

Telecoms and Media

An overview of regulation in 46 jurisdictions worldwide

2012

Contributing editors: Laurent Garzaniti and Natasha Good

 **Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer**



Published by
Getting the Deal Through
in association with:

Al Kamel Law Office
Anjarwalla and Khanna Advocates
Barretto Ferreira, Kujawski e Brancher Sociedade de Advogados
Bentsi-Enchill, Letsa & Ankomah
BLP Abogados
Carey y Cía
Cocalis & Psarras
Coelho Ribeiro e Associados
Debarliev, Dameski & Kelesoska Attorneys at Law
Drew & Napier LLC
Edward Nathan Sonnenbergs
Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer
Greenberg Traurig, SC
Harris Kyriakides LLC
J J Roca & Asociados
Lenz & Staehelin
LG Avocats
Mannheimer Swartling Advokatbyrå
Matheson Ormsby Prentice
National Regulatory Agency for Electronic Communications and Information Technologies – Moldova
Oentoeng Suria & Partners
School of Law, University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce
Seth Dua & Associates
Stikeman Elliott LLP
SyCip Salazar Hernandez & Gatmaitan
Telecommunications Regulatory Authority – Bahrain
The Telecommunications Regulatory Authority of the Slovak Republic
Udo Udoma & Belo-Osagie
Webb Henderson
Wierzbowski Eversheds
Wiltshire & Grannis LLP
Wong Jin Nee & Teo
YangMing Partners
Zang, Bergel & Viñes Abogados



Telecoms and Media 2012

Contributing editors

Laurent Garzaniti and Natasha Good
Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer

Business development managers

Alan Lee
George Ingledew
Robyn Hetherington
Dan White

Marketing managers

Ellie Notley
Alice Hazard

Marketing assistants

William Bentley
Zosia Demkowicz

Admin assistant

Megan Friedman

Marketing manager (subscriptions)

Rachel Nurse
Subscriptions@
GettingTheDealThrough.com

Assistant editor

Adam Myers

Editorial assistant

Lydia Gerges

Senior production editor

Jonathan Cowie

Chief subeditor

Jonathan Allen

Subeditors

Anna Andreoli
Davet Hyland
Caroline Rawson
Charlotte Stretch

Editor-in-chief

Callum Campbell

Publisher

Richard Davey

Telecoms and Media 2012

Published by
Law Business Research Ltd
87 Lancaster Road
London, W11 1QQ, UK
Tel: +44 20 7908 1188
Fax: +44 20 7229 6910
© Law Business Research Ltd 2012

No photocopying: copyright licences do not apply.

ISSN 1471-0447

The information provided in this publication is general and may not apply in a specific situation. Legal advice should always be sought before taking any legal action based on the information provided. This information is not intended to create, nor does receipt of it constitute, a lawyer-client relationship. The publishers and authors accept no responsibility for any acts or omissions contained herein. Although the information provided is accurate as of April 2012, be advised that this is a developing area.

