonage and others have explained, present serious competitive concerns. Vonage contends that but for those agreements, Verizon Communications would have continued to offer standalone DSL service. Tellingly, since January 2009, Verizon Communications had been permitted to take such action but had opted not to do so. For over three years after the expiration of its commitment to provide standalone DSL services -- required as part of Verizon Communications' acquisition of MCI -- Verizon Communications had sufficient reasons to provide that service. Only after entering into the agreements with CableCos did Verizon Communications decide to cease offering in the future the only other competitive wireline broadband service to most consumers within its region. Given the nexus of those agreements and Verizon Communications' decision, Vonage respectfully suggests the Commission carefully examine the competitive effects of those actions.

Additionally, Vonage expressed its concern that the joint operating entity ("JOE") agreement between Verizon and the CableCos may allow for the development of wireless/wireline integrated products that could discriminate against over-the-top apps and services by increasing the ability of those parties to control the wireless access to the wireless/wireline broadband interface. Particular areas of concern are potential discriminatory routing practices that could increase latency and result in a qualitative degradation of its voice and text messaging services stemming from (1) the use of public versus private peering points for the exchange of data traffic carrying Vonage's services, (2) the "scenic routing" of data traffic over nodes with increased latency or by selecting routes that utilize a greater number of nodes, and (3) the removal of Quality of Service tags that could alter the priority levels of Vonage's traffic.

Control; GN Docket No. 10-127, Framework for Broadband Internet Service; and WC Docket No. 03-251, Line Sharing Order and NOI (May 3, 2012)(attached hereto).

Marlene H. Dortch July 16, 2012 Page 3

Another concern is that Verizon and the CableCos could relegate traffic from competing over-the-top services to broadband data plans subject to data caps or implement other use-restrictions, while at the same time classifying their collective services and associated traffic as "managed services" that are not subject to such restrictions. The result of such discrimination would be that the "cost" to a consumer to use a Vonage service would be greater than that of a competing Verizon or CableCo service. Vonage asserts that such potential misuse of the managed service exception would run counter to the Commission's net neutrality rules and principals. Accordingly, Vonage requests that the Commission apply the same net neutrality rules to wired and wireless broadband provided by the parties given the potential for discriminatory conduct based on the current differences between those obligations.

Vonage also asserts that JOE-developed products could discriminate against Vonage services by preventing the transition (*i.e.*, hand-off) of Vonage associated traffic from the Verizon wireless broadband network to an integrated WiFi/wireline broadband network. The impact of inhibiting such a "handoff" would be that Vonage's services could be dropped or that Vonage traffic would continue to ride over a wireless broadband network subject to wireless broadband data caps or restrictions. Vonage anticipates that neither Verizon's nor the CableCos' services would be treated in a similar fashion. Accordingly, Vonage urges the Commission to ensure that over-the-top apps riding on wireless broadband services are not unreasonably discriminated against.

Vonage notes that its concerns discussed during its meeting with Mr. Peraertz are consistent with the concerns expressed by the ITTA,<sup>2</sup> the Independent Telephone & Telecommunications Alliance, with the Commission in WT Docket 12-4. As such, Vonage strongly supports ITTA's recommendation that given the integral relationship between joint marketing and joint product development agreements with the pending spectrum transfer between Verizon and the CableCos, "open review of the Commercial Agreements by the Commission is required before ruling on the pending license assignment applications, and appropriate conditions should be imposed on the Applicants to protect competition and the public interest." Accordingly, Vonage requests that the Commission fully consider the positions expressed by ITTA and others regarding the impact of those agreements on consumers and the relevant markets.

In order to militate against these anticompetitive effects, Vonage proposes that the Commission institute the following conditions in the pending license transfer proceeding from the CableCos:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Letter from Genny Morelli, President, ITTA, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, FCC, WT Dkt. No. 12-4 (July 10, 2012).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> *Id*. at 1.

Comment of The Consumer Federation of America, Application of Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless and SpectrumCo, LLC for Consent to Assign Licenses; Application of Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless and Cox TMI Wireless, LLC for Consent to Assign Licenses, WT Dkt. No. 12-4 (filed July 9, 2012).

