UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

NATIONAL BROADBAND PLAN WORKSHOP CONSUMER CONTEXT

Washington, D.C.
Wednesday, September 9, 2009
ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

```
1
      PARTICIPANTS:
 2
      Moderators:
 3
      JOHN HORRIGAN
      Omnibus Broadband Initiative
 3
 4
 4
     MARC BEREJKA
 5
      Department of Commerce
 5
 6
      ROBERT CANNON
      Federal Communications Commission
 6
 7
 7
     MICHAEL WROBLEWSKI
 8
      Federal Trade Commission
 8
 9
      Panel 1:
 9
10
     MICHAEL R. NELSON
10
     Georgetown University
11
11
      SASCHA MEINRATH
12
     New America Foundation
12
    JOEL KELSEY
13
13
      Consumers Union
14
     ARI SCHWARTZ
14
15
     Center for Democracy and Technology
15
     DEBRA BERLYN
16
16
     Consumer Policy Solutions
17
17
     Panel 2:
18
     ADAM THIERER
18
19
      Progress and Freedom Foundation
19
20
     ALAN SIMPSON
20
     Common Sense Media
21
     BURKE CULLIGAN
21
22
      Yahoo!
22
                   ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
                  706 Duke Street, Suite 100
```

Alexandria, VA 22314 Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

1	PARTICIPANTS (CONT'D):
1	
2	MICHAEL W. MCKEEHAN
2	Verizon
3	
3	TIMOTHY SPARAPANI
4	Facebook
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	* * * *
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 MR. HORRIGAN: Hello, everybody. If we 3 could get people taking seats, we're going to get 4 underway here shortly. 5 Thank you very much. My name is John Horrigan. I'm going to moderate this afternoon's 7 workshop called The Broadband Consumer Context. I work with the National Broadband Task Force. I'm 8 9 the director of Consumer Research. 10 Before we get underway, let's do the 11 ritual we do before every workshop, which is ask 12 people to turn their cell phones to off or vibrate 13 so we don't get interruptions along the way. 14 Today we want to get a diverse and 15 fascinating group of experts before us to talk 16 about how broadband impacts consumer welfare and 17 the context for consumers doing things in an 18 increasingly broadband-connected world. We have a 19 couple of dimensions to this that we want to touch 20 on today. 21 One, we want to get on the table an 22 understanding of the evolving networks and network ANDERSON COURT REPORTING 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

> Alexandria, VA 22314 Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

architectures that influences how people engage with information gathering and transactions online. We want to try to understand some of the upsides to the possibility of empowered consumers. I'm sure many of us have had the experience of going online and maybe not executing a transaction online using e-commerce, but gathering enough information so you feel like you're in a stronger bargaining position when you go to the store to make a purchase. So we want to understand how broadband may empower consumers further.

At the same time we want to also understand some of the risks, either real or perceived, of sharing information online. When you get to a point where you're putting a lot of your social life online in the course of doing transactions or social networking, sharing data can be problematic, at least in the minds of some consumers.

Later we're going to turn to some special issues that confront families when children are going online. And then finally we're ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

going to hear later in the afternoon from folks from the private sector on tools and techniques that have been developed for helping people manage the broadband world when they're doing transactions online.

1

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So, we hope to get a lot of ideas on the table today. By design, we've gathered a diverse set of people with a range of different ideas, and we hope this could result in a very interesting mix and collision of thoughts as we proceed today.

So, the way we're going to proceed is as follows: We're going to go down the dais here with our panelists.

Each person is going to get five minutes to make a statement. There'll be a timer there for panelists to keep track of how they're doing on time, and we'll go in sequence down the table, five minutes apiece. And once we're done with that we're going to open things up to questions. If you have a question there's going to be somebody in the room who will pass out cards. You can write down your question and it'll be

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING 706 Duke Street, Suite 100 Alexandria, VA 22314

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

delivered to me. We have lots of people -- I understand more than 200 people -- logging in on cyberspace. They can e-mail questions and those questions will find their way to me. Once we get into Q&A, we hope to have a lot of rich interaction among panelists on different points of view.

We also have several questioners from government agencies that will contribute with questions when we get to the Q&A session. We have to my left Bob Cannon from the Office of Strategic Planning at the FCC. We have across the table Marc Berejka from the Commerce Department. And finally, and not least since he's a fellow graduate of the University of Texas, Michael Wroblewski from the Federal Trade Commission.

So, without further ado, we're going to start with Mike Nelson from Georgetown University. Just in terms of doing introductions, I'm going to keep them about as long as they just were now for Mike. Introductions -- introductory material and biographies of each of our participants is in a ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

packet that you can get at the table over there.

I'm not going to fill this time with lengthy introductions. I'll just turn it over to Mike Nelson.

Mike?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ NELSON: Thank you very much, John. And thanks for the opportunity to be here.

I'm Michael Nelson. I'm a visiting professor of Internet Studies at the Communications, Culture, and Technology Program at Georgetown. I've been there for about two years. I do research and teach courses on the evolution of the Internet, as well as doing consulting and speaking on Internet technology and policy.

Prior to joining the Georgetown faculty, I spent almost 20 years working in the U.S. Senate, the White House, the FCC, and IBM, where I spent most of my time trying to help shape the policies and standards that are shaping the Internet. I work with a lot of different groups involved in telecommunications and the Internet, including the Internet Society, the

Internet-to-University Research Consortium, the International Institute of Communication, the IEEE, and FirstMile.US. And I'm the outgoing chairman of the computing section of the AAAS.

1

3

4

5

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

But I'm here today not representing Georgetown or ay of these groups; instead, I'm here to share a few suggestions based on lessons I've learned in more than 20 years working on Internet and telecom policy here in Washington. Since I only have four minutes, I will be very brief.

The first point is that it's crucial that we have the right mental model for broadband and the Internet. I frequently hear that the Internet is mature technology, and since it supports so many critical functions, we have to regulate it like other critical infrastructures, phone service or electricity. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The transformation due to the Internet is less than 15 percent complete. There's a lot more to come, and in the next 10 years, unless we ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

> 706 Duke Street, Suite 100 Alexandria, VA 22314

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

really screw things up, we're going to see an increase in the amount of bandwidth of 50 or 100 times; we're going to see more than 100 billion devices connected to the Internet of things; and Internet video will become a totally immersive, high definition, two-way experience, something like IMAX movies are today.

So don't think of the Internet as a mature adult; think of it as a tween, sort of like my 12-year-old daughter.

Like the Internet, we don't know what my daughter will grow up to become, but we do know that the choices we're making today, both for her and for the Internet, are going to shape the future. And we know that the best way to ensure a successful future is to provide as many different options and opportunities for the Internet and for Internet users.

My second point is that we need to focus on a lot more than just telecommunications regulation. Creating a clear, consistent environment, both regulatory and business, that ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

fosters growth of compelling services that will spur usage and investment in broadband services is more important than trying to regulate the business plans or the network architecture of the ISPs. It's the compelling services that will drive the development of these broadband networks.

The growth of the computer industry over the last years demonstrates what can happen when the federal government makes wise research investments and procurement divisions and imposes a minimum amount of regulation. Few people realize that the early success of the Internet in the United States is due in large part to the decision of the FCC not to regulate data networks in the Computer 2 decision in the early 1980s.

When I was at the White House, I was very involved in the Magazina report on e-commerce. It's a unique report. Almost every page has a promise of what the U.S. Government will not do with regard to e-commerce services on privacy, security, censorship, and the like. And the certainty provided by that report really ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

helped U.S. Companies plan their business plans and make their investments. So I'd urge you to look at that report as a model as you develop your business plan. Tell us what you're not going to do, what things business won't have to worry about dealing with, and convince them they won't have to hire as many lawyers as they might suspect.

The Internet is becoming something much more than a communications network. With the growth of cloud computing and software as a service, the Internet is becoming a platform for computing as well. In 10 years it is conceivable that more than half of all the computing done worldwide will not be done on desktop computers and mainframes owned by companies or individuals, but rather will be done in the cloud using other companies' equipment scattered around the world -- around the country and around the world.

around the country and around the world.

So, it's time to think of the Internet

and the broadband Internet, in particular -- as

a giant global virtual supercomputer and to adopt the kind of regulatory approach that has worked so ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

well for computers: A minimalist approach focusing on ensuring health, safety, and competition that will ensure the innovation and consumer choice we need.

Taking the opposite approach and regulating the cloud like the phone network or the cable television network would be a disaster and ensure that the U.S. falls behind other countries as they develop new, exciting ways to use big broadband cloud computing and the Internet of things.

So we need to look first of all at those regulations that are actually getting in the way of development of broadband services and look at places where we have to make the right decision so that the new services built on the cloud will succeed. In particular, I want to stress the importance of liability. If we hold the cloud service providers liable for everything that's done on the platform they're building, that will eliminate many of the players and will stymie a lot of the developments. And I'll talk about that ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

1 more in the Q&A if we have time. So, thanks again for the opportunity to 3 be here. 4 MR. HORRIGAN: Thanks very much, Mike. 5 And we'll turn it right over to Sascha Meinrath. Sascha? 7 MR. MEINRATH: Hello, everyone. Thank 8 you for having me here on this panel. 9 I oversee the technology arm of the New 10 America Foundation. And I direct the Foundation's 11 Open Technology Initiative, which is sort of a 12 tech tank inside a think tank. 13 And we formulate policy and regulatory 14 reforms focused on supporting open architectures and open source innovations. I put that out there 15 16 right up front so you understand my biases as I am 17 here talking today. OTI is committed very much so to 18 19 maximizing the potentials of innovative open technologies by studying their social and economic 20 21 impacts. And in particular, we're looking at the 22 impacts on rural, poor, and other underserved ANDERSON COURT REPORTING 706 Duke Street, Suite 100 Alexandria, VA 22314

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

constituencies. And as a part of this work, as 1 you can imagine, we're often asked to address the 3 question of what is the consumer context in the 4 United States today. And the reality is that 5 nobody really knows what's happening. Companies 6 have often -- far too often -- diametrically 7 opposed the systematic collection of network 8 service level information. And historically, the 9 FCC, unfortunately, has facilitated this 10 uncertainty by continually refusing to mandate the 11 collection of the data necessary to make informed 12 telecommunications policy. And because of this, 13 today the United States faces a data acquisition 14 crisis of unimaginable proportions. 15 So, while the core of the Internet has 16 continued to expand, scientific measurement and 17 modeling of its systemic characteristics has 18 largely stalled, and policymaking has continued to 19 exist under this self-imposed veil of ignorance.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

Policy that brings America into the digital future

without a solid understanding of what is happening

So we cannot hope to build a National Broadband

20 21

22

on our networks today. So, much like a scanning electron microscope is a critical tool for today's modern physics laboratories, Internet researchers need high-powered and extensive measurement suites to keep pace with the Internet's increasing complexity.

1

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

And unfortunately, as currently conceptualized, our National Broadband Data Mapping Initiative, a \$350 million endeavor, will do far too little to actually enlighten policymakers about what is happening on the Internet's core. And since the privatization of the Internet in the mid-1990s, we've embraced a policy that has sacrificed transparency and public data access, assuming that less regulation of the Internet, the better. What is absolutely clear, however, is that this data privatization has created disastrous outcomes for network science, basic research, policymaking, and the general consumer welfare. And because of the pervasiveness of nondisclosure agreements and the practice of treating even mundane operational ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

practices' trade secrets, today's policymakers operate in a self- perpetuating fog of unknowing. This, in turn, has led to massive market distortions and inefficiencies that have come at the literal expense of consumers across the country.

In the United States today, consumers pay more for slower connections containing more limitations than a growing host of other countries around the globe. And when it comes to our international standing in broadband speeds, pricing, and adoption, the United States is the exact opposite of an Usain Bolt. The best that we can say at this point in time is that the current state of broadband in the United States is that the speed of our deceleration is lessening and that we're hoping to achieve stagnation in our international year- to-year rankings in the very near future.

A fundamental assumption of classic economics -- this underlies all of the analyses that happen out there -- is that the supply-demand ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

curve will achieve equilibrium and optimal balance. We just assume that that's going to happen.

Unfortunately, this result is predicated, absolutely, upon suppliers knowing the demand and consumers having information about the supply. In the United States, however, providers have systematically kept consumers in the dark. Today's ISPs diligently work to ensure that the public has access to as little information as possible, preventing consumers from making informed decisions about their broadband options. And unfortunately, the FCC has actively supported this practice through its laissez-faire policies.

Today's FCC runs the risk of continuing the current state of affairs through its inaction on issues where the problems and solutions are already well known. And furthermore, there are areas where data collection is absolutely necessary, but also areas where decisive leadership is critically important. And through its perseveration, the FCC continues to encourage ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

business practices that directly harm the general public and the deployment of infrastructure that is guaranteed to cause further problems for consumers down the road.

So I'm going to leave it there, but I'll leave you with three quick examples. It's insane that we have card or phone for wireline networks, but not for wireless networks; that you're allowed to connect whatever you wish to a wireline phone system, but not to a wireless phone system. It's crazy that the information that was publicly accessible through NSF Net through the 1990s is now privatized and not available. And it's insane that consumers have to make decisions about their broadband choices in the dark and without information about what those choices actually are and what's available.

So, I look forward to our continuing debate on these issues and forthright action from the FCC in the very near future. Thank you.

MR. HORRIGAN: Thank you very much,

22 Sascha. Joel?

MR. KELSEY: Hello. My name is Joel Kelsey. I work for Consumers Union. We are the nonprofit publisher of Consumer Reports Magazine. And through our magazine and through our online

web properties, Consumer Reports Online, we strive to give consumers some access to the limited information about the products out there in the marketplace, everything from refrigerators to Internet service providers.

And just by way of addressing the point about empowering consumers, I would mention that CRO -- Consumer Reports Online -- has just over 4 million online subscribers that access our site all the time. And I would encourage all of you to go and look at the great information they're able to access there to empower their own choices in the marketplace.

But I'm here to speak for the advocacy side of the organization, which strives to stand up for consumers' rights here in D.C. and in state capitals all over the country. And since I only have four minutes now, I'm going to focus my

comments on three topics: first, cybercrime; second, behavioral tracking and targeting; and third, deep packet inspection.