Printed and distributed by
Encompass Print Solutions
Tel: 0844 2480 112

Law
Business
Research



Overview Laurent Garzaniti, Natasha Good and Hein Hobbelen <i>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</i>	3
Argentina Pablo Crescimbeni and María Laura Barbosa <i>Zang, Bergel & Viñes Abogados</i>	6
Australia Angus Henderson, Raymond Roca and Rebecca Iglesias <i>Webb Henderson</i>	15
Austria Bertram Burtscher and Stefan Köck <i>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</i>	29
Bahrain Eamon Holley and Alexandre Sérot <i>Telecommunications Regulatory Authority – Bahrain</i>	40
Belgium Laurent Garzaniti, Hein Hobbelen, Jan Blockx and Valerie Lefever <i>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP</i>	48
Brazil Ricardo Barretto Ferreira and Fabio Ferreira Kujawski <i>Barretto Ferreira, Kujawski e Brancher Sociedade de Advogados</i>	61
Canada David Elder <i>Stikeman Elliott LLP</i>	70
Chile Alfonso Silva and Eduardo Martin <i>Carey y Cía</i>	81
China Mark Parsons, Xun Yang, Victoria White and Longbo Wang <i>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP</i>	94
Costa Rica Eduardo Calderón, Luis Ortiz, Esteban Alfaro, José Monge and Gloriana Alvarado <i>BLP Abogados</i>	111
Cyprus Michalis Kyriakides and Penelope-Alexia Giosa <i>Harris Kyriakides LLC</i>	116
Dominican Republic Sharin Pablo de Roca, Yumari Torres de Guerra and Deborah Guzmán <i>J J Roca & Asociados</i>	125
Egypt Mohamed Hashish <i>Al Kamel Law Office</i>	132
European Union Laurent Garzaniti, Thomas Janssens, Hein Hobbelen and Diarmuid Laffan <i>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</i>	140
France Jérôme Philippe and Aude-Charlotte Guyon <i>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</i>	167
Germany Norbert Nolte and Philipp Becker <i>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</i>	181
Ghana Josiah Kojo Ankoma-Sey, Frank Nimako Akowuah and Susan-Barbara Adjorkor Kumapley <i>Bentsi-Enchill, Letsa & Ankomah</i>	192
Greece Alkis Psarras <i>Cocalis & Psarras</i>	200
Hong Kong Mark Parsons, Victoria White and Bianca Lau <i>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</i>	209
India Atul Dua, Rahul Goel and Anu Monga <i>Seth Dua & Associates</i>	227
Indonesia Noor Meurling, Toby Grainger, Dewi Sawitri and Alwin Redfordi <i>Oentoeng Suria & Partners</i>	237
Ireland Helen Kelly and Ciara Treacy <i>Matheson Ormsby Prentice</i>	245
Italy Tommaso Salonico and Luca Ulissi <i>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP</i>	266
Kenya Karim Anjarwalla, Alex Mathini and Henry Ogutu <i>Anjarwalla and Khanna Advocates</i>	279
Luxembourg Stéphan le Goueff and Hervé Wolff <i>LG Avocats</i>	288
Macedonia Dragan Dameski and Elena Miceva <i>Debarliev, Dameski & Kelesoska Attorneys at Law</i>	295
Malaysia Wong Jin Nee and Chong Tze Lin <i>Wong Jin Nee & Teo</i>	302
Mexico Bertha Alicia Ordaz Avilés and Octavio Lecona Morales <i>Greenberg Traurig, SC</i>	313
Moldova Sergiu Sitnic <i>National Regulatory Agency for Electronic Communications and Information Technologies</i>	322
Netherlands Onno Brouwer, Winfred Knibbeler and Nima Lorjé <i>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP</i>	331
New Zealand Malcolm Webb and Edward Willis <i>Webb Henderson</i>	340
Nigeria Jumoke K Lambo and Mr Godson Ogheneochuko <i>Udo Udoma & Belo-Osagie</i>	347
Philippines Rose Marie M King-Dominguez and Ruben P Acebedo II <i>SyCip Salazar Hernandez & Gatmaitan</i>	358
Poland Arwid Mednis, Bożena Marciniak and Artur Salbert <i>Wierzbowski Eversheds</i>	366
Portugal Jaime Medeiros and Mónica Oliveira Costa <i>Coelho Ribeiro e Associados</i>	377
Russia Igor Gerber and Andrey Filippenko <i>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP</i>	387
Singapore Chong Kin Lim and Charmian Aw <i>Drew & Napier LLC</i>	405
Slovakia The Telecommunications Regulatory Authority of the Slovak Republic	426
South Africa Zaid Gardner <i>Edward Nathan Sonnenbergs</i>	432
Spain Francisco Cantos, Soledad Gómez and Alejandro Milá <i>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP</i>	441
Sweden Bo Söderberg, Stefan Widmark and Martin Gynnerstedt <i>Mannheimer Swartling Advokatbyrå</i>	454
Switzerland Marcel Meinhardt, Astrid Waser and Michael Cabalzar <i>Lenz & Staehelin</i>	465
Taiwan Robert C Lee, Lisa Lin and Ivan Pan <i>YangMing Partners</i>	474
Thailand Sudharma Yoonaidharma <i>School of Law, University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce</i>	482
United Kingdom Rod Carlton, Mark Sansom and Olivia Hagger <i>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP</i>	491
United States John Nakahata, Kent Bressie, Paul Margie, Brita Strandberg and Michael Nilsson <i>Wiltshire & Grannis LLP</i>	508
Quick Reference Tables	517

United States

John Nakahata, Kent Bressie, Paul Margie, Brita Strandberg and Michael Nilsson*

Wiltshire & Grannis LLP

Communications policy

1 Policy

Summarise the regulatory framework for the telecoms and media sector. What is the policymaking procedure?

