

FINISHED FILE

ASIA PACIFIC REGIONAL INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM
EVOLUTION OF INTERNET GOVERNANCE:
EMPOWERING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
MACAO 2015
2 JULY 2015
ROOM 1
14:00 LOCAL TIME
NET NEUTRALITY IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC
SESSION 28

Services Provided By:

Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
1-877-825-5234
+001-719-482-9835
www.captionfirst.com

This text is being provided in a rough-draft Format.
Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning
are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility
and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

Live captioning at APrIGF Macao 2015 is brought to you by
Internet Society

>> I just want to give everybody an update on what's
happening for this session that's scheduled to discuss the net
neutrality. Our esteemed panelists have not arrived. One
panelist that has indicated a preference to attempt and be a
panelist in another session. What we'll do, we still have
remote participation, and if all participants in the room want
to change this into a roundtable discussion on the net
neutrality in the Asia-pacific, you're welcome to stay and
discuss it with the entire room. It is really up to everybody
if they would like to do that.

We can still have the talk, we have the remote
participation and we have people here. We don't want to waste
this opportunity if you're all interested in this topic. I
leave it to everybody by a show of hands if you want to us
continue, then we'll have a moderator leading the discussion
or -- it is up to everybody in this room. Any preference?
Anyone that would like to indicate anything?

Who has knowledge on the topic? Anybody? I would like to hear.

>> You? Please! We have a volunteer. Great.

>> Yes! Yes!

>> All right. We were trying to --

>> You want to go to the front? Please.

>> We would like to engage with everybody. Please, do go ahead.

>> Is this it? You have the slide -- yeah. Yeah. Yeah.

>> The initial discussion, there was a discussion and I'll give a brief introduction of who I am. I'm with Access and from India, this is actually where this presentation, it is originally from. It is being reused. Actually, this is an out of date map.

This map, it was prepared in 2014 and I can give you a sense as to how net neutrality is on the move. When you can track something, that's a sign that something is radically changing or taking place. This will give you a sense much net neutrality on the move and how you can specifically predict the net neutrality in the region mapping and the regulations and from agencies. Sometimes you have the standards from the regulator, sometimes from the industry, sometimes it is very well defined and needs regulatory more. Some countries, with the net neutrality, specifically in the law, it is being discussed.

On this map, this one I mentioned, it says that the U.S., that's a leader, that's no longer the case. In March of this year, the United States, they have created a document on communications and it is actually going to be used and it is a binding law and it is also what they're doing for now. There was a challenge and the courts, they have not taken it up. Essentially now, in U.S., this is a binding law. The General Assembly said that the net neutrality has implementation. That's just one country.

Net neutrality, it is showing that through Asia, there is a discussion, including India where there is a discussion taking place. Of course, it doesn't give you a sense as to when the data is involved. It will give you a sense of discussion that's happening in three places, the question is is there any consensus behind -- is there any one definition. Yeah, there is a definition, it is how they choose to enforce it and to include it, you look at the context, it may be for example the data market and you look Tenet neutrality, in other countries, it is very complex and you need to protect the net neutrality by the logistics and on the communications. In other places around India, you understand what is not protected and how to protect it in law. In the case of the European Union, you look at

what's protected and as a continent-wide discussion on the commission and the parliamentary discussion, the benefits and standards. So there are definitions.

This is from a Telecom company, this helps support that and it is an answer to the question, what is net neutrality. We'll get it up. Net neutrality requires that the Internet be maintained as an open platform, on which network providers treat all content, applications and services equally without discrimination. This is one consensus on what is net neutrality, is it protected, sometimes it is corresponding data in some countries and sometimes they're not using the Internet at all and how do we answer these traditional questions? This is an important document in India and other nations, and there are different versions of this, it is similar to what's happening elsewhere.

The topic, it is on the move. What's interesting in this session is to see the parts where this is moving. I was interested to see how the net neutrality is moving on the Internet today. It is a very complex subject. I was struck by how the -- there are extensive discussions and it is being active and on what we're trying to -- to look at the discussion and it is a larger part of what's happening.

For example, speaking from India, most say this is a complex subject, the Internet, it usually is a protection of measure and we have to keep the direct competitors from taking this up. That may be strong language. That's the thing, it is not just a demographic discussion but it is a very real discussion that goes from different countries and different markets and sometimes you have the variations in the telecommunications with the people in the industry.