1

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Cybercrime. There's clearly a cost, both perceived, but also very real, to consumers going online. For example, in our latest Consumer Reports survey, The State of the Net, we found that one in five online subscribers this past year were victims of a cybercrime. 1.2 million consumers reported having to replace their computers because of software infections, contributing to what we estimate is close to a cost of \$8 billion in 2009 to consumers because of cybercrime online. Unfortunately, from our perspective, as rising unemployment, mortgage foreclosures, and the recession fuel what will -unfortunately fuel the fire of online recession-related scams. And so we think these numbers may, in fact, increase in the next year. Some of the responsibility to protect against consumer crime -- excuse me, against cybercrime certainly rests with the consumer. But

> 706 Duke Street, Suite 100 Alexandria, VA 22314

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

1 we also believe the government and online businesses that collect and store sensitive consumer information bear some of that 4 responsibility. For example, according to a 5 security training institute, tens of thousands of online business databases have been hacked in the 7 past year. The FTC has been vigorously going 8 after the criminals that they can catch; however, 9 we strongly believe that Congress needs to pass 10 standards that set at least a baseline of minimal 11 security measures that any company that's going to 12 collect sensitive consumer information must employ 13 to guard that information. 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

We also believe that Congress should act to make sure that those companies must notify consumers if a breach of that information occurs. We also believe government could do a better job of arming consumers with the information that they need to protect themselves through public education campaigns, and we urge the FCC to act —to ask Congress to act in both of those arenas when they submit their National Broadband Plan in ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

February.

But it's not just malicious attacks that give consumers concern. For example, CU conducted a poll last year showing that 82 percent of consumers were understandably concerned about their credit cards being stolen online. However, an overwhelming majority -- 72 percent -- were also concerned that their information and online behaviors were being tracked and profiled as they moved across the web.

So, while consumers are increasingly relying on the benefits that the Internet provides — a wide range of transaction services, social networking — they're also in their minds being asked to pay a higher and higher price by turning over sensitive data about themselves that they then cannot control or have access to afterwards. Without safeguards, this information can be used for purposes, both commercial and otherwise, that we feel will harm the consumers that data trackers purport to help. For example, they could be used to target vulnerable populations with the ads.

Payday loans, subprime mortgage lenders, and other dubious products could be targeted to people. Also, they could use targeting to unfairly discriminate, sort of online redlining where some people are offered products and services at higher costs or even less favorable rates than others based on the use of personal information, like address, race, sexual orientation, et cetera.

For four decades, the foundation of U.S. privacy policies has been based on fair information practices: collection limitation, data quality, purpose specification, et cetera. We believe that Congress needs to apply these standards and give consumers more control over what is being collected about them online, where it's being kept, when it's being sold or used to third parties, and how long it's being stored for.

Just recently, last week, we joined a number of other consumer organizations and released principles which can be found on our website, hearusnow.org, for more information on what we believe those principles should be.

Lastly, with my remaining couple of 2 seconds, I'll just mention that depending on the 3 types of technology employed, tracking consumers 4 can go on just passive collection of information 5 and can actually actively affect the online consumer experience. Deep packet inspection is an example of that. We saw this through the 7 8 Comcast/BitTorrent case here at the FCC last year where consumers actually had products and services 10 and software blocked from them through online discrimination using DPI. We also see this through NebuAd last year where they used DPI to 13 monitor what consumers were doing across the web, 14 every mouse click and site that they visited. And to us, those are both unacceptable uses of deep packet inspection. While it can be used for good things to manage networks, there are certainly 18 unacceptable practices as well. And we urge the 19 FCC to act on those in a rulemaking coming up after their Broadband Plan. 20 21 With that I'd like to conclude, and I'd 22 be happy to answer any questions.

1

9

11

12

15

16

17

MR. HORRIGAN: Thanks very much, Joel. Now to Ari Schwartz.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes. I'm Ari Schwartz from the Center for Democracy and Technology. And I'd really like to thank the FCC for holding this workshop and for having CDT to present.

I'd like to focus on the use of data in broadband services. One of the hallmarks of broadband services has been interaction and user control, and a lot of that comes from personalization and tailoring tied directly to the use of user information that users provide or that's taken in other ways. And I think that users generally want these services and are willing to personalize and see the benefits of personalizing, but they see it as a two-way street: that they want to know exactly who is getting their information and what's happening to it. And that they have control over it is the main point.

And you see that bear out in the data that Joel just presented from Consumers Union on ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

behavioral targeting, but we also generally see this kind of market failure here of companies' failure to realize the basic concerns of consumers in this space. There is still a general feeling when marketing to consumers that there's still an '80s direct marketing kind of model out there, that consumers' data belongs to the company that's doing the marketing and that it's not actually -it should not necessarily be in the control of the user.

1

3

4 5

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

We're starting to see some changes in them. A lot of that is brought from the regulatory pressure and from efforts to try and show some of the concerns with different business models in this space. But the question is whether we can really get to a user control model in this space. But what it comes down to is the ISPs, advertisers, marketers that are in this area that are trying to deliver more personalized content, more personalized ads, that they be more transparent, that they give users more control. We feel strongly at CDT that the

1 Broadband Plan should call for general consumer privacy legislation which would give consumers a 3 solid level of trust. Right now most of the 4 privacy laws that we see are based in certain 5 industry areas, are based on certain technologies, and they're really set at a certain time and space 7 at the time that they're written. Rather than 8 having something that sets a baseline, is 9 flexible, where you can set stronger rules for 10 certain types of data, but really gives a set of 11 support so that we don't have to keep going back 12 to Congress or to regulatory agencies every time 13 there's a small change in technology or in collection of information. 14 15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

We also think that the plan should set in motion a process for transparency of broadband providers which is more specifically in the FCC's bailiwick. And I'll just give an example in that space that we've seen more recently of the kinds of practices that we're concerned about. We've noticed an increase in companies that collect analytics data about what websites are being used ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

and how they're being used, both in an interactive 1 way and in the old-fashioned, just to gather information about individuals. And it seems that 3 4 a lot of smaller ISPs are working with these 5 analytics companies and literally selling the entire set of data logs about their users and 7 doing it in the terms of -- and saying they're 8 doing it with consent by getting the consent in 9 the terms of service. So when the user signs up 10 for broadband service, buried on page 20 of the 11 terms of service is something saying that they may 12 share information with companies for analytics 13 purposes, when in reality they're taking all user 14 data of everyone that agrees, that becomes a user 15 of this service, and selling that data to an 16 analytics provider saying that's consent. 17 From our point of view, and I think from 18 basically any consumer point of view -- coming at 19 this from a consumer point of view -- that's 20 simply not consent. If you say no, you don't get 21 the service, first of all. And second of all, the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

information about what is happening to your data

22

is so vague and buried into the terms of service that it's unclear to the average user what is actually happening to their communications.

So that's just one example of an area. And we're starting to see new business models that allow for deep packet inspection, that allow for other types of deep looks into what users do and having that information sold along these same lines of an agreement. And that just seems completely unacceptable to the average user, and we think that the FCC should stand up for consumers in that space.

Thank you.

MR. HORRIGAN: Thank you. Debra Berlyn?
MS. BERLYN: Thank you, John. I'm here
today from Consumer Policy Solutions, and I also
chair the FCC's Consumer Advisory Committee.

Unfortunately, I don't have anything to represent for Consumer Advisory Committee today because we are meeting tomorrow after several months. We just finished our task of working on the digital television transition and now we are ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

going to move our focus to the issue of the National Broadband Plan. So we hope to bring some of our recommendations to the staff and to the Commission and work with you as you develop your plan and also as the Commission implements the plan in the coming year.

1

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

The issues that you raised on the workshop today are of great importance to all consumers, but I want to focus my remarks on one particular group of consumers, and that's the older adult population. John, as you have brought very interesting data to this issue, we now know that 30 percent of adults 65 and older have broadband in their home. So put another way that means that 70 percent of older adults do not have broadband in their homes. And although we expect that number to decrease in the next couple of years, we know it will still lag considerably behind the general population. Our goal is to get everyone connected to broadband. We want to make sure that our nation's older consumers don't get left behind.

The benefits are huge. I could spend the balance of my time discussing them: telemedicine, surfing the Net for information, reducing isolation, shopping at home, staying connected to family and friends. Maybe it won't make those wrinkles go away, but you can find a cream to reduce your wrinkles. And the benefits for our nation's economy are great as well. We know that the government is moving many forms and processes online to save millions of dollars, reaping economic savings. But for our nation's older individuals, if they're not online they won't be able to accomplish that and the government won't get those savings that it's counting on.

14 15

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

To get this to happen we need to address the barriers that exist. We know that showing value is number one. We need to make sure that our older individuals know that there's value in their everyday life. We need to help them adapt to the technology. We need to integrate that into their community. We need to work with family ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

members, and we need to enlist parents to help not only their kids and teens with technology, but also to help their parents. So I'm calling parents the new digital sandwich generation -- to help their parents adapt to the technology.

And that brings me to the important role that parents have. And I think I'm going to bridge the next panel. We need to address perhaps one of the most important barriers, and that's privacy and safety for all consumers, but particularly older adults. It's a very important issue when it comes to not only the adoption of broadband, but also the retention of broadband service for consumers.

Consumers need to feel safe and secure about going online. And protecting personal information is one major concern for consumers. I did a survey about a year ago on Internet safety and found that consumers of all generations were concerned about protecting their personal privacy. Older adults were certainly most concerned and found that their actions most closely matched

their concern. This is an important thing to bear in mind: That while older individuals are not comfortable with sharing information online, as we move commerce online, medical records, government forms, it may be a little too much to ask right away to move all of this online while they're also concerned about controlling technology and their personal information.

So, what are some of the privacy concerns that consumers, and particularly older adults have? Concerns about scams and fraud; how can I tell the difference between a genuine e-mail inquiry and a phishing e-mail; too much information shared online, both knowingly and unknowingly; e-commerce, can I enter my credit card information online and trust my information is safe and secure? So we need to develop a national plan that gets our older adults online. Benefits are tremendous for both our seniors and our nation.

And we need to focus on continuing to show the value of broadband and addressing

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

barriers to adoption/retention with particular attention paid to personal privacy and safety.

Thank you.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ HORRIGAN: Thank you. And now we have about minutes for Q&A. And as a reminder, if you have a

question in the audience, somebody can bring you a card so that you can write it down.

What I'd like to do since we have three questioners here before us, go to our questioners on the far left side. We'll start with Marc Berejka, then we'll go to Michael Wroblewski, and then we'll come back with Bob Cannon for some questions.

So, Marc, you get the leadoff position on questioning.

MR. BEREJKA: Thanks, John. I'd like to open this up to all the panelists -- nobody in particular, although I think Mike staked out a position that was a little bit different from the others. And so maybe he gets to share time with the others.

In my decade-plus interaction on Internet policy issues, we've seen different shapes and forms of privacy debates, security debates, online safety debates. And nobody has really seemed to crack the nut of what the right regulatory or policy model ought to be. You know, we can concede, I think, that the Internet is at least a tween. In the tween years you want to instill some values that are longstanding. I'm curious as to the panelists' thoughts on what the right regulatory model is.

And let me explain a little bit. We can envision statute that gets into fine details of micromanaging online sites or online behaviors, and I think we'd all agree that that's the wrong way to go about it. We can envision self-regulatory models, and I think at least some folks might question whether certain self-regulatory models have been successful. So if at both extremes we have doubts about efficacy, what's the right middle ground in terms of a policy or regulatory model?

MS. MEINRATH: Well, I think what's important to keep in mind to begin with is that for the vast majority of the Internet's history it's not so much that it was free from regulation as it was government owned and operated. So until NSF Net was privatized in the mid-1990s, you really had an onus being placed on basic research and analysis, and concomitant with that you then had kind of this radical transparency of what was happening. You had data information being made available on what was happening on the Internet. And that led to a flurry of research and development and innovation, an unprecedented flurry of that.

I think with the privatization of the Internet we kind of threw out the bath and the baby water -- sorry, bathwater and the baby when it came to having information being made available on what was happening online. And a lot of what is being called for is a return to just making information available so that people can make informed decisions about what they want to do with ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

their data, about where their privacy is and is not; about, you know, what service provider options are available; about what's happening on the core of the Internet in terms of congestion or bottlenecks or, you know, problem areas.

MR. BEREJKA: Let me take that as one theoretical approach -- just massive transparency. You know, I'll pick up on Ari's point though that, you know, massive transparency about privacy practices might not suite the average consumer when certain disclosures are on page 23 and when, you know, we know that, you know, 98 percent-plus of consumers don't ever change default or even change what the defaults are in their system.

So, I appreciate that massive transparency can be helpful. I'm looking for something that is maybe a little bit more tailored to the typical consumer.

MR. SCHWARTZ: I think it depends on the area that you're talking about. There's a reason for that. Let me talk about four areas where I think that you can always look at for when there's ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

a social policy issue on the Internet that we always look at in addressing some of the issues.

So there's the technology and whether we can come up with technological solutions that solve the problem. And I'd say at CDT we always try and look there first. Can we come up with a technology solution that solves this problem alone? In a lot of cases you can, and in some cases you simply can't.

Number two is the question of, you know, self-- regulation and what industry can do with its policy procedures to put in place along with the technology to help to address some of these issues. That's always kind of the second line of defense because that allows the industry to -- because the industry can act quickly when there's something that threatens its livelihood. So if there is a direct threat to its livelihood it can often act quickly and you can get to address some of the problems directly with self regulation.

Third, though, is existing law and then examination of existing law, enforcement of ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

existing law. And then also kind of where does it miss the boat? So, seeing if technology is working; seeing if self-regulatory action is working; seeing if you can get existing law to work. And then the question of what else needs to be done in law to address the bad actors who may not be in the self- regulatory programs or if there's a clear market failure, to address those issues.

And I think fourth and the area where I think we had a lot of hope, I think, at the beginning of the Internet, and have probably less hope now based on what we've seen, is user education. We've seen the user education efforts just trying to explain to users what's happening out there really doesn't work as well as setting up technologies and defaults for users where they make better decisions that work across the board and scale better.

MR. WROBLEWSKI: Can I ask a follow-up question?