In the United States, regulatory requirements and regulators vary by technology, with multiple federal (national), state and local government agencies potentially involved. The basic sector-specific framework is established in the Communications Act of 1934 (Communications Act). The national regulator, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), regulates interstate and international telecommunications, non-military uses of RF spectrum, over-the-air broadcast television and radio, and certain aspects of cable television content, but generally not internet backbone networks or peering arrangements. State and territorial public utilities commissions (PUCs) regulate intrastate telecommunications services (ie, the endpoints of a communication fall within the borders of a single state or territory). The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) regulates trade practices, marketing, privacy, and data protection in the communications sector, except for common-carrier services. The FCC and FTC both regulate marketing activities by broadband internet service providers (ISPs). State or local government franchising authorities regulate cable operators and some telecommunications services. Local governments regulate zoning, rights of way, and wireless tower siting.

'Team Telecom' – an informal grouping of the Departments of Defense, Homeland Security, Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation – regulates national security issues with telecommunications service providers and network owners, while the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS) reviews transactions involving existing US businesses. The FTC and the US Department of Justice (DOJ) jointly regulate competition and merger control.

Policy changes can be initiated at the federal, state, or local government level. When the FCC sets rules, they override any conflicting state or local laws or requirements. The FCC sets rules through a notice-and-comment process. All final FCC rules are subject to review in the federal courts of appeal. State PUCs have similar processes for adopting rules, with the jurisdictional limits and processes varying from state to state; judicial review is generally available in the state courts.

2 Convergence

Has the telecoms-specific regulation been amended to take account of the convergence of telecoms, media and IT? Are there different legal definitions of 'telecoms' and 'media'?

The United States has not amended its telecommunications laws specifically to take account of convergence. The Communications Act is divided into separate titles for common carrier services, RF spectrum regulation and licensing (including over-the-air broadcast television and radio), and cable television regulation. The FCC asserts

jurisdiction over internet access services, but the extent of that jurisdiction remains subject to court challenge. The FCC has not decided whether voice over internet protocol (VoIP) is subject to regulation as a common carrier voice service. With respect to media, regulation of over-the-air broadcast services remains tied to the FCC's authority to grant licences for use of the RF spectrum, and is stricter than the regulation of cable television.

3 Broadcasting sector

Is broadcasting regulated separately from telecoms? If so, how?

The United States regulates television and radio broadcasting separately from telecommunications services and infrastructure. For example, a company must follow one set of rules when it provides a landline telecommunications service and another set of rules if it owned a television or radio station.

Please note that the United States regulates the delivery of television signals differently depending on how those signals reach the end-user. Broadcast television in the United States refers only to the delivery of signals over the air directly to a television. Cable television refers to the delivery of signals to a television through a terrestrial 'cable system' with distinct rules from those governing over-the-air television. Direct-to-home satellite refers to the delivery of signals to a television through the use of a satellite antenna, and is subject to yet another set of rules. Over-the-top internet video delivery has not been addressed by the FCC, but is subject to copyright rules.

Telecoms regulation – general

4 WTO Basic Telecommunications Agreement

Has your jurisdiction committed to the WTO Basic Telecommunications Agreement and, if so, with what exceptions?

The United States scheduled specific commitments as part of the so-called WTO Basic Telecommunications Agreement and adopted the WTO Reference Paper. The commitments reflect US statutory restrictions on direct foreign ownership of wireless licences (see question 6) and took Article II (most-favoured nation) exemptions for one-way satellite transmissions of direct-to-home and direct-broadcast satellite services and digital audio radio services.

5 Public/private ownership

What proportion of any telecoms operator is owned by the state or private enterprise?

Nearly all telecoms operators are private enterprises. The US government does not own any telecoms operators. Only a few small telecoms and cable operators are owned by state, tribal or local governments.

6 Foreign ownership

Do foreign ownership restrictions apply to authorisation to provide telecoms services?

Yes. The FCC applies a public interest analysis in determining whether to allow a foreign investor to enter the US telecommunications market. For international telecoms service authorisations (international section 214 authorisations), the FCC presumes that the public interest is served by direct and indirect foreign ownership (up to 100 per cent) in facilities-based and resale providers of interstate and international telecommunications services, where the investor's home country is a WTO member, and in undersea cables landing in WTO member countries. For investors from non-WTO member countries – and undersea cables landing in non-WTO member countries – the FCC will find that the public interest is served by direct and indirect foreign ownership (up to 100 per cent) only upon a finding that the investor's home country – or country of landing, in the case of an undersea cable – offers effective competitive opportunities (ECO) for US investors. The FCC determines an investor's home market and consequent WTO status by applying a principal place-of-business test.