Marlene H. Dortch July 16, 2012 Page 4

- 1. Impose the Commission's existing net neutrality provisions on Verizon Wireless and the CableCos.
- 2. Extend all of the Commission's existing wireline net neutrality provisions to wireless broadband services offered by the Verizon Wireless and the CableCos.
- 3. Expressly prohibit classification by Verizon Wireless and the CableCos of their services as "managed services" under the exception to the Commission's existing net neutrality provisions.
- 4. Require that JOE-developed products not be used to unreasonably discriminate against a consumer's ability to obtain access to or use broadband facilities. Moreover, any WiFi technologies or protocols developed by the JOE must be made available to all third-parties at nondiscriminatory rates, terms, and conditions.
- 5. Prohibit Verizon Wireless and the CableCos from conditioning their provision of broadband service on the purchase of any other service, including, but not limited to, voice telephony service.
- 6. Require Verizon Communications to continue to provide standalone DSL within its service territories.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ William B. Wilhelm Frank G. Lamancusa

Counsel for Vonage Holdings Corp.

cc: Louis Peraertz

Enclosure: May 3, 2012 ex parte comments

#### Via ECFS

Hon. Julius Genachowski Chairman Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, S.W. Washington, DC 20554

Re: Ex Parte Comments

WC Docket No. 05-75, Verizon-MCI Transfer of Control; GN Docket No. 09-191, Preserving the Open Internet; WC Docket No. 07-52, Broadband Industry Practices;

GN Docket No. 10-127, Framework for Broadband Internet Service;

WC Docket No. 03-251, Line Sharing Order and NOI

#### Dear Chairman Genachowski:

The undersigned parties file this letter to express their concerns over Verizon's announced plans to discontinue the provision of retail standalone DSL services this coming Sunday, May 6, 2012. We request that the Commission work with Verizon to explore its planned discontinuance of standalone DSL and, if possible, to delay the implementation of a policy that would further reduce the affordability and availability of broadband services to consumers. As detailed further below, the practice of tying service offerings, like voice and broadband, is still under consideration by the Commission. To that end, the Commission should ensure that the *status quo* is maintained with respect to Verizon's standalone DSL offering until the Commission can complete its consideration of the impact of tying on consumers, the communications marketplace, and broadband deployment.

Verizon's plan affects hundreds of thousands of its own customers. *DSL Reports* obtained a copy of a Verizon email being sent to current standalone DSL users outlining the changes which are to become effective May 6, 2012. That customer correspondence confirms that Verizon will no longer support standalone DSL for new customers after May 6, and that existing customers will lose their standalone DSL services if they make any changes to their Verizon services, or move their service to a new location after that date (*i.e.*, they will be forced to bundle such services with voice services). According to Verizon, this policy change will affect about 10% of the company's DSL customers. For the year ending 2011 Verizon claimed to have 3,853,000 DSL (High Speed Internet or "HSI") connections. Thus, approximately 385,000 Verizon customers will be directly impacted by Verizon's decision to discontinue retail standalone DSL services.

See Joan Engebretson, *Verizon to End Stand-Alone DSL Service*, Telecompetitor (Apr. 5, 2012), available at: <a href="http://www.telecompetitor.com/verizon-to-end-stand-alone-dsl-service/">http://www.telecompetitor.com/verizon-to-end-stand-alone-dsl-service/</a>.

See Stephen Lawson, Verizon Will Stop Offering Standalone DSL, PC World (Apr. 6, 2012), available at: <a href="http://www.pcworld.com/businesscenter/article/253387/verizon\_will\_stop\_offering\_standalone\_dsl.html">http://www.pcworld.com/businesscenter/article/253387/verizon\_will\_stop\_offering\_standalone\_dsl.html</a>.

See Press Release, Verizon, Verizon Reports Record Revenue Growth in 4Q, Fueled by Strong Demand for Wireless, FiOS and Strategic Services (Jan. 24, 2012), available at: <a href="http://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/verizon-reports-record-revenue-growth-in-4q-fueled-by-strong-demand-for-wireless-fios-and-strategic-services-137951023.html">http://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/verizon-reports-record-revenue-growth-in-4q-fueled-by-strong-demand-for-wireless-fios-and-strategic-services-137951023.html</a>. These subscribers are reported separately from the company's FiOS Internet subscriptions.

The undersigned have concerns over the impact that Verizon's plan will have on Verizon's subscribers, as well as the impact on the broadband and Internet access market generally. The practice of tying broadband Internet access service with voice or other types of services merits careful consideration by the Commission to determine the impact on consumers and competition. As the FCC has previously found, the availability of standalone broadband service leads to significant benefits to consumers from competition in the market for voice services. On the other hand, the practice of tying broadband service to other services prevents consumer choice, limits consumers from porting telephone numbers, and essentially forces consumers to purchase local services they do not want – either because they have a wireless option or because they prefer to use VoIP or other alternatives. The net effect is to act as a drag on the adoption of broadband and new IP technologies as well as alternative, competitive voice options by making other standalone services economically unattractive.