MR. SCHWARTZ: Still -- user education
ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

1 is still important I'm saying, but I'd just say I think we have less faith in it than we used to. 3 MR. WROBLEWSKI: In your four responses 4 there or four answers, are there -- has technology 5 come up with new, innovative ways to inform people about not only how a site or a provider is using 7 their information, but why it's important to them? MR. SCHWARTZ: I think -- I'll give an 8 9 example of one. I really like Google's ad 10 preferences if you could find it without knowing 11 what it's exactly called, which is not very easy 12 to do today. But the idea of Google's ad 13 preferences is that as you're surfing they tell 14 you the categories that they're going to be 15 targeting ads to you. So, you see a list of all 16 the types of ads -- types of categories that 17 people are buying to get placed into that area. 18 Now $\operatorname{\mathsf{--}}$ and then when you go to opt out or to 19 manage your information you can see that 20 information and, you know, well, in fact, for 21 almost everyone in our office, a regulatory agent 22 -- a viewer of government regulatory agencies ANDERSON COURT REPORTING 706 Duke Street, Suite 100 Alexandria, VA 22314

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

comes up as something that they target ads on. I wonder what they're targeting on that, but I don't feel the need to change that category. Right?
But that's an interesting fact. Right?

1

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

We also know that if someone were to start targeting on something like cancer or some sensitive category, that would have to come up there as well. So, there is some major benefit to users to seeing -- to having that kind of transparency so that gets some of radical transparency in that way. But also, I think that people are less likely to hit that opt-out button if they're willing -- if they can get the information to change the categories and get a kind of intuitive understanding of, oh, this is why they want to try to target ads at me because they can figure out what categories to put me in. So there's some sense that they're not going to target in tentative areas, but that you have some control over it as well.

So, I think that's a major step forward, but you have to be able to find it and it has to ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

1 be put in the context of what this does, which Google does not do a very good job of today. 3 MR. NELSON: If I can jump in there, a 4 couple of years ago, I wrote a paper on 5 technologies that might allow for more 6 transparency and trust in the cloud. The cloud is 7 going to be this incredibly valuable platform for 8 all sorts of new consumer applications and also to 9 new services, but we have to find some way to 10 build privacy into it. And one of the things that 11 we talked about in the paper was what are called 12 immutable audits that allows you to have an 13 immutable audit trail that will allow the customer 14 to know, okay, where has my data been, who has had 15 access to it, and for what reasons? If we have 16 competition in the marketplace, I think that's 17 going to be something that will be widely deployed 18 in this new infrastructure we're building because 19 the consumer is going to demand it. You're going 20 to want to know, okay, when has my data been here? 21 Who has seen it? And having an immutable 22 technology -- a technology that makes a record ANDERSON COURT REPORTING 706 Duke Street, Suite 100 Alexandria, VA 22314 Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

that cannot be changed, taken into court if need be -- is really at the heart of that. This is still under development, but I think it's one step in the process.

There are other pieces of this, I think, that can be built in, and I've heard a lot I agree with here. I think Marc is maybe a false dichotomy here. Radical transparency is something we want. How we get there we might vary on. But at the end of the day, if there's more data out there on what the infrastructure is doing, we'll have third parties who decipher that data for individuals. We'll have competition between players as they try to provide a better, more trusted service.

And I also think Ari is right. If you can build in the solution, have it in the technology so we don't need the regulation or even self-regulation, that's the best answer.

MS. BERLYN: And I --

MR. NELSON: And so far the Internet has worked pretty well that way.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

1 MS. BERLYN: Thank you. I want to jump in as well and say that I think we are seeing some 3 effort to try and explain some of this to 4 consumers from the industry, but I think we have a 5 long way to go to educate consumers and build 6 awareness about this. And I think that's one 7 thing that the government can help with. And, you know, I know that the FTC has done a fantastic job 8 9 of educating consumers about safety, for example. 10 The On Guard Online site is a wonderful tool for 11 safety information for consumers. And we need to 12 do more to educate consumers about the privacy 13 elements of what their experience is online with 14 privacy issues. And so there's a long way to go 15 to educate consumers about those issues. 16 MR. KELSEY: And I guess I would just 17 back up a minute and take whatever editorial 18 license I have to reframe the question in a small 19 way. And that's that, you know, I think that 20 there's not necessarily anything that will crack

21

22

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

the nut. There's no silver bullet that, you know,

government policy -- whether passed by Congress or

regulated by the FTC or the FCC -- that can end all debates about what happens online, be it around privacy issues as we've been talking about here or around data collection about the infrastructure at FCC which Sascha has been, I think, alluding to.

You know, I think it's an ongoing process and it has been an ongoing process, both at each of those agencies and also within Congress. But I think that we're now at a place in the tween years where you're right, that we need to distill values in a particular way. And I think that there's certainly some bad behaviors that we've seen out there that continue to crop up. And at this point, from our perspective, I think there needs to be broad standards not only applied to the privacy arena, but also applied to the types of technologies that are deployed within the infrastructure in the network itself.

So at FCC, absolutely, I think we should get back to the place where we're collecting more data, more granular data, about where broadband is ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

available, how much it costs consumers, how fast the actual speeds not just the advertised speeds are. I think we should, you know, look at -- with the growth of deep packet inspection, you know, how our network is using that technology. Is it truly for network management purposes or is it for monitoring and/or blocking and discriminating? What's acceptable? What's not?

At FTC I think, you know, they've done — as Debra mentioned — a great job of going after the online criminals that they're able to catch, but I think defining what is sensitive information and then giving some guidance to Congress about setting standards about how those companies need to protect that sensitive information is absolutely key and essential. And then also requiring those companies to deliver some kind of notice to consumers if that sensitive information is ever breached.

A lot of states have already begun that process. A lot of attorneys general have already begun getting into that, so I think that there's ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

1 precedent out there. It's an ongoing process and, you know, each of the federal agencies, in 3 addition to Congress, has a role to play. 4 MR. WROBLEWSKI: Michael, you had 5 mentioned that -- I have two more questions. MR. NELSON: Okay. 7 MR. WROBLEWSKI: You had mentioned that 8 you anticipated there would be competition over 9 kind of a race to the top, so to speak, on privacy 10 and data security. Is that happening now or why 11 isn't it happening now? 12 MR. NELSON: Well, I think the main 13 reason it's not happening is we don't see enough 14 competition in a lot of these areas. And my 15 biggest fear is we're kind of going in the wrong 16 direction at the network layer. We're not seeing 17 new players coming in with a lot of new 18 technologies. We're seeing too many places where 19 the regulatory process, particularly the state regulatory process, is being used to block 20 21 potential competitors. This is very worrisome. 22 I go to France and my friends tell me or ANDERSON COURT REPORTING 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

> Alexandria, VA 22314 Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

boast about the wonderful service they get. They actually -- they all sign up for two services. They've got the cable television broadband and they've got the phone service broadband, and they pay less for both services than I get for my single service and their service is two or three times faster. And they've got 6 -- in downtown Paris you've got 20 or 25 different providers to choose from. Even in the far suburbs and the rural areas, most French consumers have a lot more choice.

My biggest fear is the fact that we do have a duopoly -- or at best three players in a lot of markets -- will mean that those players are going to control what services are built on top and, particularly, as I say, the cloud.

I do see, in some consumer services, an understanding of the needs of consumers. I'm a big Amazon.com user and I like the transparency they provide for me. I know exactly what data they're collecting and I can go in and see what I've purchased and what they know about me. And a ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

lot of that is very sensitive information because it reveals a huge amount about me, but I know what they've got.

And I also can read their privacy policy and I have some choices there. So that's a nice example of where it's working.

I have a lot of other places where it's not working and I really worry that a layer down from those services, like Amazon, are these middleware layers, these other services that will be the foundation upon which the next generation of applications are built. And if we don't have competition in that platform, then I think we're really going to be in trouble. And that means we have to have competition in the broadband itself.

I'm sorry that was a very long answer to a very complicated question.

 $\,$ MR. HORRIGAN: Michael, let me see if -- turn to Bob Cannon first.

MR. WROBLEWSKI: Sure.

MR. HORRIGAN: Then maybe questions from the audience in cyberspace and then we'll, I hope, ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

have time for any additional question you may have.

So, Bob Cannon?

MR. CANNON: All right. I'll try to ask this question very quickly.

What I want to do is I want to tie this panel to the next panel. A lot of the next panel will focus on online safety. Ari, I really liked your analytics of, you know, how you approach a question and what solution you get to. With online privacy I hear a much more aggressive approach to a solution. With online safety I hear very much, you know, government stay out. Let's focus on media literacy and consumer education. And then you said -- which really, you know, smacks me like cold water -- we have much less faith in consumer education than we used to.

So I'd like you to sort of juxtapose the two issues and tell me why you're coming out in one place and maybe in a different place for the other.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Sure. Well, I think it's
ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

clear in terms of the technology that there is 1 incentive to build user-controlled technologies for safety. And they work. And they have been 3 working and they've been getting better. And 4 5 there's been competition in that space and it continues to improve. Almost every product that 7 you see out there, every browser that's put out 8 there, has safety as, you know, the number one 9 selling point for it. All of the ISPs sell 10 safety. I mean, there is safety all over a lot of 11 these products. And it is something that 12 consumers are looking for and buying in the 13 marketplace today. And it is something that seems 14 to be working in that way. 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

I do think that in terms of education it is difficult to figure out how to do education -- online education. And I do think that the FCC should be -- and Commerce as well should be focusing more resources on figuring out how to do better education and how we educate parents, especially new parents, whose kids are my kids' age, who are, you know, using the Internet for the ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

first time and using technology that could affect them in the first time -- for the first time, how to educate them about what they can do to protect their kids. We have seen some good efforts on that. I think more of it comes from in selling the products than from the education that goes out there.

1

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

In the privacy space, we've seen some competition in the browser area for privacy, but that's basically it in terms of real competition in terms of privacy. We have seen less on -- but we do see a lot of competition on data collection and on use of data. Right? It's not like -- you have that kind of parallel in the safety space where there are large companies and organizations that have to do both the protection and have to do -- and are both collecting data. There's no corollary in the safety space to that.

So, I do think that there is a lot that can be done. We also have, you know, rules about commercial data and regular speech, too, and non-commercial speech. And that alone sets up a ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

> 706 Duke Street, Suite 100 Alexandria, VA 22314

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

different dichotomy for the discussion about safety versus commercial privacy issues that's worth pointing out as well.

MR. KELSEY: I'd also mention just quickly that I think the market incentives are a little bit different there.

You know, with safety, you know, Ari is absolutely right that there's a lot of products out there. We rate them in the magazine about, you know, how can they deliver -- how can they ensure your safety when you're surfing online?

When it comes to privacy and the types of kind of behavioral tracking and information that's collected, the incentives are different. The incentives are either, you know, with the Internet service provider to buy and use different types of technologies, including DPI, but many others — to track information and then sell it to third parties or use it for their own advertising purposes. The incentives are there for the companies, you know, online companies at the edge that are collecting information about consumers ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

and using it to serve up ads. And in that area where the market incentives are different is where, you know, from our perspective at least, we see a role for government to get involved to say, hey, there needs to be at least some kind of basic security standards out there for consumers because this information can at some times be very sensitive.

And if it's ever stolen or if it's used in negative ways, there should be a baseline for consumers to get some redress and some relief.

And I think that there's precedent out there. Right? The way that credit cards are approached, the way that health information is approached, and other privacy policies out there, I think, you know, set a baseline for FCC and FTC and others to look at.

 $\,$ MS. MEINRATH: If I could maybe very briefly come back to one of the original questions.

In terms of what this regulatory structure or framework might look like, I view it ANDERSON COURT REPORTING 706 Duke Street, Suite 100 Alexandria, VA 22314

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

as sort of a reconceptualization that places the locus of control with the edges of the network, with the end-users or participants in this network, so that you're looking for an environment that enables maximum control over data, over your privacy, over security at the edges of the network and not endowing power in the center of the network or over the, you know, the service providers on that network.

MR. HORRIGAN: Empower the user.

MS. BERLYN: Can I just mention one other quick thing? That privacy for consumers means many different things. And it's not just --doesn't just mean data protection, but it means all sorts of other -- it's a wide spectrum of issues. And so there are -- and it is in many ways a subset of online safety as well. And there are tools that consumers can utilize online to protect other private information that they have.

So, you know, when we talk about online privacy we have to look at it as perhaps a broader issue. And so there are tools that they can use

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING 706 Duke Street, Suite 100 Alexandria, VA 22314

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

to protect certain information that they have about themselves online that are available today. And so we have to look at it perhaps as a big picture because I think consumers, when they think about privacy online, they think about a whole host of issues.

MR. HORRIGAN: Just as an interjection from my part. Is there a tension between what Sascha just said about empowering or putting control — the locus of control at the edge of the network and what Ari said earlier about it seeming to be the case that user education is a less effective tool as experiences taught in time? So if you're going to empower the edge of the network and the person — the individual is the very edge of the network — and if that person seems less amenable to user education on some of these issues today than has been in the past, how do we reconcile that? What mechanisms might we think about? And how might that feed into the Broadband Plan, as well?

MR. NELSON: Maybe you need a plug-in or ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

a third- party service at the edge of the network rather than focusing on the person in front of the screen. And I think that gets to this fundamental point that Ari said, let's build in some solutions. That requires having this flexibility at the edge. That requires having lots of competition, allowing lots of thousands of players to come to the marketplace with services that will do different things for different people and do it well.

 I think this ties into the transparency though, too. I mean, in order to make these applications work -- in order to actually understand what the privacy threats are to the user, you have to have some sense of what data is being collected. And I do agree that there is a critical need for that.

MR. SCHWARTZ: I think -- I mean, one way to think about it is that the technology -- I mean, we've been successful in building technologies that do this, but we haven't been as successful in making them easy enough to use to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

give users the right set of choices. So you give them two or three choices to be able to use from. Then we can educate around those choices.

Today it's more about setting the right defaults and about building it in from the beginning. If we want to move towards giving users a set of choices to use, we're going to have to narrow down the number of choices and make it so it's easy for users to use. And then we could do education around that. And I think that then — so maybe if we get to the point of setting up — of building the solutions in and then we could do education around that, it might be a way to bring education back up toward the top of the list.

MR. BEREJKA: Can I just add a comment? Which is that in some ways this latter part of the conversation answers my initial question because you're describing a model. Right? You're describing a model. Maybe it's at the 10,000 foot level, but you're still describing a model that's different from prescriptive legislation down to ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

every website must do A, B, C, and D. And, you know, it's different from self-regulation, too, because somebody is going to have to simplify the choices.

MR. NELSON: At lunch I was talking to Mitch Kapor and Bob Frankston. We came up with the term autonomic regulation, sort of built in. It just happens, like the autonomic system of our body ensures that we breathe and our heart beats. That's the kind of thing I think we need to think through.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ SCHWARTZ: That sounds better than paternal libertarianism.

MR. NELSON: Cyber libertarianism. We've got a Facebook for cyber libertarians. We've got 75 of us so far.