It is interesting, you see colleagues working within the moving markets and what the net neutrality, what it means to you. Where is it moving? Is it initial point? I would love to hear more about that. I'll hand it over for some more points.

>> Jonathan Brewer, here as a recipient as a grant, thank you to ISOP for that, and also a trainer for the University of Oregon Resource Center, and that's part of my time. The rest of my time is I'm a network commercial engineer and consultant.

I'll go back to 1995. This is a time when you first connect to the Internet as a commercial provider. Up until this point, the Internet had just been education networks and was funded by the national science foundation and the U.S. military. As this point, to connect to the Internet, an ISP bought a connection. They didn't buy a connection from another ISP. They bought the phone line from AT&T and that phone line went to Chicago. When we got to that point we had to pay the other Internet service providers to carry that on to the rest of the

Internet. This was a pay interconnection, we paid them.

If we wanted to stop paying them and actually have traffic for free, we only had to do one thing, we had to buy three circuits, 45 megahertz per second each, one to each three exchanges, and if we did that, these other carriers would start carrying our traffic for free. Then of course, we would carry their traffic for free.

The idea of paying to connect to the Internet has always been one of reciprocity, and if you're a small player or let's say Singapore, that's an interesting situation, they're a small country with a high population and they're very wealthy. Malaysia has very high population spread out over a gigantic area. Imagine if the governments of Malaysia connected every single house in the entire country, it may cost them \$50 billion. Malaysia to connect every single property, it costs them \$2 billion. Now, an ISP from Singapore comes to Malaysia, hello, I have a web server. I would like to provide Netflix to all of the people in every one of your properties in your country and Malaysia says, okay, pay us. Singapore says, well, no, it is the Internet, we should connect for free. It is a neutral network, right? No. It is not a neutral network because one player had spent a lot more connecting their infusers than another player. That's the idea of data connection. I have seen it throughout my career.

In New Zealand, for many, many years, the large players refused to provide a free interconnection with small players, the small players had to buy service either from a dominant telco or from the second telco and in some cases they bought it from an international company and that company was big enough so that they could do this. This is one aspect of net neutrality and a lot of regulation in the United States has happened because of Netflix and because networks like Comcast who have cable connections to a lot of millions and millions of houses have said, well, we want you to pay us for traffic up bring to our network.

If it was going to the other way, there was an equal exchange from Netflix one way and Comcast the other way, it would be a different story, in this case, all of the traffic is coming from 1, 200 locations in the U.S. for Netflix and going out to millions and millions of locations. The network neutrality debate in the U.S. has revolved around Netflix, the legislation says that you can't unfairly limit somebody's service. You can't discriminate against applications, paid interconnection is -- it is just the way that the normal way that Internet works. It is two equal sized carriers and they were carrying traffic, interconnecting for free. One carrier said I don't want to rely on Skype calls from that other

carrier, and the effectiveness of that, it was in a negative way, it is easy to do this, some carriers have done it from Skype calls on particular websites with other services. It is possible and that's in violation of the network neutrality.

I came to this discussion because I saw that there were a number of people from India involved in the discussion. I really wanted to see why are people talking about zero-rated content with net neutrality and I would like to hear from the people in the audience. My analogy for Facebook zero is the same as broadcast to television or radio.

Advertisers pay for broadcast television, people who are consuming broadcast television, they buy a TV and put an antenna up and they watch the television. They don't have to pay. This thing with radio, with music, you know, advertisers pay the radio stations to broadcast this free music. What's happening with Facebook and there was Google-free zone whip I think ended but I wouldn't be surprised if they came out with a similar product. With Facebook zero in some cases Facebook is saying to the mobile carriers, okay, if you provide this content for free, but in other cases I believe it is a matter of other parties paying just like when you go to the post office, you buy a stamp, you put it on there, you send content. You're sending part of your information, you pay. On Facebook, it could be paying the mobile carriers to transmit the data for them. I see heads shaking. I would like to hear people's opinions about this. Why is Facebook zero different from broadcast TV? How is this a violation of network neutrality or is it a completely different issue that maybe should have a different name?

>> To continue the discussion, I just want to remind everybody to speak loud and clear for the benefits of our remote participants.