Standalone broadband service allows "over-the-top" providers to compete with traditional voice providers for customer's primary lines. Standalone broadband service also makes it feasible for customers to "cut the cord" and use only wireless service for their voice calling needs. The competition between over-the-top providers and traditional voice providers has resulted in significant direct and indirect cost savings for consumers. <sup>5</sup> Cutting the cord could also result in substantial cost savings for consumers.

Recognizing the inherent competitive and cost concerns with broadband tying schemes, the Commission released a notice of inquiry to examine "the competitive consequences when providers bundle their legacy services with new services, or 'tie' such services together such that the services are not available independent from one another to end users." The NOI also sought to address "whether competition is supplying sufficient incentives for providers to disaggregate bundles to maximize consumer choice," and if "bundling behavior is harmful to competition, particularly unaffiliated providers of new services, such as voice over Internet protocol (VoIP)." While the proceeding remains open, there has been no significant action in the docket since 2005. The Commission should use the occasion of Verizon's plans to discontinue retail standalone DSL service as a reason to finish its examination of tying voice and broadband services and to analyze the consumer and competitive impact of such practices.

Likewise, the Commission should consider how Verizon's discontinuance of standalone DSL service will impact number portability. Currently, when an alternative voice service provider "wins" a Verizon voice customer that also subscribes to Verizon DSL service, Verizon automatically converts the customer to a standalone DSL service and ports the voice number to the winning voice service provider. However, if Verizon ties DSL and voice services together, it is unclear how Verizon will handle porting requests in the future. If no stand-alone DSL option is available, Verizon may reject port requests.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Verizon Communications Inc. and MCI, Inc. Applications for Approval of Transfer of Control, Memorandum Opinion and Order, WC Docket No. 05-75, n.320 (rel. Nov. 17, 2005) (finding that Verizon's commitment to offer stand-alone DSL broadband service as a condition of its merger with MCI to be in the public interest); see also SBC Communications Inc. and AT&T Corp. Applications for Approval of Transfer of Control, Memorandum Opinion and Order, WC Docket No. 05-65, n.322 (rel. Nov. 17, 2005) (same).

See Consumer Benefits from Cable-Telco Competition, MiCRA, at 15-16 (Nov. 2007), available at: <a href="http://www.micradc.com/news/publications/pdfs/Updated\_MiCRA\_Report\_FINAL.pdf">http://www.micradc.com/news/publications/pdfs/Updated\_MiCRA\_Report\_FINAL.pdf</a> (providing economic analysis of the savings to residential consumers of new and emerging technologies, including VoIP).

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Request for Declaratory Ruling that State Commissions May Not Regulate Broadband Internet Access Services by Requiring BellSouth to Provide Wholesale or Retail Broadband Services to Competitive LEC UNE Voice Customers, Memorandum Opinion and Order and Notice of Inquiry, WC Docket No. 03-251, ¶37 (rel. March 25, 2005).

Chairman Genachowski May 3, 2012 Page 3

Instead, it may force customers to call Verizon customer service to request or authorize the change, which would defeat the Commission's policy of streamlining the porting process for consumers. At the very least, customers will lose their broadband Internet access service and have to obtain such service from another provider at that time (which, of course, would significantly stifle their willingness to port the voice service in the first place). The Commission and the industry need to work out the porting process end state prior to Verizon's discontinuance of retail standalone DSL services.

Further, in 2008 the FCC adopted an order finding that Verizon violated section 222(b) of the Act by using, for customer retention marketing purposes, proprietary information of other carriers that it received during the number porting process. According to that decision, Verizon used proprietary information gleaned from Local Service Requests to determine which customers were disconnecting Verizon voice services for purposes of engaging in retention marketing practices. The practice of tying voice and Internet access services may provide Verizon a means to circumvent its obligations under the *Retention Marketing Order* by using other forms of information (i.e., customer DSL-related information) to engage in retention marketing practices directed at voice services. As Commissioner McDowell noted in his statement accompanying the *Retention Marketing Order*, "American consumers deserve the benefits that come from robust competition, especially in the telecommunications marketplace. It is the FCC's mission to promote such consumer-friendly competition." The Commission must ensure that Verizon's planned discontinuance of standalone DSL does not jeopardize the Commission's goal that "consumers in all areas of the country reap the benefits of competition in the form of lower prices, innovative services and more choice."