For common carrier RF licences (for terrestrial wireless/microwave, mobile, and satellite services), under section 310(b)(4) of the Communications Act, the FCC must approve cumulative indirect foreign ownership exceeding 25 per cent. For investors from WTO member countries, investment of up to 100 per cent is presumed to be in the public interest. For investors from non-WTO member countries, the FCC permits indirect foreign ownership (up to 100 per cent) in common-carrier RF licensees only upon satisfaction of the ECO test. Regardless of whether the investor's home country is a WTO member country, section 310(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 prohibits the following from directly holding a common-carrier RF or broadcasting licence:

- a foreign government or representative thereof;
- a non-US citizen or representative thereof; or
- any US corporation of which more than 20 per cent of the capital stock is owned or voted by a foreign government or its representative, by non-US citizens or their representatives, or by a corporation not organised under the laws of the United States or its territories.

The FCC may nonetheless deny approval if the US government raises serious concerns regarding national security, law enforcement, foreign policy or trade issues, or if the entry of the foreign investor (or cable landing) into the US market presents a very high risk to competition. In practice, applications for carrier licences for facilities-based and resale international telecommunications services, common-carrier RF licenses, and non-common-carrier licences used for mobile or wireless-networking services are typically subject to national security reviews by the Team Telecom agencies. These agencies (which also review mergers and acquisitions – see questions 53 and 54) often require negotiation of security agreements or assurances letters prior to consummation.

The CFIUS reviews only acquisitions of control (eg, by merger, acquisition of stock or assets, or creation of a joint venture) by foreign persons of existing US businesses engaged in interstate commerce (as described in questions 53 and 54). The CFIUS does not review 'greenfields' investments, whereby a foreign investor creates a new US telecommunications service provider or builds new telecommunications infrastructure and applies for related FCC licences.

7 Fixed, mobile and satellite services

Comparatively, how are fixed, mobile and satellite services regulated? Under what conditions may public telephone services be provided?

Fixed providers of common-carrier services are authorised by a blanket FCC authorisation to provide interstate domestic services and

must obtain affirmative prior authorisation from the FCC pursuant to section 214 of the Communications Act (international section 214 authorisation) to provide services between US and foreign points, whether facilities-based or resale, whether using undersea cables, domestic or foreign satellites, or cross-border terrestrial facilities, and regardless of whether the traffic originates or terminates in the United States or both. For intrastate services, a fixed provider must generally be licensed by the relevant state PUC. For VoIP services that connect with the traditional telephone network, neither the FCC nor the states have generally required prior authorisation. PUC processes and requirements vary, with procedures less strict for long-distance services and more rigorous for local services. Although the FCC requires all interstate and international carriers to offer just and reasonable rates, terms and conditions, and prohibits unreasonable discrimination, in practice these are not significant constraints except for incumbent local exchange carriers.

Mobile service providers must also obtain international section 214 authorisations to provide services between US and foreign points. States cannot regulate the rates or entry of mobile service providers, but can regulate other terms and conditions. The FCC prohibits tariffing of mobile services and does not regulate prices for such services. Facilities-based mobile service operators must obtain licences or leases to use RF spectrum, except where the FCC rules permit unlicensed operation. Mobile service providers must also ensure that their handsets meet FCC interference, human radiation exposure and hearing aid compatibility requirements.

Satellite service providers similarly must obtain licences to use RF spectrum and must ensure that their handsets or antennae meet FCC interference requirements. If providing common-carrier services between US and foreign points, satellite service providers must also obtain international section 214 authorisations. They are not subject to state rate or market-entry regulation or to FCC price regulation.

Providers of domestic interstate or international telecommunications services (other than Commercial Mobile Radio Services (CMRS) for domestic services) must obtain prior FCC consent to discontinue services. Prior consent is also required to transfer ownership (as discussed in questions 50 to 54).

8 Satellite facilities and submarine cables

In addition to the requirements under question 7, do other rules apply to the establishment and operation of satellite earth station facilities and the landing of submarine cables?