>> Who wants to go first? Go ahead. Yes.

>> Recently I was in Bangladesh and saw the Facebook zero service and the service, it was in Bangladesh. You have to subscribe to go on to the Internet, then if you accept the site, then you can access for free. That's how it is right now. How do you define the website from Facebook zero, it is not clear from the general link. How do you define this in Bangladesh to get the different accesses from the Facebook zero? You have the application, and then you have this sector, you can upload many things on their site. In your perspective, I feel is how do we define this.

>> I'm going to try -- my mind is -- I'm a little garbled, it may be because I -- I think you asked the right question. I'll explain how I see it. Can you bring up that slide where you defined the net neutrality?

One of the things, for the last five years I was involved

with Wikipedia and -- they have -- this is different views, et cetera. If you use this definition of net neutrality where all content application and services are to be treated equally without discrimination, then I think you could make the case that if on certain data plans you give certain services and applications free of cost without others that you're favoring. Right now, whether that's a good thing or a bad thing or a neutral thing is another question entirely. I think from a global perspective, I see if I was a user, for instance, who couldn't afford a data plan I might well prefer to have some access to some data free of cost rather than have no access to any data. Right?

Secondly, from the non-commercial perspective, I know when we started this Wikipedia, we got a lot of flak for it but in the country, people say I can access this at no cost, that's fantastic, you know, there is all of this information access between various countries and various income levels within the country. At the same time, the ideas that we consider, it is actually that if we were to get access or to be given access at minimal cost that maybe the country have sort of a zero rating, for want of a better word, capability where you think of essentials or information services that should be given to all citizens so it doesn't become just one platform but you say that information, you try to get free access where bunches, non-commercial, the question is -- that's why I'm confused. Frankly if -- in India, you may only want to access information services for free. I will go on social media to get the stuff for free, if I can. I'm just putting together different pieces of the puzzle.

>> A quick response here, governments around the world already sponsor public information through public radio broadcasts and public television broadcasts. I have suggested that the New Zealand government sponsor access to schools and health information with the government services as a zero-rated layer. The idea has been much discussed and published in business journals and the government really doesn't see it as a priority because we're a very well think nation and access is near to 100%. I think it is a very good idea and we still try to make this analogy of it being like a broadcast medium when someone else is paying.

Let's pass on to Microsoft and then we also want to hear from all of you.

>> It is like a broadcast, you're paying, you're paying for data, every time you log on to Facebook, you get an immense amount of information and they'll -- they use that. I don't think that that's a good analogy.

>> The platform, as a model, yeah, then you get into the

basics of discussing the economics of it, that's a separate discussion and I don't think we want to get on that track.

I want to specifically make some points about the Internet, in response to that, the points being made, I just want to clarify that from a software point of view. The first point is -- I think there's confusion on this and I'll take this opportunity to clarify, these are essentially two markets and the users are on one side and there are users of the Internet on the other side, it is two sides and everybody extends that. It is not always free on both sides. It is free to -- it is free to users, it is free to content providers, and the person is not paying the operators, there is no money exchanging hands. We have made that statement clear, the position clear. There is disclosure on that at the highest levels of companies and it is also clear with that confusion thanked, about whether it is free or one sided, so we'll move on.

Part two, this is a mystery part, this is what we have heard from the community, that the criteria is seen and you address and recognize that there was a sentiment that we needed to make an announcement to, we announced our changes in public policy and we talked about certain principles and the definition of the selection criteria and the disclosure around that, and one of the things around that, we talked about efficiency, it was one that it has to be a criteria involved. Others, it was looking at the Internet from access for the first-time users. Sometimes it is not very clear to people in the very rural environments and the users could have a different level of economic development and several points that were being made. Therefore, one of the criteria to be successful is people actually move to the broader Internet, outside of the Internet and .coms. The only research based are in the countries with the data that's streaming, that there is some high percentage of people that are actually using Internet through the -- using the Internet and they're actually moving to the broader range of Internet, that's one of the prime areas we have in the program and we have talked about an access program and we think it can be coexist with the principles of net neutrality and there is a -- the situation in India, the Internet, where we have very strong uniformity of usage with the entire applications there to get equal access to the Infrastructure and we have net neutrality to the users in that area. I thought on the free part we would clarify in the question of who it is that we're clarifying.