Finally, important questions remain as to how Verizon's policy will affect the wholesale DSL market. If the company no longer supports retail stand-alone broadband, how far behind will its wholesale offerings be? The loss of wholesale Internet access options will only further reduce competitive broadband availability options, which is of particular concern to providers that do not offer their own facilities-based broadband services. The loss of wholesale DSL will further reduce competition to the detriment of consumers and reduce the number of market participants that can offer bundle services that compete with the cable and wireline duopoly in the broadband Internet access services marketplace.

See Bright House Networks, LLC, et al., v. Verizon California, Inc., et al., Memorandum Opinion and Order, File No. EB-08-MD-002 (rel. June 23, 2008) ("Retention Marketing Order").

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> *Id.*, at Statement of Commissioner Robert M. McDowell, 1.

<sup>10</sup> *Id.* 

For the reasons set forth above, the undersigned parties respectfully request that the Commission work with Verizon to maintain the *status quo* until such time as issues pertaining to the consumer and competitive harms associated with tying, number portability, retention marketing, and the offering of wholesale DSL services can be explored by the Commission and the industry.

Respectfully submitted,

#### **Access Humboldt**

/s/ Sean McLaughlin
Sean McLaughlin, Executive Director
P.O. Box 157
Eureka, CA 95502

## Blue Casa Telephone, LLC

/s/ Jeff Compton
Jeff Compton, CEO/President
10 E. Yanonali Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

#### **Future of Music Coalition**

/s/ Casey Rae
Casey Rae, Deputy Director
1615 L Street, NW, Suite 520
Washington, DC 20036

## Lightyear Network Solutions, LLC

/s/ John Grieve John Grieve, General Counsel 1901 Eastpoint Parkway Louisville, KY 40223

## **Media Working Group**

/s/ Fred Johnson Fred Johnson, Policy Associate 4540 NE 35th Place Portland, OR 97211

# National Alliance for Media Arts & Culture (NAMAC)

/s/ Jack Walsh Jack Walsh, Executive Director 145 Ninth Street, Suite 102 San Francisco, CA 94103

#### **Access Point Inc.**

/s/ Richard Brown
Richard E. Brown, Chief Executive Officer
126 Millport Circle
Suite 101
Greenville, SC 29662

#### **Consumers Union**

/s/ Parul P. Desai
Parul P. Desai, Policy Counsel
1101 17th Street NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20036

#### Institute for Self-Reliance

/s/ Christopher Mitchell
Christopher Mitchell, Director, Telecommunications as Commons Initiative
1313 5th Street, SE
Minneapolis, MN 55414

#### Lingo, Inc.

/s/ Richard Ramlall
Richard Ramlall, SVP Corporate Development & Chief Communications Officer
7901 Jones Branch Drive, Suite 900
McLean, VA 22102

#### **Mountain Area Information Network**

/s/ Wally Bowen
Wally Bowen, Executive Director
34 Wall Street, Suite 407
Asheville, NC 28801

## National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates (NASUCA)

/s/ Charles Acquard
Charles Acquard, Executive Director
8380 Colesville Road, Suite 301
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Chairman Genachowski May 3, 2012 Page 5

## Primus Telecommunications, Inc.

#### /s/ Richard Ramlall

Richard Ramlall, SVP Corporate Development & Chief Communications Officer 7901 Jones Branch Drive, Suite 900 McLean, VA 22102

## **Vonage Holdings Corp.**

## /s/ Brendan Kasper

Brendan Kasper, Senior Regulatory Counsel 23 Main Street Holmdel, NJ 07733

## Writers Guild of America, West

### /s/ Ellen Stutzman

Ellen Stutzman, Director of Research & Public Policy 7000 W. Third Street Los Angeles, CA 90048

## **Public Knowledge**

#### /s/ Harold Feld

Harold Feld, Legal Director 1818 N Street, NW, Suite 410 Washington, DC 20036

#### Women in Media & News

/s/ Jennifer L. Pozner Jennifer L. Pozner, Executive Director Women in Media & News Brooklyn, NY

cc: Sharon Gillett, Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau

Michael Steffen, Legal Advisor to the Chairman