17 MR. HORRIGAN: Well, we have probably 15 18 to 20 more minutes of Q&A time, notwithstanding 19 what the display says there.

I have some questions from the audience and from cyberspace that I'm going to present to the panelists. I'm going to try to do things in ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

such a way that the questions are on point. There's one question that came in that was very much about mapping, which I'm sure people on this panel could talk about, but it's not the topic of the panel.

So, let me turn to a question that reads, "How should we address the tradeoff between privacy, that is controlling data flows, and free speech online? Since publishers rely on advertising to fund free content, services won't be able to be provided." I'm having handwriting issues.

Basically, if the business model of providing content for free because of ads is no longer viable, what are the consequences? And for some of the policy initiatives that have been raised, are there tradeoffs between free speech and some of the policy notions propounded so far?

Does anybody want to take a crack at the

privacy free speech tradeoff as posited by the questioner?

21 questioner? 22 M

MS. MEINRATH: I'll take a stab at it.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

```
1
       A lot of this comes down to -- you know, I feel
       like I'm kind of maybe beating a dead horse, but
 3
       transparency of information about what data is
 4
       being collected and control over that information.
 5
       So, if I am knowingly providing personal
 6
       information and doing so, like, in return for
 7
       whatever -- the content or whatever else -- and {\tt I}
 8
       have control over my information, et cetera, in
 9
       giving that away, that's entirely different than
10
       deciding, hey, I want to watch this movie and the
11
       next thing you know I'm getting, you know, all
12
       sorts of other lists that I'm being signed up for.
13
                 A lot of this really comes down to just
14
       making explicit to users of various services and
15
       applications what happens with that information.
16
       And giving the opportunity for people to opt out
17
       of privacy invasive business techniques. And I
18
       would say if your business model is predicated
19
       upon sort of a nefarious privacy invasive, yet
20
       hidden agenda, it's probably a bad business model.
21
                 MR. HORRIGAN: Others on this?
22
                 MR. KELSEY: Yeah, I mean, I would just
                    ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
                   706 Duke Street, Suite 100
                      Alexandria, VA 22314
            Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190
```

say that absolutely consumers, you know, enjoy and very much benefit from the use of free online products: Everything from social networking sites to search engines to, you know, all of the wonderful free things that you can access online. And that business model is predicated on the ability to serve ads.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And contextual ads, from our perspective -- I can speak on behalf of CU -- that don't necessarily present a problem, real-time ads served to people based on what they're looking at, is different than tracking a consumer's behavior over six months. And I think that there's a line that needs to be drawn at some point when that information is being used in ways that consumers either (a) don't know about or (b) would actually even feel is harmful.

So, I mean, I think we can all agree that serving ads in order to give free content to consumers online is a good thing. But if you're using sensitive information -- race, age, household income and other types of information --ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

to serve up, you know, products and services that might not be as good as products and services you're serving up to other people, that's a bit of a deceptive process that's going on there and that should be stopped.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ HORRIGAN: Thank you. I'm going to try to edit down a very densely packed question on the card here.

We've talked a bit about measurement today, specifically, actually, measuring activity at the network level and the need for more of that. This question has a different measurement cast to it.

It reads, "What mechanisms exist or should be developed to measure the secondary consumer and societal benefits to broadband?" So that could include the government saving money on delivery of services. It could include additional

consumer surplus that accrues to consumers who might be better informed.

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{And the other part of the question has} \\ \text{to do with whether those measurement techniques} \\ \text{ANDERSON COURT REPORTING} \end{array}$

might be adapted to actually inform our national income accounts as to whether this kind of activity is improving or adding to economic growth.

So, does anybody have perspectives on, or proposals for, measuring some of the benefits to individuals or institutions to broadband delivery of various products or services?

MS. MEINRATH: Yes. This is absolutely fundamentally important. You know, if we were to look at, say, how much money do we make on primary education or on our road system, you would find that it's very little. In fact, it's a massive cost center. And yet as a society, the benefits of having, say, roads and education are massive for their secondary and tertiary effects.

And broadband is very much the same way. How one goes about measuring that, I mean, that's -- there's, you know, the study of community informatics does a lot of work in this space. And there's a number of different folks that are looking at this. We, as a country, I think, have

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

been for the past decade stuck in this notion of, you know, show me the business model which looks at only the primary effects. It looks at, you know, how much money can you make off of broadband and externalizes all of these other benefits. And we then make a decision. Should we deploy broadband in City X based on whether we can get a return on that investment?

And that's exactly the wrong way to go about doing this. And a host of other countries have realized that we need to build out this infrastructure because the secondary and tertiary benefits are so great. We need to perhaps look at countries that have already been collecting this information and utilize the best practices that exist there.

Import those good ideas as a part of our own decision making processes.

MR. HORRIGAN: If you could point us to those, that would be -- those other country models.

MR. NELSON: Just a second. I think
ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

1 this is an area where you could have the highest impact for the fewest dollars. And the FCC should 3 really be out there collecting this data, putting 4 it in digestible form. It's not a matter of 5 trying to prove that broadband is good and that there are economic benefits. We have a much 7 bigger challenge here, which is showing that investing in broadband is more important than some 8 9 of the other things we could be investing in. 10 Whether it's public investment in bridges or 11 investment in state and local services. I mean, 12 there are a lot of different things that we need 13 to spend money on. And having more robust 14 statistics on where the value is is helpful. 15 And we're lucky. We have good datasets 16 from some other countries that are ahead of us in 17 broadband investment. 18 We can actually do state-to-state 19 comparisons because some states have much worse policies than others and have not seen build out 20 21 as fast as they might. And you can actually start

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

looking -- doing econometric modeling and trying

22

1 to make some sense of it. The estimates aren't going to be perfect, but even getting within 30 or 3 40 percent will allow you to make a pretty 4 compelling argument that this is -- this broadband 5 investment that the public sector and the private sector need to make is going to pay real benefits. 7 But the FCC, I don't think, has put enough emphasis on this. And other agencies, of course, 8 9 have a role to play in funding some of this work. 10 MR. HORRIGAN: Thanks. Other questions? 11 Do our panel questioners, Marc or Michael, have 12 any additional questions? I have one remaining 13 from cyberspace and I hear another one being 14 printed out. 15 Did you have one, Michael? 16 MR. WROBLEWSKI: I just wanted to follow 17 up on a comment, I think, Sascha, you had made. 18

MR. WROBLEWSKI: I just wanted to follow up on a comment, I think, Sascha, you had made. You had indicated that consumers are completely kept in the dark about what choices there are in —— I'm assuming you meant by it —— choosing a provider. And I wanted to know from your perspective what you thought. They were in the ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

19

20

21

22

dark. What should be illuminated? MS. MEINRATH: Right. Well, I view it as kind of like imagine if every gas station in the country didn't have a sign telling you how much it costs and what the octane on it was and you were told, look, just start pumping gas and we'll tell you what you're going to pay for that gas and, you know, we'll tell you what your octane is post hoc. That's kind of the environment we're in with broadband connectivity.

1

3

4 5

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

There's no place that I can go today and say show me all of the providers at my house or for my business and tell me what are the different facets, like what is it that they're offering me in terms of not just speeds, but like maybe uptimes and service level guarantees. And in terms of the contention ratio, how many people are sharing the single line that comes into my neighborhood.

All of that information -- you can't make an informed decision about what your broadband service options are if you don't have ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

access to that information. And this has been an entirely well thought out systematic effort to keep us all in the dark about that information. And that's before we even get into all this, like, what's actually happening online? How many people are sharing a line in the United States versus, you know, elsewhere. In Europe, they just say, look, as part of your service offering you have to tell people what is the contention ratio on this line. It's just that simple.

1

3

4

5

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

And I think these are mandates that would be excruciatingly easy to implement. Maybe unpopular, but easy to implement. Just say, look, provide people with information so they can just make a decision as to what providers are in their area and what best fits their needs.

MR. KELSEY: That's a pretty 18 comprehensive and good answer. The only 19 sharpening point I would put on it is with relation to the question of speed is, you know, we 20 21 have a pretty good sense of looking at 22 advertisements and seeing what broadband providers ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

are advertising their speeds are, I think both download and upload. But we don't know what those actual speeds are, particularly at, you know, the times -- the high traffic periods of the day. And so I think providing more transparency to consumers about what the speeds that they're paying for actually are when they go online at 5 p.m. is something that consumers have a right to be able to know because they're paying top dollar every month for that connection.

MR. NELSON: I am glad to see Drew Clark in the audience from Broadband Census. And he's been doing a grassroots bottom up collection of some of this data. And it's some of the best data out there, and yet it's done very cheaply and not by the carriers.

I do have to say we're in better shape here than we are in the healthcare area where there are at least three prices for every procedure you might want.

MR. HORRIGAN: Let me go to another question from the audience. This one is, "Are ANDERSON COURT REPORTING 706 Duke Street, Suite 100 Alexandria, VA 22314 Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

concerns about privacy and broadband limited to how ISPs utilize private info or also to how applications and service providers on the edge utilize the same information? For example, is the NebuAd model a greater concern than search engines utilizing cookies that the vast majority of consumers do not really know about and that are buried somewhere in the terms of services that the consumers don't read?"

So, does anybody want to tackle that?

MR. SCHWARTZ: I'd say, I mean, there's
more concern about the service provider using that
data in general than an application provider
because of the relationship of the service
provider. It's simply not expected that a ISP is
going to use that data in a way that may not be in
the user's interest. They're supposed to be
fulfilling that capability, whereas it's very
clear to someone that's using a search engine that
the results are being tailored for them directly
using that data.

So, just from a consumer expectations
ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

point of view, there is some -- there is greater concern over the ISP.

Now, that's not saying that you couldn't come up with a scenario where you could do notice and consent and user control in a way that worked better in the ISP than it does — or some service provider scenario than it does in the application scenario. We haven't seen that yet, but I wouldn't completely rule it out. I'm just saying that the basic expectations of a user are that that information is used to tailor services at the application level. And that's certainly not the expectation of the user at the ISP level.

One good thing about the Internet is it does provide some counterbalance because when people get upset about something they have a very easy way to share their concerns with thousands of other people and rally the troops.

The beacon case with Facebook a year and a half ago was an interesting example of where clearly the beacon service was a step over the line that Facebook users weren't going to

tolerate. And they felt violated and they got online. They blogged. That got picked up in the mainstream media. So that's a piece of good news here. In this industry we have ways for users to mobilize hundreds of thousands of customers and really put some economic pressure as well as some PR pressure on bad actors.

MR. KELSEY: There is also, I think, you know, that's very much a perception issue there. As Ari mentioned, the perception of consumers when they sign up for service from the Internet isn't that their service provider is going to look at everything that they do. And the perception may be different, although as the questioner points out, sometimes pretty ambiguous. And consumers have no idea what online companies are doing as well, and content companies are doing as well.

But it's also -- I think, goes back to the competition question in that there's a switching cost there associated with consumers, and even a choice in access costs associated with consumers if they choose to leave a broadband ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

service provider based on the information that they're collecting rather than I choose not to use a search engine or any type of content online or a website. You know, there's different economic models that we can debate forever about, you know, how competitive the search marketplace is. But I think there is a distinction to be made between consumers choosing to switch providers versus choosing to switch the types of websites that they use online.

MR. HORRIGAN: Let me put out one final question. This is a question that reads: "Are any panelists familiar with a recent article, 'Broken Promises of Privacy: Responding to the Surprising Failure of Anonymization,' by Paul Ohm from the University of Colorado? The findings were rather scary and, if true, have broader implications for our privacy laws and, in particular, to those that affect online activity."

Does anybody have a perspective on that?

MR. SCHWARTZ: Paul Ohm is actually a fellow at TDT right now. So, I think it's an

fellow at TDT right now. So, I think it's an

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

interesting article that people who are interested in -- basically, it gets at the idea that it's very difficult to actually anonymize information today. That we think that we're anonymizing it, but in reality it is almost impossible to do that is his claim.

So, and there's been other work by other people that have shown similar viewpoints, but politics more from a legal analysis. So I would recommend that to people that are interested in that.

MR. NELSON: CMU did some similar research. The idea of deanonymization is a very scary one when you think that your data is protected and your name isn't associated with it, that someone can take three datasets that include your data and reconstruct your address, your phone number, maybe even your birthday just because they have ways to combine the data. It's a fascinating problem.

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{And I think it gets back to this earlier} \\ \text{discussion we had about the need for some kind of} \\ \text{ANDERSON COURT REPORTING} \end{array}$

immutable audit, some way to be able to build trust by showing to consumers that we've got an infrastructure. It can track where your data has been and who has had use of it and that will be a competitive advantage for the players, both the network providers and the application providers who deploy that kind of thing.

 But we're still early days and I would be very concerned if in the plan or in any approach to privacy we sort of mandate this is the answer. The principal idea, I think, is the right way to go and that's been the strength of the U.S. regulatory system as opposed to the European system for many years. We can't set up a system where companies are trying to guess what's going

to be imposed on them next and worry that their business plan is going to disappear because some new requirement is added.