>> (indiscernible).

>> We have a question from a remote participant, I want everybody in the question to remember that it is still a discussion that we want -- this is a question from a remote

participant. The question is actually directed to the panel but I think it could be directed to the whole room because the discussion format has changed.

Her question is I am from India, I would request if the panel member can share their views on the rules on net neutrality especially on subjects such as specialized services. That's a question from a remote participant.

>> RAJANJIT SINGH CHIMA: Thank you for that question. That's a good question.

As many of you may know, we have been having discussions around protecting net neutrality as part of a larger discussion, including the data regulatory and we have looked at different countries and as part of that, many of the things that we're evolving from that recommendation itself, as to the net neutrality, harmonizing, let me stress this, it is harmonization, it is not saying that there is no definition at all, that's incorrect. There's been countries, the European country harmonizes this here and the three countries, the most important packet of information, some of you may know, it is a complicated process but essentially it is whatever the question was posed and we have been focusing on a broad possibility of net neutrality including specialized services and the question is some of this specialized services, it is not that you use it, but it is there, the IPD, you have an example and perhaps another example, it is separate of medical information and some have pointed out that that service, what is the public opinion and others use a ID network, this is in fact the commission in that a specialized service, it rolls out the service, this is informal discussions with the parliaments and council to see -- that was press announcement this week saying they agree to move ahead with this. And the concern, it is of the possibility of specialized services and there is a consensus on that generating and it is not sure how to be treated. What we have here, that is enclosed, whatever comes out of the council, it goes before the parliament for a vote on the amendments in parliament.

This could be a problem, that's an interesting sample that we may see, a prominent left wing academic and then we have the right wing academic in the media sector, and we have both, and an author, we believe that if you take the idea not of forcing people to take these arguments and in India, we have where you reduce the content and you have economic inefficiencies and there is a person who is operating the network in India and the broadcast, they can use that and the broadcasters are also getting the money. It is a situation that's been developing and they do grant the access. That is the question if you want the Internet to be broadcast, that's a concern that I sometimes see, we'll open that up for more discussion. An interesting example

is that this is a specific term that's been used and has been used, and it is okay, you respond to the access to everything that you look at and the example, it is the service, the ads, you see the marketing for all of that in the first 5 minutes and then you can access everything. You can ask users to choose the services that they want. It is interesting to discuss.

This is a user choice, they're bringing a possibility of a user. I mention this because there is a prominent start-up in India, many start-ups, and you have the government people, and then you have this person, the first thing they do, you know, they look at this when deploying this. It is just what they want to check and talk to more people then. The first thing that person did was actually go and see the arguments and manically it was why would a person do this? It was not even that serious, and I can even open up a store, I think I can create a space there. That's why I'm personally -- you know, I talk to people and the proactively involves the programs and that, but to discuss in terms of working with and even if I was competing, they're not involved in it.

>> Not to what you said, but I just think that we should distinguish between sending the plans, and that in a situation of zero-rating when a content provider donates equipment and services to a mobile company that it is almost trespassing even if you're in the paying for the travel and I have seen stats equivalent.

>> Jeremy Macolm: I was going to talk about something completely different but since we're talking about this zero-rating, I'll make a few remarks on that. I don't disagree that it is essentially like -- or similar to, similar to the Broadcasting where people pay to get their message to the consumer, but to the point of it, we don't want the Internet to be like broadcast media. Broadcast media has come a long, long ways. A benefit is that it is a completely small platform, content provider, what they spend on the same basis, so when we allow the corporations, they have the money to pay to get the content in front of the user, then it distorts what the Internet is really. I think that is one of the justifications against zero-rating. I don't disagree that there may be some context in which zero-rating is permissible and the downsides are outweighed by the positives and those circumstances though are pretty narrow though. One of the examples that you might give is where local content that's actually in the same geographic region probably because it is cheaper to get that content to the end user that content is actually available for free and connects to that point because it doesn't actually cost anything to move around that. That would be a logical case of local content. There may be other cases. In general terms, Google,

Facebook, and even Wikipedia, I love it -- I hate to say it, but if there is ever a competition between the information that Wikipedia provides and information of a small operator provides, we shouldn't be making this sort of monitoring, even if it is not monitoring, Wikipedia has a policy that they don't give or take money for their zero rating which is a group policy and I appreciate the policies on transparency which we don't get from many other arrangements. Often we don't know if the provider is paying or being paid if they have an agreement with the network operator or not, but even so, I just think it is a bad policy. It opens the door to abuses and to changing the Internet from what it is into something positive.

