

MARKET STRUCTURE FOR
ULTRABROADBAND:

*Should We Expect
Multiple, Competitive UBB Access
Infrastructures*

or

*Regulated Monopoly UBB Utility?
(or Something Else?)*

Robert C. Atkinson
CITI

April 18, 2008

*Should We Expect Multiple,
Competitive UBB Access
Infrastructures...or Regulated
Monopoly Utilities?*

(or Something Else?)

YES!

So, What Is UltraBB?

- At least 100 mbps, initially, evolving to 1 gbps to consumer/residential premises
- Likely to be fiber-based
 - FTTH (such as Verizon FiOS)
 - HFC (such as cable DOCSIS 3)
- Implications
 - No “bottleneck” (unless the core is overwhelmed)
 - “No scarcity” changes much of the “conventional wisdom” in telecom, media
 - Less or no access competition
 - A bigger “digital divide”

How Much Bandwidth Is Needed?

QuickTime™ and a
decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

Source: “Ultrabroadband Overview,” Roland Montagne, IDATE, April 3, 2008

Build It and They Will Come?

- Are there any NEW applications that require UBB?
 - 3D HDTV?
 - 3D movies coming in 2009
 - 3D interactive games
 - Telepresence and the true “virtual” office at home?
 - Pay for UBB by eliminating commercial office space?
 - And who was able to forecast the internet and P2P, anyway...?

Is UBB Just the Continuation of the “Need for Speed”?

- 56kbps, +200kbps, 1 mgbps, 1.5 mgbps...
- Enhanced by political concern about “falling behind” Europe, Japan, Korea?

Market Structure Overview from CITI's Annual "State of Telecom"

- "Boom-bust" cyclical likely to repeat
- Equilibrium for telecom networks (particularly "access") is not infrastructure competition but infrastructure oligopoly
 - Operators must cover fixed costs
 - Some markets won't support multiple infrastructures
- This is not a CITI preference or policy recommendation, but a forecast based on business fundamentals
 - High up-front costs, commoditization, competition driving prices to marginal costs

Source: CITI (2003 - 2007)

Governments *Will* Be Involved in BB and Then UBB Infrastructure

- In "good" markets: commercial critical infrastructures are *always* regulated
 - Usually inversely to degree of competition
- In "poor" markets: Government *will* subsidize, directly and indirectly, to encourage UBB deployment
 - But \$\$ come with strings attached
- In terrible markets: Government *may* be the UBB builder, even operator, of last resort

The Critical “Market Structure” Issue: How Many UBB Infrastructures?

- Can each market sustain multiple, parallel UBB access infrastructures?
 - Is it likely that each UBB’s revenues will consistently exceed expenses, over the medium-to-long term?
- If the answer is “no” (to be expected in many markets), there will be:
 - Consolidation (or no entry) = few or one (or no) UBB
 - A substantial public policy challenge:
 - Deal with a monopolistic situation (utility regulation?) or no privately owned UBB at all (government ownership?)
 - OR**
 - Create an environment that can sustain multiple, competitive UBB access networks

Is There a Business Case For Multiple UBB Access Infrastructures?

- The answer will depend on the *changing, specific circumstances* of **each** market, such as:
 - UBB demand/demand growth
 - How much revenue will “stick” to infrastructure/ how much will “flow through” to unaffiliated applications providers?
 - User density and market topography
 - Incremental upgrade or greenfield investment?
 - Competition (how will the demand be divided?):
 - For how long/how many will conventional BB be “good enough”?
 - How many sunk-cost BB “incumbents”?
 - Cable TV/ satellite TV penetration?
 - Are start-up competitors likely?
 - Is a lower cost UBB technology (probably wireless) likely?


Example: No Business Case (For A Telco Reselling Satellite TV)

"We haven't seen a business case that justifies some of the investments that Verizon and AT&T have made **because of the geography and our particular markets**," he said. "We're offering 10-Meg service, and we continue to make sure we have the bandwidth that is necessary for HSI [high-speed Internet]. We also see a lot of **non-linear entertainment** coming in the future. We have our new portal we migrated to that includes our video store with 5000 movies, 5000 music videos and 1000 television episodes that our customers can pull down over the 10-Meg pipe."

Embarq CEO Tom Gerke

Source: Broadband Reports.com, March 3, 2008

Can Multiple Broadband Infrastructures Be Sustained?