Satellite space stations notified to the International Telecommunication Union by the United States or using US orbital slots, as well as transmit-receive earth stations, must be licensed by the FCC prior to launch or services commencement, respectively. Receive-only earth stations require only FCC registration. Earth stations in certain frequency bands are covered by blanket authorisations (ie, the FCC does not require individual licensing or registration). Foreign-licensed satellites may serve US earth stations only if they appear on the FCC's Permitted Space Station List.

Before installing or operating undersea cable infrastructure in the United States or its territories, an operator must first receive a cable landing licence from the FCC pursuant to the Cable Landing Licence Act of 1921. For an undersea cable to be operated on a common-carrier basis, the operator must also apply for and receive an international section 214 authorisation from the FCC, as described in question 7.

9 Universal service obligations and financing

Are there any universal service obligations? How is provision of these services financed?

Incumbent local exchange carriers (incumbent LECs) generally have state-imposed universal service obligations to meet all reasonable

requests for service within their service area. The FCC also sets voice and broadband performance and service requirements for carriers that choose to receive explicit universal service funding. Some cable companies also have requirements in franchise agreements with local or state governments to build out their networks.

The federal Universal Service Fund (USF) supports the provision of telecommunications services in high-cost areas, to low-income consumers, to rural health-care providers and to schools and libraries. The federal USF is financed by an assessment on all end-user interstate and international telecommunications revenues earned by telecommunications carriers and voice over internet protocol (VoIP) providers send and receive calls from the traditional telephone networks (interconnected VoIP). The rate at which a provider must contribute to USF varies by quarter, reaching a high of 17.9 per cent in the first quarter of 2012. Internet access is not subject to that fee.

Many states also require providers of intrastate telecommunications to contribute to state universal service programmes, and a few states require VoIP providers to contribute.

10 Operator exclusivity and limits on licence numbers

Are there any services granted exclusively to one operator or for which there are only a limited number of licences? If so, how long do such entitlements last?

The FCC does not limit the number of licences for telecommunications service providers. Regarding licences for RF spectrum, see questions 21 to 27. Some state PUCs refuse to grant operating authority to multiple intrastate telecommunications providers in rural areas.

11 Structural or functional separation

Is there a legal basis for requiring structural or functional separation between an operator's network and service activities? Has structural or functional separation been introduced or is it being contemplated?

No, the United States does not require carriers to maintain separate wholesale network and retail-service subsidiaries. In some cases the FCC or state PUCs require separation among service activities (eg, a US carrier affiliated with a carrier with market power in a foreign market must provide US-originating or terminating services to that foreign market through a subsidiary separate from the foreign carrier).

12 Number portability

Is number portability across networks possible? If so, is it obligatory?

The FCC requires telecommunications providers, including interconnected VoIP providers, to permit customers remaining within the same geographic area to switch between wire, wireless, and interconnected VoIP providers while keeping the same telephone number.

13 Authorisation timescale

Are licences or other authorisations required? How long does the licensing authority take to grant such licences or authorisations?

See questions 7 and 8 for a description of the US licensing regime for telecommunications services and infrastructure. Although the FCC has adopted detailed licensing timelines (for example, a 14-day streamlined review for most international section 214 applications, a 45-day streamlined review for most cable landing licence applications, and a statutory 30-day review for applications involving common-carrier wireless, mobile, and transmit-receive satellite earth station applications), these are typically suspended in cases involving aggregate foreign ownership exceeding 10 per cent, as Team Telecom (discussed in question 6) generally asks the FCC to defer action on such applications pending sometimes lengthy national-security reviews. See questions 50 to 54 for a description of the timing of

consents for mergers, stock and asset-based acquisitions, and joint ventures (JVs) for the telecommunications and broadcasting sectors.

14 Licence duration

What is the normal duration of licences?

Licence durations vary by service and infrastructure type. International section 214 authorisations have no set term or expiration date. Cable landing licences have a 25-year term. Commercial wireless licences, private microwave and industrial wireless licences, and transmit-receive satellite earth station authorisations generally have 10-year terms. These licences are generally eligible for renewal so long as the licensee has complied with the relevant FCC service rules. Cable systems are generally authorised by local franchising authorities for a set term, subject to renewal.

15 Fees

What fees are payable for each type of authorisation?

The FCC assesses application processing fees for new and modified-licence applications involving telecommunications and broadcasting services and infrastructure and for applications seeking consent for transactions involving transfers or assignments of FCC licences. The FCC also assesses annual regulatory fees for the providers it regulates. All of these fees vary by licence and service type; the FCC revises application processing fees periodically and regulatory fees annually.