That's my take on zero-rating.

>> Thank you. Answered some questions I wanted to ask.

The one question I had, is that this notion that providing -- and I think we alluded to providing access, and especially partnership with governments and that it sort of has become now the way for governments in partnerships with private sector to provide access to the Internet. I think that's kind of dangerous, to me that's a dangerous trend when it is being passed off as providing connectivity instead of say looking at more affordable, the prices, looking at fixing the Infrastructure, et cetera, and it is -- it is sort of a thing that's -- to some extent it is quite perceptive and that's a concern that needs to be discussed.

>> I would ask, if anyone else has any questions or would like to ask about access and Infrastructure, that's been strong views and I was going to ask if there are any other points before we respond a bit?

Specific to the zero-rating, it makes a lot of sense, and if you want the Internet, you want that in a large way, and I think that's a problem that you're working under, what's the problem you're facing in India as a country, is it that it is too expensive. Sometimes it is more expensive. It is not as cheap as it could be with the comparative consumer data and how expensive it is in other places. For example, Internet, it could be -- the question is, where is that coming from? We have the flexibility that we're -- I think that everybody is looking at this now. The economic data, you're actually marketing with the network. This is involving other partnerships and a debate with advertisements. I think that zero-rating is not a good system. I think that the Internet solution of bundling, it has the access and sometimes is a cost issue. It is not often the access with the Internet of Things in different parts of Asia and across Africa, that's a different issue. We have asked the question in terms of variance, we have the question of what is the solution. If indeed, if that's a problem that should happen

at all. The competition, if it is working, you won't have any because nobody will have that much control and remember, to be involved, it is not who has access to your area, the Broadband, what you have, the area, it is evidence, but you -- in other parts of the world, even in India, you look at the access, that's regulation and other models. That's a thing as well. If you have the IP, you have that principle and you apply that to your country, it depends on your model, that's the argument preferred in the UK as to why they have chosen this kind of communication, not to have a binding society, but to have a standard that's good with the industry. On the other hand, is this the situation, the zero-rating, is it good rules? It is an important inference to money, number one. I think that's established and summarized. You look at all of the accesses with all of the IP services and then they say, okay, we won't do it, and others say it is regulation preventing us from doing this. you're seeing this -- it is a direct competition, they say that applications, that those sources, that there is a special licensing, and that the regulation, it is in the Telecom, so saying that -- then someone will say that it is not regulated and others will say that's not true and talk about deregulation and licenses and we have to have the feedback, I think that zero-rating, it may feed the other, the IP, but the IP, for some Telecom operators, it creates a cycle where people are saying you must look at the money and let's do this. Maybe we need another concrete example of this, maybe we should look at Wikipedia and other companies for partnerships.

This is another fact, that they're looking at people to negotiate, the negotiations, it is not always logical and recognized, what's happening. But that's what's happening. The zero-rating in partnerships, not necessarily partnerships, but then they have the zero-rating. Again, personally I recognize those neutral numbers. I know sometimes as start-ups we don't think this, but other times you say we do this because we believe our competitors will do it and it is better for to us spend our money. Wouldn't you rather use that money for something else? That's a complex question that's involved.

>> The economics are absolutely correct. If an operator is not paid to deliver content, they won't extend the network and there is low performance. In a case where there is no money changing hands everybody except the consumer loses but then the consumer loses in the end because they have terrible service.

I like the idea of governments paying mobile carriers to provide free government services to end users who wouldn't have otherwise have the money to get to the end services online. I'm neutral on the idea of companies doing this because it is no longer an Internet that I grew up with. It is no longer the

Internet where everything is the same, but I came from a privileged position of being able to use the Internet, everybody for the last 24 years. Not everybody can pay for the Internet. It -- with no incentives, you have no real worth. That's kind of how it is. It is very, very interesting debates.

Who else?