We saw that with VOIP and the FCC requirements there. We've seen a lot of changes over the last 10 years that have really upset the marketplace. I didn't appreciate this when I was ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

at the White House and the FCC. When I got into business and understood just how, you know, relatively small changes that seemed so minor when 3 I was at the FCC, could ripple through the entire 5 industry and just lead to investors backing out. That's a very serious problem and we have to be 7 thinking about that as we develop this plan. 8 Think about the uncertainty that might be inserted 9 into the business environment if you don't make 10 clear what you really want or you change the rules 11 every two or three years. 12 MR. HORRIGAN: Thanks very much. We are 13 going to adjourn this first panel. Let me first 14 thank each of you for the time and thoughtfulness 15 that you've put into your presentations. I've 16 certainly learned a lot and what you said will 17 inform how we go about constructing the National 18 Broadband Plan. 19 So we're going to take a 10-minute 20 break. Reconvene for Panel 2, which is entitled Meeting New Challenges: Tools and Techniques. 21 22 So, for now let me ask you to thank our ANDERSON COURT REPORTING 706 Duke Street, Suite 100 Alexandria, VA 22314

panelists and take a 10-minute break. So thank 1 you very much. 3 (Recess) 4 MR. HORRIGAN: If I could ask panelists 5 -- if I could ask panelists to come to the table and ask those gathered in the audience to come to 7 their seats, we're going to get underway with the second portion of this afternoon's workshop. 8 9 And as people settle in I'll start to 10 talk a little bit about what we have in mind for 11 the second session that we have. The second 12 session is called Meeting New Challenges: Tools 13 and Techniques. 14 Often times you can get away with saying 15 stuff, like we operate at the 30,000 feet level in 16 the prior panel. 17 So we were talking about cloud 18 computing. I guess we're literally at the 19 30,000-foot level at some of what we were 20 discussing in the first panel. 21 So, we talked a lot about architectural 22 issues in the online world and its impact on ANDERSON COURT REPORTING 706 Duke Street, Suite 100 Alexandria, VA 22314

1 consumer welfare and privacy. We talked a good bit about policy frameworks in the first session. And it was all very provocative and worthwhile, 3 4 and I think helps set the stage for the second 5 session this afternoon which does sort of bring things back to the ground level a little bit more. 7 We will be talking a good bit about online child 8 safety in this panel. We're going to be hearing 9 from some companies who provide some of the 10 infrastructure and services for social networking 11 and other kinds of applications that are very 12 popular online for consumers. And we'll hear 13 about some of the tools and feedback they get from 14 some of their customers on some of the issues 15 we're talking about. 16

17 18

19

20 21

22

So, with that we're going to proceed for the second session in the same way that we did in the first. We're going to start to my immediate left with Adam Thierer from the Progress and Freedom Foundation. I will let you read the distinguished biographies, backgrounds, and credentials of each of these folks for this panel, ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

> 706 Duke Street, Suite 100 Alexandria, VA 22314

1 so I will not take up time with that. I will simply turn it over to Adam and then we'll proceed 3 down the table and then have a chance for active 4 Q&A and discussion. 5 So, Adam, the floor is yours. MR. THIERER: Thank you so much, John. 7 I really appreciate the opportunity to speak here 8 today at this broadband workshop. 9 I've been asked to address a fairly 10 narrow issue in this space of whether or not 11 there's any relationship between online safety 12 concerns and broadband adoption in the United 13 States. 14 And hopefully, my laser pointer will 15 work. You need to go to full screen on that 16 PowerPoint, by the way. 17 MR. HORRIGAN: If whoever is running it 18 can hit the F5 key. 19 MR. THIERER: Hit the -- yeah, hit F5 or 20 the full screen. Thanks. And hopefully, my 21 clicker will work. There we go. 22 And most of what you'll see here today ANDERSON COURT REPORTING 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314 Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190 is from my book on Parental Controls and Online Child Safety: A Survey of Tools and Methods. It's available on the PFF website.

1

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So, jump right to the punch line here of the summary of my remarks. I've never in my research -- my 15 years of doing child safety research found any empirical evidence suggesting a strong correlation or any correlation between parental concerns about online activity or online safety and overall household broadband uptake. believe -- and I'll talk a little bit about this -- that there really are four explanations for this, why child safety concerns haven't moved the broadband needle very much, so to speak. And that's because one, not every home has children present; two, parents use a variety of household media rules to control media and Internet usage; three, a vibrant marketplace of parental control technologies exist; and four, it's likely that most parents now believe that the benefits of broadband and the Internet far outweigh the costs or potential downsides.

So, really some quick data points really quickly. I've aggregated all the Census Bureau data on families and children and household access to technology I can find. Here are some of those numbers which just go right to the red line there.

Only 32 percent of homes in America have children present.

And the next slide shows in a different way how that number has been in a steady state of decline. Since 19 -- well, for a long, long time, many decades, but specifically since the 1970s, we've seen a steady drop in the number of households with children in them. And moreover, not every home has children of a certain age where they might be concerned about access to the Internet. Very young children in a home, you might be less concerned about it. You might not allow your kids on as much when they're young.

Or very much older kids, older teens, you might trust them more to do the right thing

Or very much older kids, older teens, you might trust them more to do the right thing online or to talk to you about online services. That also unlocks the mystery as to why so few

households use certain parental control technologies, simply because they have other methods of approaching it or their kids are of a different age where they don't need it.

So bringing it all together, the picture that emerges from looking at this is that if you take it as sort of a subset of a subset of a subset, you start to realize that far fewer homes are concerned about online safety concerns than you think. It's certainly smaller than the 32 percent of homes that have children in them. It's probably somewhere at least in the neighborhood of half of that.

And that's especially the case because as I point out, number two, parents use a wide variety of household media rules to control media and Internet usage and content.

Poll after poll has suggested that parents take a very hands-on active role in monitoring what their kids do in the home. These Kaiser numbers that I've put up here, as well as the common sense media numbers in polls that have ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

been done in 2007, both suggest that parents are very actively engaged in monitoring what their kids do online.

In my work on this in my book, I've divided these household media rules into four general groupings: Where rules, when and how much rules, under what condition rules, what rules, so on and so forth. Pretty self-explanatory. The bottom line here, as I pointed out there on that slide, is that the widespread use of such household media rules by parents suggest that most parents realize they have other ways of dealing with potentially objectionable household content or media consumption if they choose to subscribe to broadband.

Third, and perhaps most importantly, there now exists a diverse array of parental control tools, far too numerous for me to mention here. I catalogued them all in my work in my book on Parental Controls and Online Child Safety, so I won't go through them all. But the even better news is that technological innovation in this

space continues at a very vibrant and impressive pace. These tools are growing both increasingly sophisticated and user friendly at the same time. And perhaps most importantly, they are usually absolutely free, or very, very cheap, or cross-subsidized by some other service.

So, in summary, it's a well-functioning marketplace. I can't possibly say it any better than the FCC did just two weeks ago in its Child Safe Viewing Act Final Order when it said studies have found that Internet parental control tools on the market are effective and that those who use these tools are generally pleased with their performance.

So, again, this is another reason that these concerns about online safety are generally lessened for parents who subscribe to broadband.

That's a mosaic of sort of everything that's out there that parents have at their disposal to deal with parental control concerns before their kids get online or when they subscribe to broadband services. From technology ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

solutions in the upper left-hand corner to the education methods that I haven't talked about much here in the upper right-hand corner, or those household media rules down at the bottom.

So, concluding thoughts. Basically, it's likely that most parents believe the benefits of broadband now outweigh the potential downsides. I really do believe we're starting to see the same pattern unfold on the privacy front.

And the best thing the FCC can do if there are continuing concerns or problems that parents have or others have about child safety or privacy concerns is to educate, educate and alleviate those concerns through public education and empowerment.

Thank you.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MR}}.$ HORRIGAN: Thank you. Alan. Thanks very much, Adam.

MR. SIMPSON: Thank you, John. Thank you for the opportunity to be here.

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{And Adam sort of teed this up pretty} \\ \text{well because I want to talk about that education} \\ \text{ANDERSON COURT REPORTING} \end{array}$

component. And especially as we look really at the Broadband Plan and a greater investment in broadband, I think it's essential that we put together the tools for parents and teachers that help us ensure that kids have the knowledge and skills and ethics to harness the educational and economic power of broadband, but also avoid what we all know are the potential negatives and dangers.

And let's be very clear that there's a lot of great opportunity and there are some real negatives. Digital media offers opportunities for kids to do amazing things in school and at home, and it gives them new and exciting ways to get in trouble and to find in appropriate things and create inappropriate things. And we've got to be able to manage both ends of that.

Five years from now if the general conclusion out there is that a massive federal investment in broadband was just a way to get faster porn and hyper violence and e-mails from banks in Nigeria to kids, we're not going to see ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

this as a success. We really need -- and I would agree with another part that Adam would say and probably has said quite a few times, the best solutions for this space are generally going to come from industry. This environment changes so fast that it's hard for anyone other than the industry leaders to come up with the best tools. Now, my colleagues here know that we've often encouraged them to come up more, and we will continue to do that. And there is a role for all of us working together -- government and business and advocates and parents and schools themselves -- to do the things that are necessary to educate and empower parents and teachers and protect kids where necessary.

We do need to educate a lot of parents and teachers about what's going on in this digital space. In many cases, kids are really much more native and much more experienced, and a lot of their parents maybe are sticking their heads in the sand about what kids can potentially do. At the same time, we need to make sure that kids are ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

prepared and are digitally literate so that they're going to be able to use and understand the digital technologies they have, and they're going to be able to fill the high tech jobs that we're all expecting them to be working in in 10 and 20 years.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

We essentially believe that the Broadband Plan should include a call for and funding for digital literacy programs developed with the FCC, with the Department of Education, with other agencies. Not run by federal government, not mandated by federal government, certainly, but encouraged at all levels in our schools and in afterschool programs and similar locations. These programs should include funding for professional development of educators. And the work that we've done at Common Sense Media, we have a Common Sense schools program that's now in about 4,000 schools. These are early adopters, and yet in many cases these educators are volunteering to us that they don't know what's going on in this space. So we know from that that ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

a lot of educators need help and they need something to help them catch up with what's going on.

At the same time, these digital literacy programs and this investment should include more ed tech resources, especially in underserved schools and communities. But media education and digital literacy need to be essential components for all kids in all schools. At the same time, we need to be able to do more to empower parents to make smart choices on behalf of kids. There are a lot of great resources out there, but we know that some families don't know about them or don't know how they work. They need better information and access to the tools and technologies that are there.

We also know -- Common Sense Media's website, which is primarily about reviews and information about media, gets nearly 1 million unique visitors a month. And in the feedback we get from our users we also hear a lot of parents who really don't want to just block content; they ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

want to find the good stuff. So they need to be empowered to do that just as well. And that will include that they need access to independent third party ratings and reviews from outside industries so that they get information that they can build on and feel they can trust.

And lastly, I would just say that there obviously is a role for protection. There is a role for the federal government. A lot of it is already in place. There are areas where we still believe government needs to take the lead in protecting children, including prevention of crimes and protection from adult content and from things like behavioral advertising. But the best form of protection really is education and empowerment. The people who are best positioned to protect kids are their families, followed by their schools. And that's where the education and empowerment needs to be central.

If we do it right, investing in broadband is great news for kids. But our Broadband Plan needs to include those empowerment ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

tools for parents, and it needs to include education programs in all our schools so that kids and their parents and their teachers learn more about how to prevent the potential negatives and how to find the positives and really real the benefits of broadband.

MR. HORRIGAN: Thanks very much, Alan.
Onto our next panelist, Burke Culligan from Yahoo!
MR. CULLIGAN: Is this on? There we go.
Hi, I run Global Product Development for Yahoo!'s
front doors. That includes the Yahoo! home pages
around the world, the My Yahoo! product, and
toolbar, among some other things.

So, it's a great privilege to come and talk to you guys today about the National Broadband Plan and the particular perspective that we can give given the number of users that we interface with every day. And just for a little context with that, around the world about 150 million users come to some Yahoo! service every day. In the U.S., we reach about 80 percent of the online audience within a month.

And over half of all online users around the world come to a Yahoo! site within a month.

So, we have a very unique perspective to look at. What are Yahoo! -- sorry, what are Yahoo! users -- what do Internet users in general want from the Internet? What kind of things resonate with them on the Internet? And how -- what kind of products and services are successful in meeting those needs and meeting those desires over time?

So, that's a good -- let's see here. There we go. So, what do users want on the Internet? At the end of the day when we look at what users are doing and what's happening right now online, there's an overwhelming plethora of choices that confront them every day. Everywhere they go they're bombarded with messages to go to xxx.com, yyy.org, whatever it may be. And it's a great mass environment for them to try and navigate. So what users do is they look for tools and products and services that allow them to choose their exact path and their exact way that ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

they kind of create what I call their personal Internet. Their daily personal internet. Everybody has their favorite sites, favorite ways, favorite tools, favorite whatever it is, to manage that on a daily basis.

At the same time, obviously openness and social networks and all those things are kind of infusing new ways to think about what is the Internet and how do I engage with it every day as a user. And then we've all become an incredibly inpatient society, particularly in the U.S., and the fact that we need to be connected all the time. If we're standing in line at Starbucks for our coffee, we need to have that BlackBerry; we need to check e-mail. So, we want access to the Internet all the time, every way we can.

With all of that going on though, the real core needs of what users want to get out of the Internet really hasn't changed. They want to find and connect to the information they're looking for and to the people that matter to them the most and stay in tune with what's going on in ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

the world. Those are the two sort of spectrums of this is why I use the Internet. This is what I'm trying to get done. In the middle is a set of products and services that help them do that in a very simple, cohesive manner. And this is what we think about every day at Yahoo!, is how do we give them this set of products and services? And what works for them and what doesn't across that vast audience?

And so let me share a couple of quick examples of how we're approaching this with some new product launches at Yahoo!. And in particular in how we've opened up Yahoo! to encompass the entire Internet and give users choices so they can craft and create that personal daily Internet that I was talking about before.

So, this is a screen shot of our new Yahoo! home page. It has been testing for a number of months and is planning on being released at the end of the month. The key things to notice are we obviously continue to maintain and emphasize the Yahoo! search. And searching, in ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

general, on the Internet is one of the most powerful tools people use every day to find what they're looking for on the Internet.

On the left hand side you'll see a section that's brand new to Yahoo! called My Favorites. And what this is is it allows users to add quick previews and navigation to any site on the Internet that they want. It's based on the new Yahoo! open platform where publishers and developers can come build previews and advance previews and offer these to the users as well, but it also works for pretty much any site on the Internet in general. We do -- using some search technologies and some other technology we have, we'll create at least a site summary and some navigation to that site if there's no other content available for that site.

But the real key attribute here is that we've given users the ability to customize -- add, edit, remove, personalize this page -- in any way they want to make it work specifically for them. And we've seen great increases in engagement

usage, time spent with this product given the openness and the user choices that we've provided for them.

As you move forward you can look at --here's an example of a new search results page that we're also experimenting with, same sort of concepts apply. On the left side here we've added some applications to help them manage this. We've added different filters to again help them manage and really get out of this exactly what they want to get out of this.

Let's see if this works on a build. Yeah. So, what this does is you see there somebody can click on the left side and filter the results based on eHow or even on YouTube or that sort of thing. So what we've found is by giving users choices, embracing the entire Internet, allowing them to craft their own personal Internet, but with stronger tools, they really adapt to it and strongly use it a lot more than they did before.

And then another way we're meeting
ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

consumer needs is through consumer privacy. And taking an approach -- at Yahoo! we've developed an approach that combines both front end uses and back end protection of the data, front end being users' ability to manage and monitor their privacy policy on their own; back end management of the data to protect their privacy if they happen to not do anything on their own.