Source: Analysys Group

1.5 versus 2.5 Infrastructures

(More Relevant for International Comparisons)

- 1.5 = one ubiquitous “wired” (usually telco) plus various wireless and niche (CLEC/reseller) networks (the 0.5)
- Most of Europe, for example
- Less infrastructure competition means:
 - More profits/less risk = easier to finance
 - But less dynamic and innovative
 - More regulation, particularly to protect open access (such as structural separation)

Source: CITI/Eli Noam

1.5 versus 2.5 Infrastructures

- 2.5 = two ubiquitous “wired” networks (cable and telco) plus the wireless/niche 0.5
- USA, for example
- More infrastructure competition means
 - Greater volatility, greater innovation, lower consumer prices, greater investor risk
 - Reaction is oligopolistic (collusive?) behavior
 - Or, in markets with insufficient infrastructure profits to sustain 2.0, additional revenue required (subsidies, content) or 1.0 results
 - Pressure for vertical integration to capture “content” revenues creates “network neutrality” issue

Source: CITI/Eli Noam

So, Current BB Market Structure Affects UBB Business Case

- Fiber-rich (FTTN or better) BB infrastructure operators have substantial lower risk “head start” advantages over UBB start-ups
 - Incremental cost upgrade to UBB
 - Installed customer base/substantial revenue flow
- Therefore:
 - “1.5” fiber-rich BB markets are likely to be 1.5 UBB
 - “2.5” fiber-rich BB markets *may* remain 2.5 but risk of becoming 1.5 if one fails or both consolidate
 - 0 or 0.5 BB markets (or fiber-poor 1.5/2.5) will need government help to become 1.0 UBB.

Can Government Help the UBB Infrastructure Business Case?

- Be an anchor user
- Reduce costs (ROW/spectrum licenses)
 - But does this encourage competitors?
- Provide subsidies
 - To operator? Or to subscribers?
- Access to content revenues?
- Allow/encourage sharing, consolidation, or unbundling?

Infrastructure Sharing (aka, Unbundling or Consolidation)

“The single biggest reason to adopt sharing is to lower the cost of deploying broadband networks to achieve widespread and affordable access... For developed countries, infrastructure sharing promises to play an important role in the move to FTTx access...”

Source: What Do We Mean by 6 Degrees of Sharing? Discussion Paper for ITU GSR08, Feb. 2008

Lowering UBB Access Costs Through Sharing, Unbundling, or Consolidation

“Deploying mobile base stations on fibre backbone networks to reach rural areas may be uneconomic if each company builds its own network. Likewise, laying fibre to every home, building or street cabinet may be unattainable where operators act alone. Companies can, however, share some infrastructure but compete on services.”

Source: What Do We Mean by 6 Degrees of Sharing? Discussion Paper for ITU GSR08, Feb. 2008

If Multiple UBBs Are Not Sustainable, Sharing, Unbundling or Consolidation May Produce UBB Access “Utility”

- Allows operator to capture economies of scale and reduce investor risk (lower costs)

BUT

Requires operator to share the lower costs with resellers and consumers (rate regulation? structural separation? unbundling?)

- Minimizes infrastructure competition

WITHOUT

Sacrificing retail application/service competition (if conduit market power is separated from “content”)

Should Government Be the UBB Risk-Taker of Last Resort?

- Subsidize incumbent telco/BB to upgrade to “UBB utility”
- Government builds (contracts) for the construction of universal UBB access network
 - Strong competition for government contracts = lower initial costs

Government can then auction the UBB infrastructure to highest (qualified) operator

- Monopoly for wholesale-only/open access “utility” operator?

Any “loss” is a one-time infrastructure subsidy (like building a highway and road system)

And What About UBB Investors?

- UBB Infrastructure Competition = Risk and low risk-adjusted return
 - “Remember the CLECs!”
- Monopoly = Inevitable regulation and possible break-up is highly political and unpredictable, so risky in longterm
- Utility = Negotiated regulation and low risk therefore reasonable risk-adjusted return
 - Theodore Vail, again?

Some Conclusions

- Initial UBB market structures will be similar to current telecom/BB market structures
- UBB market structures will evolve over time (decades?), in response to changes in business, technology and market conditions as well as changes in public policy
 - Tendency to fewer UBBs and therefore less competition and more regulation
 - Public utility model may be attractive in many markets
- However, there is no single market structure that will be optimal in every market, for all time
- Operators, investors and governments will need to be “adept at adapting” to changing circumstances (or have perfect foresight)