>> We have a comment from a remote participant from the response from before, comment, on the subject of free services being offered I believe it is for the customer to decide if they want to avail services or not. After all, it is their prerogative. As an association representing the 100,000 public Internet access points new users and people not connected are challenged in India, it is to get people to connect. If people access services for free and then they connect it, so be it, why should we stop it? We should also remember that new users are smart. If they feel that the service is being provided is substandard, they will not use it in the future. End comment.

The second comment from her is -- this is directed to our panelist: The models have to be different. For most of English, the non-speaking English, in rural India the model has to be different. The model which has worked so far for other products has been the small packets which cost less provided for free definitely helps in better adoption. We at CCAOI India feel rather than discouraging more and more companies should be encouraged to provide their services for free of cost if they want more citizens to be connected.

End comment.

>> I wanted to make the comment, that speaking of the same highly developed nation that you were referring to a short time ago, we have in the case of a country which is developing very sophisticated approach to government, interaction with the citizens by the Internet as a natural part of policy, it follows if a government is expecting all citizens to be able to interact with government to use government services to transact business with government online using authenticated identity then there are two implications. One is that the government has an obligation to the Internet to be accessible to all its citizens, otherwise it is contradicting its own policy. Secondly, the government should not only rollout Infrastructure, be widely accessible but the government should regulate the thrust is within the reach of its own citizens, otherwise it is being -- the government is not behaving in a Democratic way. That's all, just a comment.

>> Thank you. I just have two comments that are under discussion.

I think there is a differentiation, and that's something that we're taking in this definition and the different types

of -- it is useful to have that nuance in that discussion and examining that.

Part number 2, as I studied this, I'm curious to understand particularly in countries where access is a problem with the economics as well as the relevance and the standards and the proper way of looking at the content, is there any data on the content provider side, there have been instances of market and some have been put out of business because of that, I want to understand if -- what is causing this assumption?

>> I think as always with most Telecom regulators, with ITU, others, they have a provision that Broadband data and others across regions are taken into account, for example, country leaders have that regulatory and they choose not to, they use the policy of forbearance saying we can but we won't as a reminder to people. They're looking at the prices across the telcos often -- I will use the C word, content -- but that's a balance act. Some people do it. To another point, that's also joy we take one example to capitalize to make sure it is doing the service obligation so it is looking at the Internet access and we have 200 million and then you can use anything, that's the basic idea when you talk about the service needs. You look at the associations of India, the comment, the users, also we often learn that we have a choice with the operators. There is a free choice. I think that the market, it is not a free market but an opportunistic market. So we have a free choice. Keep that in mind.

I think that's a question that people are ready to understand. Let's see what happens. I think it is interesting, the zero-rated, yes, quite possibly, yes, there is a model in the circumstances that's been chosen to choose between two services, that's academic and it may not happen right now.

>> (indiscernible).

>> And then, of course, there is the zero-rated of all content, so you need the product. What you do, you have the he row-rating for a certain app or service, but my basic intervention is that all of this, the technical abilities, this is the point I think it comes down to, not individually or even open to a net neutrality market, you have that. The telcos, they're using these resources and regulation, that's the transparency, the first information you have, the data being available for people. The meaning of this, I expect to do that particularly with those that are ready to adopt, that's the spectrum, it is this, the basic content, it must be some regulatory oversight on this to undermine the opportunity. The net neutrality, it needs to be protected in some way and -- the net neutrality, it needs to be protected in some way. Is there questions in terms of what I mentioned in terms of the

communication? I think it is just putting the Infrastructure nearby, even having the content distributions, many will say it is not an issue at all. I have heard many say it is not a problem and we don't get those rates, we don't even know what the rate is. Others say we have rates, we just do this for the point of sharing data. You know, you have the markets, it is not an issue. You could have better markets for transparency, that's something that's useful, to answer your question, my argument is that based on the principals of the framework, if your country, it has problems, it may be best to be protected. This is a question that I'm asked in particular, can we do anything and I say, well, not really, no. There is no mandate really, it is an enterprise, not really. So there is no power, that's a common problem. It should be limited and out there and available. That's the basics. Especially for individuals.

>> I can't understand what that model is, do you mean like a -- you give us something, right, and then to entice for further consumption?

>> It is a model that he was (indiscernible).

>> (indiscernible).

