

DRAFT COPY OF CTIA PRESIDENT AND CEO MEREDITH ATTWELL BAKER
KEYNOTE REMARKS DAY 2 AT SUPER MOBILITY WEEK ON CONNECTED CAR
AND NET NEUTRALITY

As prepared, not necessarily as delivered

A few weeks ago, I was lucky enough to visit AT&T's Drive Studio in Atlanta.

They are helping lead the world by closely integrating technology with the driving experience.

First, and foremost, it will make us safer. It will also unlock a lot of amazing new innovative features.

All of this is part of differentiation, which is at the core of the mobile experience today.

As competitors fight to be first and experiment with this amazing LTE platform, consumers are the clear beneficiaries.

This dynamic market is the backdrop for the FCC's consideration of new Net Neutrality rules.

No issue or policy is more important right now to our industry's future than Net Neutrality.

To be clear, CTIA and its members support an Open Internet.

It is non-negotiable.

Mobile providers fully embrace Internet openness and consumers demand it.

Since its inception, the mobile Internet has been open.

And since 2010, we have had Open Internet rules especially designed for mobile reflecting our technology our competitive dynamic and our evolving nature.

Consumers have benefited with four amazing years of continuing innovation and investment.

We've witnessed the remarkable consumer adoption of LTE and 4G solutions. The rise of tablets, wearables, and the Internet of Things. Venture capital pouring billions into new mobile solutions. And, since 2010, U.S. smartphone speeds have increased 8 times over.

On today's mobile Internet, there are only fast lanes.

And they will become faster as long as we keep a framework that is investment-friendly...and deliver hundreds more MHz of spectrum for mobile broadband.

And, yes, I will always come back to spectrum.

Some groups, however, want to dramatically upend the 2010 framework.

And give the government a far more prominent hand in how tomorrow's mobile Internet is shaped.

The risk of a new and troublesome regulatory approach is real.

Under their view, we must treat broadband as a utility.

In regulatory speak, this is Title II.

They say broadband is no different than our roads, our electrical grid, and our water supply.

Really, imagine 5G featuring brown-outs and potholes.

The mobile industry has changed more in the past 6 months than those industries have changed in the past 60 years.

Now, the FCC on a bipartisan basis rejected similar calls to regulate mobile broadband as a utility in 2007 and again in 2010.

This has paid untold consumer dividends.

And there is no evidence that our consumer and transparency-focused regime isn't working today.

Competition is vibrant, new app companies launch daily, and consumers are the winners.

So applying antiquated rules to wireless broadband services runs counter to everything we have done for over a generation to build the world's leading mobile ecosystem.

In an area this dynamic with this much competition the last thing you do is radically change the regulatory regime particularly when there is no consumer harm to cure, or industry problem to fix.

The bottom line is Title II would not preserve the Open Internet, it would stifle it. It would place jobs and investment at risk. It would threaten to export innovation overseas.

And I worry that Title II regulation would not end with the carriers, but would reach deeper into the ecosystem.

Regulators, regulate. It's what they do.

We want and need an Open Internet, and we have one today.

Title II is the wrong way to preserve it.

Title II gets the headlines as it should.

But, we face another substantial threat.

Some demand that the FCC apply the exact same rules on wired and mobile broadband platforms.

We are told wireless is too important not to apply every potential rule to it.

The opposite is true.

Ours is too important a platform for rules designed for a different technology and a different competitive landscape.

Similarly, we are told that the remarkable growth of smartphones and LTE since the 2010 rules warrants heavier regulation now.

Wrong again.

The growth of smartphones and LTE – and the constant change in our ecosystem – is the clearest evidence we should retain a mobile-specific approach because it has worked so well for consumers.

Now, I understand that rival platforms want the FCC to put its thumb on LTE because LTE is becoming – and becoming is the key word – more robust and more dynamic.

I don't blame them.

If I were a wired company, I would be nervous about how bright our future is too if the FCC keeps the right rules.

Wireless is fundamentally different. Congress said so in 1993. And the FCC has treated us differently with dramatic pro-consumer results.

And, in 2010 when faced with this exact same issue – the Obama FCC again found we were different.

Given our track record of innovation and openness and the vibrant competition in our space, the FCC found that prescriptive rules were not necessary for mobile.

We were already open, always have been, always will be.

And, all of this remains true today.

I have about 20 reasons why mobile is different. I'll give you 4.

#1. Mobile broadband is still very new. Saying wireless was nascent in 2010 and not now misses the mark on our industry. We are always reinventing – from 1G through 4G and beyond.

We need to find ways to champion VoLTE, LTE broadcast, and LTE advanced. We cannot adopt a path that would halt or inhibit new services and options just as they are being introduced.

#2. Mobile broadband is dependent upon limited spectrum. U.S. mobile providers are very efficient users of spectrum, but physics is physics and we can't snap our fingers and make more. Our spectrum policy is simply not keeping pace with the exponential growth in mobile data, which causes obvious network management challenges.

#3. Spectrum is a shared resource. The same MHzs are used by all consumers in a cell. This requires nimble and dynamic network management to optimize everyone's experience in real time.

And #4. Mobile broadband competition is flourishing: more than 8 out of 10 Americans can choose from 4 providers. And, just check out some of my carrier CEOs' tweets.

This is a fiercely competitive landscape, and consumers are the winners with more robust services, better options, pricing plans, and wider deployment in rural America.

For those reasons – and others – mobile voice has always been treated differently than rotary phones, so has mobile broadband.

At CTIA, we want to work collaboratively to maintain openness.

To do that, we need rules that treat no part of the ecosystem like a utility.

A regime designed for our networks, not superimposed upon them.

This issue cannot be defined away by regulators.

There is no potential definition of reasonable network management that could be broad enough or adaptive enough to capture today's – let alone tomorrow's – mobile broadband experience.

Or offer providers the certainty they require to invest billions more in networks and spectrum.

This is our call to action this week. We must have an Open Internet, just as we do today. And it must be Title I and it must be mobile-specific.

We need your voice and your engagement. Not from DC, but from where you work, where you innovate.

Any new rules must provide incentives for continued innovation and investment at every level of the mobile ecosystem, and they must be mobile-specific.