1

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

We've recently announced some new changes to our privacy policy that really sets us apart from most of the other big industry players in the sense that we've decreased the amount of time that we store user identifiable data from what used to be roughly 12 or 18 months down to 90 days. And we will delete that information after 90 days except for a few cases where we may for legal obligations or where we use it for fraud or security detection it may extend beyond the 90 days. But in general, we will decrease that information down to 90 days.

At the same time, we've increased the scope of what data encompasses these new policies. ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

> 706 Duke Street, Suite 100 Alexandria, VA 22314

1 2 3	And that goes beyond just search results, but also page views, page clicks, ad views, ad clicks, and those kind of things. It's our belief at Yahoo!
4	that there's no way you can survive long-term in
5	this industry if you don't take trust and take
6	care of the user centric focus at the forefront.
7	There are too many competitors. The cost of
8	switching, as Joel sort of mentioned in the early
9	one, is too great and too fast that if you don't
10	protect that user and take care of them, it's very
11	easy for them to choose somebody else to use. And
12	so we look at the forefront and we look for ways
13	that we can do that.
14	And that's that.
15	MR. HORRIGAN: Thanks very much.
16	Michael McKeehan?
17	MR. McKEEHAN: Okay. My slides up,
18	please. Don't start the clock. Thank you.
19	Okay. Full screen, somehow.
20	MR. HORRIGAN: F5.
21	MR. McKEEHAN: Are we going to have a
22	slide show?
	ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
	706 Duke Street, Suite 100
	Alexandria, VA 22314
	Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190
	rnone (703) 519-7180

1 MR. HORRIGAN: Can you hit full screen? MR. McKEEHAN: Full screen, please. MR. HORRIGAN: Hit the F5 key. 2 3 4 MR. McKEEHAN: Thank you. 5 MR. HORRIGAN: Thanks. 6 MR. McKEEHAN: Hi. Mike McKeehan from 7 Verizon. I'd like to thank both commissions for inviting Verizon to be a part of today's 8 9 discussion. 10 I'm going to focus my remarks today on 11 protecting consumers and online safety. 12 First, let me talk about what the 13 industry is doing. We're actually doing a lot, 14 and I think we're not tooting our own horn enough 15 when it comes to letting people know what industry 16 is up to. There are several coalitions, the 17 Family Online Safety Institute being one, but 18 there have also been a number of task forces over 19 the last couple of years: The so-called MySpace 20 AG Task Force where we looked at age verification; 21 the NCTA Blue Ribbon Task Force, which I thought 22 was a great thing because it brought together ANDERSON COURT REPORTING 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314 Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190 companies from on the cable side, the telco side, the ISPs, the web content providers as well; and also we have the NTIA Online Safety and Technology Working Group, which is ongoing.

And I see several of my fellow committee members here today that work -- the report to Congress is due for that next June. So that should be an interesting snapshot, if you will, of what's happening in the online safety world.

Now let me talk a little bit about Verizon's position and our approach to online safety. We basically look at online safety as kind of a three-legged stool, if you will. The first aspect -- the first element of it is tools.

And as Adam mentioned, we believe in offering our customers a strong set of cyber security tools, including firewall, anti-spam, anti-virus stuff. The parental controls part of those tools are free and then there are subscription-based things like the virus protection where you get updated virus controls that are a for-pay product.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314 Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190 The second element is education and awareness. And that's a key aspect of online safety as you've heard today. In particular, we reach out to kids, parents, and community organizations, and increasingly to seniors who we're finding is a very vulnerable segment of our population, especially to phishing scams and online fraud.

And the third element is support for law enforcement and everything law enforcement does, especially when it comes to stopping the propagation of child pornography and to help catch online predators.

So, on the consumer awareness and education aspect of it, we've done 12 or 13 different events in different states, collaborating with state and civic leaders in terms of helping to educate parents and kids about how to keep themselves safe online. We do grants to libraries, schools, and public broadcasting stations, all with the goal of empowering people to help themselves.

		104
1 2 3 4	Like I said, this year our focus will be on seniors, on cyber security, and on the linkage between online safety and domestic violence, which is kind of an interesting new linkage for us.	104
5	There's a website there which for us is the	
6	one-stop shop where you can go to find out what's	
7	going on on each of our platforms: The television	
8 9	platform, the broadband platform, and the wireless platform.	
10	Free tools for parents. We give them	
11	away. That's pretty good.	
12	Working with law enforcement. We	
13	support all kinds of investigations into criminal	
14	activity. We work with NCMEC to report and	
15	investigate online child pornography. And	
16	finally, we provide training to law enforcement	
17	regarding how to comply how best to comply with	
18	subpoenas and conduct their investigations.	
19	So, in conclusion, let me just say that	
20	industry is doing a lot and we think there's	
21	you know, we can always do more and I think	
22	evidence of that came out today. There was the	
	ANDERSON COURT REPORTING 706 Duke Street, Suite 100	
	Alexandria, VA 22314	
	Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190	
	111111 (100, 01) 1100 1411 (100, 01) 1100	

news article -- I'm sure some of you saw it now -out of Australia where two girls, 10 and 12, fell down a well. Fortunately, they had their cell phones with them. So what did they do? They didn't call 000, which is the Australian equivalent of 911; they updated their Facebook profiles. Basically, called for help on Facebook and then a friend, who happened to be online, saw the update, called emergency services, and the kids were pulled from the well safely. Thankfully.

So, we have a lot of room to do in the education area when it comes to these kids. You know, just when you think they get it, they do something really wacky. So we can do more there.

But I think the thing that the
Commissions should take away here is that there are no quick fixes. Online safety is a society issue, and we need a broad-based response involving everyone in the dialogue across the board.

So, that's it, Mr. Chairman.
ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

1 MR. HORRIGAN: Thank you. Perfect segue 2 to our Facebook representative, Tim, on whether 3 kids get it or not. 4 MR. SPARAPANI: Thank you. That is a 5 fantastic segue, Mike. Thank you so much. I

appreciate it.

I was about to say that much depends on Facebook. And that's a perfect example, although not one I was expecting to hear about today. There are miracles that happen every day.

Thank you very much for inviting Facebook to come and talk about what's good about Facebook, and also what's important about the Internet.

I'm here today, primarily, to push the FCC to really get forward on broadband and to do so forcefully. We really, at Facebook, believe that the Internet will -- the Internet ecosystem in the United States has come to rely on fast, reliable service. And we experience that at Facebook every single day.

This weekend we had a bit of latency
ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

1 from some service that went down on the East Coast. It just happened for a little while, and 3 yet we saw people who would normally be online drop off quickly. And I think every company that 4 5 is on the Internet will explain to you that people get really guite impatient if they don't have 7 reliable, consistent, speedy access to their 8 services that they have come to rely on. So we 9 want affordable broadband to be everywhere. We 10 want broadband to be priced at a point where every 11 consumer can have access to it and can have 12 reliable access to it. And they won't be priced 13 out of it by tiers of services. We think everyone 14 should have -- this is sort of a right. We really 15 treat it as a critical infrastructure piece 16 because in modern life -- in order to engage in 17 modern life in the United States, we really think 18 that most people ale going to have to be on the 19 Internet. 20

One important point. With respect to mobile services, we think mobile services are just as critical. Facebook announced last week that we ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

21

22

have 65 million people who are already accessing Facebook through their mobile devices, and that's just in the last 9 months that we've had that capability. And the scale is pretty wild if you were to chart it out.

So, the second important point is that it's not just that, you know, kids are on Facebook; it's that consumers and businesses are really -- have come to rely on Facebook. And people tend to think of Facebook as maybe a place where kids go. But, in fact, what we've found is that there are already over a million developers worldwide who have built over 250,000 applications that are up and running currently. So, Facebook, in and of itself, is a successful company, but it's an engine for an economic growth and innovation that is providing enormous numbers of new goods and services for the marketplace.

So, what do consumers want? They want new goods and services to be brought to bare. And that, of course, relies on there being fast, efficient broadband service through which they can

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314

access Facebook because we become the platform for other opportunities for individuals to succeed.

It's not just businesses. It's also charitable institutions and not-for-profits. One good example is a company called Causes, which, in fact, is helping currently 300,000 not-for-profits around the country grow their membership, share their message, improve on their work, and resolve the problems that they have been created to work on.

They've already raised, in fact, \$10 million online through causes and more is yet to come.

So, it's not just business. It's not just consumers. It's not just not-for-profits. It's also the place where the American public goes to reach their loved ones abroad who are stationed and serving the country in an American military capacity. It turns out that Facebook is now the letter home from the front to family and back again.

And it's happening in almost instant
ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

time. So we have seen extraordinary boosts in morale for troops and their families who are stationed abroad — their families at home. I get e-mails every day thanking me, which is really quite an honor because I just happen to be the recipient of them, thanking Facebook for making this a capability where folks in the military, folks at the State Department, can keep in touch with those people they love and miss back at home here in the United States.

Last point, and I think it's an important one for consumers, Facebook is also a place where the public has come to engage in true civic discourse. And that works in a couple of really interesting ways. Not only are friends, of course, sharing news about what they're experiencing and what their opinions are — they're clipping articles and they're posting them with friends, et cetera — but it turns out that the government has become increasingly reliant on Facebook to have an ongoing conversation with the public. So, it is true that everyone here in ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

Washington will begin, I think, to engage more deeply with constituents around the country by providing goods and services directly from your agencies down to consumers and then back again. You're going to be engaging in more efficient conversations.

So, we're pleased to announced that already we have 23 federal agencies which are using Facebook. Just today we launched Facebook.com/government, a place for best practices for government agencies to go and learn about how other agencies are utilizing these tools in innovative fashions in order to share this new social environment and to interact directly with the people in the public who are there to serve.

So, it turns out that much relies on Facebook. But even so, even more relies on the FCC making sure that broadband, which is the lifeblood for Facebook, is open, accessible, affordable, and consistent.

Thank you.

MR. HORRIGAN: Thanks very much. We're
ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

going to proceed on this panel as we did on our prior panel and start with questions. If you have a question from the audience, please find somebody with a card.

You can jot it down and it will get to me. People from cyberspace will no doubt weigh in.

I'd like to start off with our agency questioners. First off will be Bob Cannon from the Office of Strategic Planning, who has done a whole lot of work on, particularly, the issue of online child safety. So, Bob?

MR. CANNON: I want to try to hit you with two quick questions. One of them, particularly, I'm very grateful -- one thing is I get to tie in our two last representatives. I'm very impressed with what industry is doing.

This last weekend I got to crack into my Verizon router because I wanted to block the Mac address of my son because my son is up all night on Facebook and I want him to go to bed so he will go to school. And I was really impressed at how

easy it is to do this because previously I've cracked into routers and looked at the interfaces and I'm like, "Oh, my god. Even I don't understand these things." So, I was very impressed.

One of the questions I wanted to ask is in your experience with providing the online tools to consumers with your network packages, do you have a sense of what percentage of consumers are using these products that you're providing?

MR. McKEEHAN: Well, no, I don't have a specific number that I can give you. Sorry.

MR. CANNON: That's okay. I'll give you the next question.

One of the things I'm very curious --MR. McKEEHAN: They're free so it's real

hard to track.

MR.

MR. CANNON: One of the things I'm very curious about is how much that lines up with Adam's numbers of, well, these are households, these are households with children, these are households with children who would want to use ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

these tools, and whether those numbers are lining up at all.

So if there's any answer to that, that would be interesting. The other question I wanted to ask is to try --

The information you're providing is really information -- very informative. I want to tie this specifically into the Broadband Plan. As we're developing the Broadband Plan and looking forward, what's necessary for a successful Broadband Plan? I want to ask you, what I keep hearing is media literacy, media literacy, media literacy. What does the government need to do? And as part of that question, what data do we need to make that decision? Do we need to be looking at certain things to be going forward with how this fits into an appropriate Broadband Plan?

MR. SIMPSON: I wish I had better data for you other than, you know, we launched our

for you other than, you know, we launched our first step in a media literacy program, Our Common Sense Schools Program, in November of last year. And as I mention, we're now in more than 4,000

schools.

What we also know is despite -- even with our efforts to market those programs to schools in underserved communities, rural and urban, most of the quick uptake, the early adopters for this sort of thing are in private schools and well-funded public schools. That's not surprising to me.

But it means that, you know, those late adopters, who are going to be some of those same educators who are admitting to us that I don't really understand how most of this works and I don't go into the computer center in my school, and I'm not well-prepared to do this personally, they're going to be in the places where the kids probably need this most. I mean, you have these resources. Kids need these in all schools. And without help and prodding from their school districts, without -- one of the things that we want to start doing is creating more resources so that it's easy for schools to patch things in to their own program. We are not trying to design a ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

curriculum; we are not trying to have a -- we do not -- no one wants a mandated curriculum from the federal government or from their state governments. But they do need resources and they need teacher training or -- especially in those most needed communities, it's going to be really slow to pick this sort of thing up.

MR. HORRIGAN: Others on that topic?
MR. McKEEHAN: Yes. I think we're
seeing the same thing. One of the mistakes that
we see made, unfortunately, is that school
districts will not make time or space in their
curriculum for these activities or it becomes an
unfunded mandate and the school has to make a
tradeoff. You know, do we give up biology or phys
ed in order to wedge this Internet training into
our curriculum?

And like Alan said, the other thing is a need to train the trainers, if you will, the teachers themselves. You know, it's tough in the home when the most Internet- literate person is the 14-year-old boy, the very person you're trying ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

to protect. So, in schools, imagine that problem exacerbated by 30. You know, the poor teacher is up there trying to outsmart her students, if you will. And that's a real challenge for a lot of school districts.

MR. HORRIGAN: If I could try to connect this back to something that was raised in the prior panel, which was this notion that education is an important part of the equation, yet it seems to be in certain contexts, as Ari Schwartz said, less effective today than it was a few years ago, meaning that people seem to be taking less advantage of tools online that might help them be better problems solvers for whatever issue may confront them.

And as we now turn to talk about schools -- and particularly, as you say, that the early adopters tend to be the private schools or the wealthier public schools -- have tools been developed or is it on the radar screen to think of how to deal with people whose attention is extremely scarce?

You hear a lot these days that in the digital world and digital economy there's a scarcity of attention more than anything else in

trying to get people engaged with various digital goods or products. Has anybody thought of how to sort of tie these kinds of empowerment tools to actual task solving in a world where people's attention is scarce?

For instance, you raised the issue of a tradeoff in some people's minds between biology and digital literacy tools. Can't they be in the same sentence in a lot of respects? And have there been efforts that anybody on this panel is aware of to try to tie those two things together to really integrate that stuff into what people are doing so that this attention versus acquiring very useful information tradeoff is less severe?