>> Sometimes it is much broader, this model.

>> I just wanted to comment on my experiences in bank Bangladesh and the regulator wants to have organizations to have separate licenses for providing different services. An organization asked a question of a regulator, this organization has offices in 20 cities in Bangladesh and says, so if I want to provide this between my 20 offices, do I need a license, he yes says you need a license for this but I recommend that you use one of the host of many providers and in addition to this I was asked by someone for advice on hardware that could monitor Skype conversations at 10 gigabits a second so that they could have service in the national backbones and track the amount of minutes on Skype conversations so that the regulator could take their cut of one tenth of one cent of one call like they take their cut from the phone companies. There are a lot more issues going on than just network neutrality. I thought I would bring that up since you did mention all of the crazy regulations.

>> They say they want net neutrality and then you ask them about the application services and they want to have some control and know what's there. That's where you need the open market, not just the net neutrality. It is very easy for regulators to come and look, and to look at Skype, and the notices across the region, they're working within the IP in the last decade, they have the IP system and what you have now, you have the other operators so it doesn't really matter what you do. That's a thing, you need the consultation. They will see a strong push from some agencies to say we want to license the

services. Others view net neutrality as it is another issue completely anyway. Also Telecom operators, they're fighting the issues often. They want to regulate the licenses in some way. Some will say that. In that sense, that happened in India. The gift they have given to the region is that you have a discussion that actually started with the consultation and they need to have access to the applications.

A final thing is, they have India as the proposal and not the European proposals. The net neutrality, that's actually doing that, that's a complicated space now in Indonesia and we'll see what happens.

>> When you asked for volunteers, I said I would come over to talk about the recent developments.

You know, we have heard about the -- sorry about this microphone.

We have heard some about the E.U. plans with the process between the parliament, council and the commission to develop net neutrality. We're talking about the U.S. F.C.C., some people never know about that, you may have heard about it, but we'll talk a bit about that.

Historically in telephone networks in the U.S. regulated under title 2 of the broad band services that regulate the entire month, what's that mean? Well, title 2, it is a common carrier regulation which allows the services to be regulated whereas title 1 is building services on top of those that are not able to be regulated to that same extent. The FCC made several attempts to regulate that neutrality and the existing authority and it failed time after time because it was always challenging and always found that the FCC had over stepped its bounds and authority. The only choice left in the end was to reclassify the Broadband services and attract so that it had broader regulations. When -- the danger of this, we didn't want the FCC to be able to regulate every aspect of Broadband. The FCC, they kind of -- we didn't want to necessarily regulate stuff like that. We advocated for the FCC to have forbearance and we have heard about if they were able to regulate, including the rates, that they would commit not to do that or to regulate the core principles and in the end, that's what the FCC started to do. In March it released draft rules, and the rules contained three guideline rules which are no blocking of application services or devices, number two is no throttling of applications, services or devices, reducing the speed, the third was no paid prioritization favoring some traffic for payment. Those are the three. Two limitations to the first two of those rules, they are reasonable network managements and looking at the traffic, that's allowed, potentially that could be -- some of those things are not well-defined, they're problematic and

then the general conduct rule. That's a kind of catch-all where they can also deal with other issues that don't fall within throttling or prioritization. General rules that simply there is no unreasonable discrimination or disadvantage to particular uses, content, applications and interestingly the general connect rule doesn't just apply to end user services, but also provides to other interproviders and interconnection providers. If an IP is being disrupted, that falls within this.

You may notice that zero-rated is not mentioned there. What that means, that is also part of this.

Finally, there is transparency rules, the transparency rules were under the previous FCC rulings and that was struck down. What's the future for the net neutrality role making, there is a bill in Congress to refund the FCC in terms of the net neutrality and they have not signed a bill like this in the past, we don't know if the FCC will -- we'll have to see.

There are several court challenges. Most court challenges, they could last for years yet. It is still under a cloud in the U.S. so we'll just have to hope for the best there.

We had a hand up. Did you have a question? Do you have a microphone?

>> AUDIENCE: The government is necessarily acting aspirators or not? If it is not necessary how do you do this in a better way, the net neutral?