MR. SIMPSON: It's a huge question for this because this is new territory, especially for educators. And so one of their questions is -- even if it's not a matter of cutting time into biology -- is where do we fit this media literacy ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

program? Is this part of a language arts program? Is this something that goes -- is this run through our school library?

And in many ways you're probably getting at the smarter edge of it, which is how do we make these lessons in media literacy fit into a lot of different classes. Because, in part -- we did a poll earlier this summer about kids' behavior online and with digital tools. And one of the questions we asked about was how much they cheat, how much they download a paper and submit it as their own. And if you ever poll teens you know you need to ask them sort of the friend question, like how many of your classmates do this, and you get maybe a more reliable number. And the numbers were pretty high. They weren't shocking, but it's consistently something that's going on.

So how do you make media literacy for that example connected to something about research literacy? And what do you teach kids about how they get information and how they cite and what the purpose of authorship and authority are? But ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

that's only one particular lesson.

1

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I mean, one of the things -- listening to the earlier panel and Ari's point -- which I think is very valid, especially for some of the adult issues, but the thought that crossed my mind was the first panel was primarily focused on kind of adult commercial privacy issues. And what made me sort of cringe is how are we teaching privacy in that same frame -- commercial, protect your own financial identity and information -- to kids today who are seemingly quite willing to put pictures of themselves half naked doing beer chugs on Facebook or anywhere else.

I mean, their sense of privacy is so drastically changing. And that's something that we, as adults -- their parents and teachers and mentors -- need to address. Not in a mandate of you can't do this, because anyone who has worked with kids has to respect that there's a negotiation there. And for younger kids maybe there's mandating and then later it's a little bit more let's figure out the best middle ground. But ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100 Alexandria, VA 22314

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

their lives are changing because of this technology, and they're going to continue to change. And the way we educate them needs to continue to change.

MR. HORRIGAN: Other comments?

MR. THIERER: I just briefly want to add onto that that what we're talking about here is privacy and media content expectations and how they've changed broadly throughout society. And this is something that there is a serious generation gap problem in both debates about privacy and online child safety. And we have a disconnect between older generations and parents, particularly in kids, and that's what Alan is getting at. Knowing, therefore, how to message to kids when they look at some of the messages that we old farts send and say that's laughable, you know, is a real problem.

So, you need to boil down the messages in terms of media literacy to sort of core principles about what's really most important and what the kids can get and understand and ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

appreciate, and what's really changing in society. And I think there are changing expectations, especially about privacy. And a lot of people suggest it's all about we want more and more privacy, but, as Alan just suggested, that's not necessarily what everybody wants. Some people actually are willing to give a lot of information away online on everything they visit and every site they go to. And there's a changing expectation about that.

And I think the same is true for child safety, and specifically for media content more generally. There are types of content that would have been found far more objectionable 10, 20 years ago that are now more routine to find on YouTube every day of the week. And, you know, we as a society have to adapt -- and I think we do adapt -- but we have to understand that there's no way to handle this through a Broadband Plan, I don't think. I don't think you can manage all those expectations. There are many diverse expectations on that spectrum.

1 MR. HORRIGAN: Yes. I think for the purposes of the Broadband Plan we're trying to understand the issue and how and whether norms are 3 4 changing. And that's really what is coming across 5 to us in this discussion today. Tim has a comment, then I'm going --7 MR. CANNON: Real quick. 8 MR. HORRIGAN: We'll let Bob follow and then we'll get to Tim. 9 10 MR. CANNON: I wanted to put it all 11 together. What I'm hearing in terms of the 12 Broadband Plan is that the big ticket item is 13 media literacy. If we talk about online safety, 14 where are we going forward? What's the plan? What should be the policy? It's not maybe 15 16 different solutions, but it's maybe looking at the 17 schools, looking at the localities, empowering the 18 educators. And media literacy is really the big 19 ticket next step. 20 MR. THIERER: Agreed. 21 MR. CANNON: I mean, we're looking for 22 areas of consensus and areas of nonconsensus, and ANDERSON COURT REPORTING 706 Duke Street, Suite 100 Alexandria, VA 22314

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

that's the consensus I'm hearing.

MR. THIERER: Right.

MR. SIMPSON: And what I would add to that is when we talk about online safety, which is very much a reasonable concern, I tend to try to move the conversation quickly to online smarts as the first principle of that.

MR. HORRIGAN: Tim?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ SPARAPANI: So, without being a contrarian, I want to wrestle with the premise of the question.

We tend to hear about sensationalized events when sharing of a piece of data or a piece of information, particularly where a child is involved, becomes a national story. And we hear about them periodically. But what we don't hear about is that, at least on Facebook, every day people are sharing more than 1 billion pieces of information about themselves and they're doing it without incident. And that's the other part of the equation.

And so what we are finding is that
ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

people are quickly adapting to the opportunity to share information about themselves, and they fall across a huge spectrum of attitudes about privacy and speech and security. And even the kids understand when you talk to them -- we talk to our users quite frequently and ask them about their expectations and their understandings. Kids get it a lot more than adults suspect that they might. Like, they would say, I would never put that picture up because I know that that idiot in my class did that and, gosh, that picture is going to come back to hurt that person later on.

And they understand this in a way that I don't think we give kids credit for because they're used to these technologies. They grew up with them. They know where they're good and bad and where they can cause trouble. But it's really important to get a perspective on how much data is shared without incident and without consequence that's negative in order to help the FCC

21 understand the broader issue.

1

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

MR. HORRIGAN: Which doesn't stop ANDERSON COURT REPORTING 706 Duke Street, Suite 100 Alexandria, VA 22314

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

somebody from the audience from asking you, Tim, about what's with all the strange quizzes on Facebook, like What Extinct Reptile Are You? But there's a serious dimension to this, which is where does this information go that people put into these quizzes? Is it shared? What is the consequence of taking those quizzes when you do share information? Where does this stuff go?

1

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. SPARAPANI: So it's an important question. And what a lot of people don't understand is that when you initialize an application on Facebook or on Google or through Microsoft or any other platform that's out there, including your iPhone if you have one, you actually are leaving that particular company's domain and you are traveling to an entirely separate company. And those applications have special rules which are spelled out, which you -you know, when you initialize that application and launch it you have agreed to the terms and services and the privacy policy of that ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100 Alexandria, VA 22314

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

application.

1

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So, our answer is as a consumer you have to know where you're going and why and what you expect to get from it. And before you say yes, you should read the fine print because Facebook nor Google nor Microsoft can be in the position of policing the million applications that are launched through Facebook. Certainly, you know, that would take an army of people to do the work for you, so consumers have to be aware and they have to read the fine print, and they have to have a little bit of common sense when they launch an application. If they do that, I think they're going to find that although they might find out what reptile they are, they may also be able to access an extraordinary number of new services and goods which had never been created before, which will make their lives faster, more efficient, more rich.

So, there's a lot of balance to that question as well that needs to be brought back in, I think.

MR. HORRIGAN: Let me see if either Marc Berejka or Michael Wroblewski have any questions for our panelists or reactions to any discussion thus far.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

MR. WROBLEWSKI: I have two. Tim, following up on your advice to when you go to a third-party application to read the fine print, has Facebook experimented with novel ways to provide that to the 12-year-old who is on Facebook, who is very savvy, but may not understand what the fine print is or can't read the legal -- you know, because it's not written at their level -- to advise them as to what the consequences of going to this third party application? Because they may just think they're on Facebook.

MR. SPARAPANI: We would disagree that that's their understanding. And what's important, though, to know is that, yes, Facebook does care about this because, you know, even the questions from this room suggest that somehow anything that happens on an application might rebound against

Facebook's good name, even though, again, this is happening from a separate company. We would say, you know, the FTC has to go out there and do some hard work and look at the applications. We would say the Justice Department has to go and look, that state AGs need to police third-party sites.

But what Facebook does is that we provide a really obvious popup interstitial when somebody is about to launch an application. It's written in plain English, a really important pro-consumer choice that we make. It's got a doom and gloom message to it, and I can't recount it for you directly here, but it says beware, pay attention, here's what may happen and you need to be aware as a consumer. So, we definitely let people know, including the 12-year-old, in ways that, you know, any kid could understand, that this is a choice you are making and that you'll have to live with those consequences.

More importantly, we allow people to go back and disable applications at any point, so there's directly relevant privacy tools that we ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

are giving our consumers in order to -- if they feel like they've made the wrong choice about an application, go ahead and disable that application.

And that's a really important, innovative tool that we have given people, and we hope that the rest of the industry follows our lead on that.

MR. WROBLEWSKI: The second question I had was we were talking about media literacy and I'm assuming we're using the term media literacy to mean we're going to use the media to educate people about privacy or data security or whatever. I'm assuming that's what you're meaning and not media literacy the way we would think about it maybe in another context in terms of understanding what you're even just receiving from the media.

But assuming it's that context -- using the media to help educate people about changes in technology and how to protect themselves -- are there examples in your experience as to which media literacy outreaches have been successful for ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

1 a technology product? And why have they been successful? 3 MR. THIERER: I actually have a couple 4 of examples that I've used in my work. 5 But first, to answer your other question, what do we mean by media literacy? 7 Media literacy can mean a lot of different things to a lot of different people. What you're really 8 9 talking about there in the way you described it 10 was sort of media awareness building or using 11 media platforms to build awareness about a 12 problem. And I can give you some very concrete 13 examples of how our government has very 14 successfully used media platforms in the past to 15 build awareness about a serious societal problem. 16 My favorite example is Smokey the Bear. 17 I mean, we all remember Smokey the Bear and it 18 built awareness about a serious problem with 19 forest fires. How about Hoot the Owl; "Woodsy the 20 Owl"?XXX and the problem of littering? 21 How about the campaign we did around 22 seatbelt safety? How about the awareness that was ANDERSON COURT REPORTING 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314 Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

1 built about public health and so on and so forth through the Presidential Commission on Physical 3 Fitness? So in each of these cases government 4 agencies worked together to use resources and 5 deploy resources through media platforms to build awareness about problems in our society that 7 needed to be addressed. I would argue that each of those have been very, very successful in 8 9 raising awareness about the problems. 10 Now, we need a metric for success, and 11 that's hard in some of these cases. And, of 12 course, there are other things that did come into 13 play. With seatbelts it wasn't purely education. 14 There was a Click It or Ticket part of it. 15 There was also a regulatory part. We 16 can't discount that as being part of it. But with 17

can't discount that as being part of it. But with these other cases, I think the awareness had profound -- I mean, we had a serious problem with littering in this country back in the '60s and '70s when I was growing up. Nobody throws garbage out the window of their car anymore, for the most part, when they're riding down the highway.

And I would say, finally, another 1 2 example is smoking, but there is more regulation 3 and other complications to that example. But 4 those are five examples of where we used media 5 platforms to build awareness. 6 Now, none of those are about technology, 7 so I haven't answered your question entirely. But they are examples of how we've tried to do this in 8 9 the past. 10 Just, finally, I want to put in a plug 11 for what our government already does in this area. 12 We have On Guard Online and other methods at 13 various government websites that address this. 14 Right? 15 MR. WROBLEWSKI: Sure. 16 MR. THIERER: And try to build 17 awareness. Now, that's mostly been about cyber 18 security. 19 MR. WROBLEWSKI: Right. 20 MR. THIERER: More than cyber safety, 21 but there's the social networking tips that are on there and so on and so forth. The FCC website has 22 ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

a variety of these tools.

1

3

4 5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

I'd like to see all the government agencies really start to put a lot of resources in that. We have to remember -- I think it was John that brought it up -- the scarcity of attention problem. You only have -- you have very few chances to get people and find a teachable moment. And when you get them, you want to drive them to something really quick and get it done.

We learned a lot of lessons in this regard from the DTV education and transition process. You really have to have a single site, single messaging, and really drive people to it and hammer it home. That really, really is helpful. Because, I'll tell you, ironically, right now I think the biggest problem we have on this front is we actually have too many competing voices. We have so many good plans and ideas and policies and approaches and groups that there's almost sort of a little bit of information overload about online safety and privacy. We're directing people so many different ways. So I try ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

not to ever pick favorites -- Common Sense Media is among my favorite -- but, you know, there are many, many great groups doing many great things. But the government has a way of focusing resources and messages in a constructive fashion.

MR. SIMPSON: And just to pick up on that, we published a white paper on what we're calling "Digital Literacy and Citizenship" in June. And it's on our website, but I'll bring you a copy, so not to go into too much detail on that. It does pick up -- as Adam said, it builds on the work of a lot of other organizations and a lot of good folks out there.

I want to focus on one piece of it because we haven't yet. The citizenship part of that -- digital literacy addresses kind of all those things, but it's more about the content that kids see and share. Citizenship is more about what they do and their behavior, which is, I think, kind of the growing front of this issue: The way they behave to each other, the way they manage their own privacy, the rules of the road ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

for their own conduct and ethics, if you will, which is going to be another important part of this and another important reason why this really needs to be localized down to each family, down to each school, according to local standards and customs. And so that's a big growing area of this.

I also want to come back to one of the things that Tim said. I would agree that a lot of the negatives that we hear about in this space are sensationalized by the news media and others. I'd agree with that completely. But I'd also say for the purpose of your Broadband Plan and for the administration's goal of getting people to adopt broadband and make sure that they benefit from the educational and economic opportunities created by broadband, those same late adopters may be the most worried about the sensationalized stories that they've seen in the media.

And your research, John, from earlier in terms of relevance, that may be a big chunk of that. If those families are looking -- if all

they know about broadband is, well, yeah, you know, the terrible story this, terrible story that, even if it's sensational, it's going to have an impact on them. And they need tools and resources that reassure them not only about managing the negatives, but about getting out there and finding the positives that they want.

And that's a big part of this as well.

MR. HORRIGAN: Michael, you had --

MR. HORRIGAN: Michael, you had --MR. McKEEHAN: Well, Alan kind of stole my thunder, but I'll say it anyway.

I think on media literacy, we -sometimes when we talk about child online safety
or online safety in general, we lose site of the
fact that the Internet and broadband access to the
Internet is overwhelmingly a good thing for
society. There's a tremendous amount of good
information out there.

So I think when we talk about online safety, we talk about filtering tools, we talk about rating content and those kinds of things, what we're really talking about is helping people ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

find the good stuff. Okay? And so I'd like -- I would hope that the plan would take that kind of approach, that, you know, broadband is good, the Internet is a good place, and there are these tools that help you find the good stuff out there. And I think this is -- the media literacy aspect of this, I think, is now that we have broadband -- and it's a two-way street -- we see a lot more end-users creating their own content.

I think it's especially important for the kids that are creating content and posting it online to understand the rules of the road. So that kind of rules of the road, in my mind, is the media literacy. It's, you know, the persistence of information that you post to the Internet. And guess what? Some day a college admission officer may look at your Facebook page and try to decide do I take Student A or Student B. Kids get that and they understand that. So, that's kind of our view of media literacy.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ BEREJKA: So I started off or have sat through this panel -- except for the last $$\operatorname{ANDERSON}$$ COURT REPORTING

1 couple of minutes -- having almost the complete opposite reaction to the otherwise positive feeling I had about the first panel. Because in 3 4 the first panel I felt like we were driving 5 towards a common understanding of data privacy 6 issues and potential solutions, even if we just 7 saw solutions at a 30,000- to 100,000-foot level. 8 Whereas up until about three minutes ago, I felt 9 like this panel was kind of all over the map. 10 And it's come to me as to why this panel 11 seemed to me to be all over the map. And it is 12 because we didn't have that same consensus sort of 13 definition of the issues. But let me offer one up 14 and get you guys to react to it. 15 My reaction to this panel has been very 16 similar to my reaction to a homeowners' 17 association meeting I went to about four years 18 ago. I had just moved into my neighborhood of 100 19 homes and there were a few folks in that 20 neighborhood who were very, very concerned about speeding in the neighborhood. And so I went to 21 22 the homeowners' association meeting and I learned ANDERSON COURT REPORTING 706 Duke Street, Suite 100 Alexandria, VA 22314

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

from the board that they had spent all this money getting the police department to come through with their speedometers or their traffic cameras and what have you. And guess what? They found that popercent of the people driving through the

neighborhood were going the speed limit. And that was pretty good, so we should be pretty happy. We actually don't have a speeding problem because 90 percent of the people are going the speed limit or below.

And I thought to myself, you're looking at exactly the wrong part of the problem. Right? When a kid is crossing the street in our neighborhood, yeah, the folks who live in our neighborhood who are going the speed limit are not going to hit that kid. It's the 10 percent. It's the 10 percent who are zipping through the neighborhood, right, and who aren't going to see that kid who are going to create the sensational problem. Sure. But it's also a real problem when a kid gets hit by the car.

And so my concern about the panel at the ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

outset was that we're munching these things together. We were talking about the great successes, you know, and the great tools that are out there and the fact that, you know, if you look at, you know, Adam's statistics, the nature of the problem, you know, isn't as big as we sometimes make that out to be.

And so my general comment is, yeah, I get you. I got kids. I teach them about media literacy, you know. I'm not able to disable their Mac address, but, you know, we do our job. And maybe we've got an 80 percent solution here, you know. And maybe the lion's share of households are kind of getting with the program, notwithstanding the difficulties and notwithstanding the blizzard, I agree, of information that's out there on how to be safe online.

So, it seems to me that if there is an issue, the issue is what to do about the remaining 20 percent or whatever that vulnerable population is. And I think in the last few minutes you guys ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

were starting to come together around this notion that there remains a vulnerable population, and something needs to be done to improve our ability to reach that vulnerable population.

1

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

Taking off my government hat for a second and talking as a parent, I'm not going to acquiesce to the notion that norms just change and that somehow adult content or really violent content at some point in time will be appropriate for small children who have nightmares. Right? So, putting back my government hat on, you know, what can industry do to help reach this vulnerable population? Instead of spending, you know, dollar after dollar after dollar or millions of dollars on this, that, or the other educational campaign that just adds to the avalanche of information, how do you come together to sort through the information and crystallize it in a way that's easier for the uneducated teacher to then educate the students with. I put that challenge out to you and I also ask whether that's a useful reframing of the issue.

1 MR. THIERER: So I definitely have a few comments on this because, Marc, what I hear you 3 saying is the refrain I hear from a lot of parents, a lot of policymakers, a lot of people in 4 5 the press I talk to, which is a frustration based 6 on, you know, perhaps a personal experience or a 7 particular concern that you as a parent have or a 8 policymaker have. And there's always a question 9 of, like, how we deal with this or that problem. 10 And my answer is, well, there's never one 11 solution. The one thing I think a lot of people 12 have set up here is there's not a single solution 13 or a silver bullet. What we need is a diversity 14 of tools and methods for a diverse citizenry. We 15 have parents and policymakers with a wide array of 16 concerns. We have attempted to apply an old play 17 book based upon sort of community standards or 18 community norms to an increasingly diverse world 19 where each household needs to be empowered to make 20 the decisions for themselves. 21 Education and media literacy is a big 22 part of that. The tools that we've been talking ANDERSON COURT REPORTING 706 Duke Street, Suite 100 Alexandria, VA 22314

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

about are a huge part of that as well. But what 1 we're really getting at is a way to give each 3 family and each household a chance to dictate for 4 themselves what their household standard looks 5 like so that we don't have to have the HOA necessarily applying it to all. Now, that doesn't 7 mean there aren't any community rules. There is 8 still going to be a percentage of bad buys or 9 problems out there that need to be addressed 10 through a collective community solution, but if we 11 can get a long way towards educating and 12 empowering the households to make the decisions 13 for themselves, then we've narrowed the problem 14 and we can decide what's the really, really big 15 problem here and decide what that is. 16 Now, I happen to believe we can't even 17 agree on that right now in this country. I mean, 18 I've spent the last five years trying to debunk 19 myths about online predation. Again, it is a legitimate problem, but it is not the problem that 20 21 policymakers have painted it out to be. And it 22 took two task forces to address this and ANDERSON COURT REPORTING 706 Duke Street, Suite 100 Alexandria, VA 22314

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

officially say this is not the problem you should be focusing all your time and attention on. It's not online predation; it's online child- on-child or peer-on-peer cyber bullying that's probably the bigger online safety problem today. And we're finally starting to turn that corner. We've spent five years arguing about the fact that there's a bad guy lurking on every corner in this cyber world. It's just not true.

1

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So, defining problems is hard and then figuring out how we solve them is the other hard part. But I would say empower and educate gets us a long way there. And then we decide what's that 10, 20 percent -- what's the speeding problem in our neighborhood online that we all have to decide on?

MR. BEREJKA: Yes. I should clarify because I get the sense you might have misunderstood my comment a little bit.

I personally believe -- and you know, I haven't read your papers in detail, but know you're quite good at articulating data and

> ANDERSON COURT REPORTING 706 Duke Street, Suite 100 Alexandria, VA 22314

pointing people to data -- I do have comfort. And this is based on my own experience, you know, as a parent, but also observing other parents, I do believe that the hump on this content question -- many, many, many, many Americans have gotten over the hump, by hook or by crook. And so my question comes back to what about those who have not gotten over that hump? And that's how I refine the problem.

I think the task is, frankly, more challenging in this space than for the privacy folks because on the privacy front we haven't even gotten over the hump, you know. And where I was comforted by the first panel was in that I started to sense, among the panelists at least, you know, a path forward to getting to the 80 percent solution. Whereas what I'm suggesting is that maybe here industry, government, just common sense, has gotten most people comfortable doing the right thing for their kids in their home. And now it's the 20 percent challenge and that's a tough nut.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

1	And what comforted me about one of your									
2	earlier comments was you pointed out that in									
3	reaching that 20 percent, having massive, massive									
4	amounts of information isn't necessarily more									
5	helpful.									
6	MR. McKEEHAN: Can I?									
7	MR. HORRIGAN: Yes.									
8	MR. McKEEHAN: Let me just put a									
9	cautionary note on that. Numbers have a way of									
10	taking on a life of their own, so let's not get									
11	stuck on 20 percent.									
12	MR. BEREJKA: I think a rule of thumb.									
13	It's not an actual percentage.									
14	MR. McKEEHAN: Okay.									
15	MR. BEREJKA: Sometimes it's easier to									
16	solve 80 percent of the problem and then the									
17	remaining 20 percent is the tough problem. It's									
18	just a figure of speech.									
19	MR. McKEEHAN: I hear what you're									
20	saying. It's just we'd hate to have that taken									
21	out of context.									
22	So, let me circle back and say that one									
	ANDERSON COURT REPORTING									
	706 Duke Street, Suite 100 Alexandria, VA 22314 Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190									
	Alexandria, VA 22314									

of the things that got lost in the noise of the so-called MySpace AG Task Force was some of the research that Dana Boyd at Harvard did where they found that the number of kids engaging in risk-taking behaviors online was actually vanishingly small.

Okay? A very small number of kids. But nevertheless, having said that, if it's your kid, it's a real problem. And this cohort of kids that was taking — that was engaging in risky behavior online was also the same cohort that was engaging in risky behavior offline, that is in the physical world.

And so she posed the question and didn't really have an answer -- which I didn't expect her to -- that is how do we get those kids together with the social workers to get them the help that they need? I mean, that's really the population that you need to reach to, the so-called 20 percent. The number is really not that high.

MR. BEREJKA: Right.

MR. McKEEHAN: But when you talk about ANDERSON COURT REPORTING 706 Duke Street, Suite 100 Alexandria, VA 22314

1 the 20 percent, that's the cohort that you're talking about. It is that small group of kids 3 that are engaging in risky behavior online and 4 offline. 5 MR. BEREJKA: I agree. 6 MR. HORRIGAN: Tim, did you have a 7 comment? Or we can field other questions. MR. SPARAPANI: I was just going to say, 8 9 Marc, in response -- you asked how companies could 10 operationalize -- at least this is how I 11 understood the question -- how companies could 12 operationalize resolving the difficulties of 13 dealing with those people who had difficulty. 14 MR. BEREJKA: Well, actually, I don't 15 know if I had a question to any specific company. 16 Having been on the private sector side, I know 17 what each individual company tries to do, you 18 know, in order to be able to put up slides like 19 have been put up today or have a conversation like 20 you've had. But I do think the challenge for 21 industry is how do you facilitate a coming 22 together, you know, or simplifying the dialogue ANDERSON COURT REPORTING 706 Duke Street, Suite 100 Alexandria, VA 22314

with these vulnerable populations.

1

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

MR. SPARAPANI: So, I can't facilitate a coming together, but I can facilitate a conversation, which is the approach that Facebook is taking. Very shortly, we will be rolling out for all of our existing users and any new user an interstitial with a popup which will force a conversation about settings. So they will say, you know, do you want to share this type of information with this category of person or this category of person or this category of person, so that we will have a moment when a user will have to confront the questions about how their data will be shared, with whom, and how.

And in addition to that, we are creating something called "per object privacy," which will allow people at any moment to change the settings just before they share a piece of data. So they can make it completely granular with whom they share data, when, and how. So we are forcing that conversation, at least with our own user base, because we think it's an important question to try ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100 Alexandria, VA 22314 Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

to get at the small, very tiny fraction of a percent of people, as Mike said, who really need to have the conversation forced upon them.

MR. HORRIGAN: Do we have other

questions or comments?

Well, let me try to bring a few themes together as we conclude today, both from this panel and our first one today.

One thing that comes across is, you know, people love this stuff. People love the Internet. We heard Tim talking about 65 million Facebook users on the mobile platform, 9 months old. Burke noted, what, 150 million people come to Yahoo! every day. So, clearly people have embraced the Internet as a tool for information exchange, social interaction, commerce, the whole bit.

We also heard that there are some real risks. Joel Kelsey from Consumers Union put out the figure that there's an \$8 billion cost, I think, annually on computer crime. And I think that's just talking about invasive software or ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-

malware. That means that people have to get new computers and there's a real economic cost to that.

There are also other kinds of risks to being online. We were just talking about how the incidence of that among children might be low in fact, yet, if it's your kid it's a real issue. And 1 percent of 300 million people, if that's the small incidence, adds up to a lot of people perhaps having some issues and encountering real risks while they're online.

So we heard about some of these benefits, some of these risks, and talked a good bit about the tools that are out there and what the nature of those tools are. We heard about user control being a good thing, a good value, from Ari Schwartz. He also noted that technical tools often are very effective. And we heard today on the second panel how there are a number of different tools that enable users to take steps on their own behalf to mitigate whatever problems that they may encounter, either for themselves or ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

their kids.

But then I think we hit upon sort of the friction or the sticking point here which is not everybody avails themselves of these tools. Not everybody knows that they are there. So, we get to the issue of media and digital literacy as a way to try to empower users more, empower consumers more to take action so that they have an online environment that is safe and welcoming and appropriate for them.

That gets into, I think, an issue that the FCC and other agencies have to think of. But for the FCC, particularly as we develop the Broadband Plan, how do we get people in an era when attention is increasingly scarce for people to really engage with some of these media and digital literacy tools, when increasingly it can be just challenging to find the time to do those things? Whether it's the parent in the household trying to embrace those media tools or, as Alan said, trying to reach out to educators who have a host of responsibilities placed upon them in

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

addition to developing media literacy.

So, that's certainly a lot for us to chew on as we develop the Broadband Plan, but this panel and our first panel today has certainly given us a lot of information with which to go back and continue our deliberations. It's probably not the last you've heard from us at the FCC as we develop this plan. We hope we can rely on each of you today who have spent time in preparing your remarks for additional queries that we may have going forward.

I want to close by thanking Michael Wroblewski, Mike Berejka, and Bob Cannon for serving as questioners. I also want everybody to thank Rachel Kazan on the FCC staff in the Consumer Bureau who did a lot of work to help bring this together. Lastly, I want to thank the panelists for coming today. It was really illuminating for us, and we appreciate it. So thank you very much.

(Whereupon, the PROCEEDINGS were adjourned.) $\,$

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

									100
1		*	*	*	*	*			
2									
3									
4									
5									
6									
7									
/									
8									
9									
10									
11									
12									
13									
14									
15									
16									
17									
18									
19									
20									
21									
22									
	ANDE	RSOI	N C	OUR'	T R	EPOR	TING		
	70C D								

706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

1 CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC 2 I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby 3 certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my 4 5 direction; that said transcript is a true record 6 of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am 7 neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by 8 any of the parties to the action in which these 9 proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I 10 am neither a relative or employee of any attorney 11 or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor 12 financially or otherwise interested in the outcome 13 of this action. 14 /s/Carleton J. Anderson, III 15 16 17 Notary Public in and for the 18 Commonwealth of Virginia 19 Commission No. 351998 20 Expires: November 30, 2012 21

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

22