>> I think the question that you're asking, should the licensed spectrum be -- unlicensed spectrum be supported, is that the question? The second part? Yes. It will support the unlicensed spectrum and that's something that's seen as being useful and it will help increase the competition. It is not a be all, end all, we need to have the shared spectrum, we need that available there. Often you have the communication across the world, especially Asia, you often need to be updated and the systems, even in the markets where they first are, but I suspect the U.S. is working around this as well, and making that progress and there was a question about the use of spectrum, it is a question to point out if you had the spectrum and then you have the competition and the less issues in the net neutrality, I know this is different from region to region, some regions, they will point out that this is developed with the content users which is an argument which is with traffic management and I believe must be standard. Many parts of Asia, the mobile, they're able to have content with respect to these areas. If you want to look at the spectrum, it may be more comparable to open, it may prevent violations and not lead to deregulation but sometimes the unstructured spectrum allocation impacts their ability. We always ask people on that information to show me the data. If you have the data, you can look at that for it,

sometimes there is data enough.

Is there a question?

>> Basically we have been testing the United States, basically that's that spectrum, and in that testing it has been proven, we actually did it with a Broadcasting, large Broadcasting network, that the Broadcasting channels actually interfere with the TV white space technologies that we use. It is the reverse and not what's been claimed.

The question more importantly is who owns the spectrum? Is it a license for the broadcasters? Is it the license for -- it is the living Broadband, that's why they say it is ours using the Broadcasting spectrum which is why the broadcasters, they say it is theirs. As far as we're concerned in general terms, on spectrum, it is a natural resource. The appropriate owner of that is the government. It does not belong to the broadcasters.

Obviously, this is a battle that's not been fought in court and it is anticipated that this will be. I think it has been done -- I think the FCC actually took on the Broadcasting channels and the spectrums. It should be something like licenses as well. It should be licensed if that's the question that you have earlier.

That's what we're working towards in other regions now.

>> I would like to add to that, I think we talk about who owns it, in the U.S. courts, it is actually -- it didn't happen in the U.S., the United Kingdom proposed this, but they're still -- they still are looking at the FCC powers and they say it is a spectrum and it should be regulated for content.

In India, there is one distinct point, with this regulation, when we look at this, it is clear that the spectrum, it is a resource and this is particularly for any devices, but for people in end I can't, it is not the governments say that, it is the people. That's an important distinction, it may seem like we're analyzing it but --

>> Yeah. Yes.

>> It is the thing that even government usage's, their stand on spectrum, it must be supported by the public. The net neutrality, we jumped into it because of the content in the regional scheme. You have a clear public intent and approach in the communications, and then actually have to provide this and it is -- I think you had mentioned this, it is a subject of -- if they're not interested, it would be different unless you have the dynamic case operating this. Even if you don't use, you should engage with the regulators, you need the societies, the start-ups, you need the entrepreneurs and all of this.

This is what we believe, some people have the standard negotiations but this is the content, you will see this across India, they do not always do this, but this is something that

some have done first in the region.

>> We're basically using the spectrum to deliver the public space, not to the customer. It is not really for private consumption, but public service.

>> You mean it is a natural monopoly.

>> No, we're changing that, the government wants to use the spectrum to provide the public service to the customers.

>> Any last questions?

>> Two things, one is this sounds like a promising conceptual breakthrough, but I have not heard of it being advanced as a viable policy option. Do you know are there examples of groups that are actually the conversation is stimulating and no way to really look at this through an access link. Has anyone actually seriously looked at that?

>> We have talked to the public in terms of programs like this, you know, to provide full access to them in the partnerships. They want to point out that they prefer -- they look at this and they choose to interpret this and say we don't have to allow this. I will look at that interpretation and it may be different than that. If you look at Brazil right now, if you see Brazil, they have a section there on propriety but it can be an interpretation of that, even though the Telecom operator has to enforce it, some people are asking the regulator what is this, what is equal? What do you think?

>> At least one of the mobile operators there gives Internet -- basic Internet service to be given to the entry level offered by subscriptions even if you have a pay as you go subscription or a very basic, you get the basic Internet access, it is slow, it is really, really slow. That's the incentive to pay. We would support that over 08 because then you can access and if you find it is too slow and you can afford, you can upgrade.

>> The provider, they're responsible and there is a reason for this and to reach that understanding in India.

>> [Applause].

This text is being provided in a rough-draft Format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.