The FCC also assesses fees for a variety of federal programmes involving providers of interstate telecommunications and interconnected VoIP, including: federal universal service (as discussed in question 9); relay services for the hearing-impaired; numbering administration; and number portability.

State and territorial fees and contributions vary by jurisdiction.

16 Modification and assignment of licence

How may licences be modified? Are licences assignable or able to be pledged as security for financing purposes?

FCC procedures and requirements for licence modifications vary significantly by licence type and service, and, in some cases, by whether the modification is 'major' or 'minor.' The FCC permits assignments of many types of licences, though it distinguishes between a pro forma assignment of a licence or transfer of control of a licensee (where ultimate control of the licence does not change, such as with an internal corporate reorganisation) and a substantial assignment or transfer of control to an unrelated third party. Substantial assignments and transfers of control generally require prior FCC consent.

FCC licences may not be pledged as security for financing purposes. Nevertheless, a lender may take a security interest in the proceeds of the sale of an FCC licence. Lenders are also permitted to take a pledge of the shares of a company holding an FCC licence, though FCC consent must be obtained prior to a lender consummating any post-default transfer of control of an FCC licensee or assignment of an FCC licence. In structuring arrangements for protection in the event of a borrower default or insolvency, lenders, security-interest holders and FCC licensees need to be mindful of the FCC's rules on security interests and requirements for transfers of control and assignments, whether voluntary or involuntary.

17 Retail tariffs

Are national retail tariffs regulated? If so, which operators' tariffs are regulated and how?

The FCC generally prohibits filing of tariffs for almost all retail domestic interstate and international telecommunications services, except for certain specialised situations, local exchange

carriers (both incumbents and non-incumbents) providing an interstate access service (access to local networks for origination or termination of non-local traffic), providers of international telecommunications services regulated as dominant (ie, having market power) on particular routes to particular foreign countries, and certain services where tariffing is optional. State PUCs typically require tariffing of local-exchange and intrastate long-distance services.

18 Customer terms and conditions

Must customer terms and conditions be filed with, or approved by, the regulator or other body? Are customer terms and conditions subject to specific rules?

States regulate customer terms and conditions for intrastate, including local, services, frequently with advance filing or approval. The FCC does not require the advance filing of customer terms and conditions for any interstate services, other than a portion of local telephone service. Both the FCC and state PUCs generally require terms and conditions that are reasonable and non-misleading.

For non-common carrier services, the FTC also has jurisdiction to regulate misleading or unfair terms and conditions. The states' attorneys general also police false, misleading, or unfair terms and conditions. Neither the FTC nor state attorneys general require advance filing or approval.

19 Next-Generation Access networks

How are NGA networks regulated?

The FCC treats all broadband internet access networks, such as ISPs as information services subject only to minimal regulation, rather than as common carriers (as discussed in question 7). Nevertheless, the FCC prohibits traffic blocking by all ISPs and unreasonable discrimination in the transmission of traffic across their internet access networks by fixed-line ISPs (see question 32). The FCC also requires internet access networks to comply with surveillance and law-enforcement assistance requirements, as described in question 47. The FCC generally has declined to regulate internet backbone networks or backbone traffic-exchange arrangements (ie, peering agreements).

20 Changes to telecoms law

Are any major changes planned to the telecoms laws?

Fundamental changes to telecom laws are unlikely in the near future. The most likely changes would occur in the areas of spectrum auctions and copyright law (fighting copyright piracy and modifying statutory copyright licences used for broadcast television programming).

Telecoms regulation – Mobile

21 Radio frequency (RF) requirements

For wireless services, are radio frequency (RF) licences required in addition to telecoms services authorisations and are they available on a competitive or non-competitive basis? How are RF licences allocated? Do RF licences restrict the use of the licensed spectrum?

In addition to telecoms services authorisations, facilities-based wireless service providers must have an RF licence, unless they operate exclusively in unlicensed bands. In most circumstances, the FCC must grant terrestrial RF licences by auction if there are two or more competing applications. Pre-auction FCC rulemakings establish spectrum blocks to be auctioned, geographic areas covered, licence terms, service rules including technical and interference-related rules, and network build-out rules. In some cases, the FCC limits the entities eligible to participate in the auction. Some satellite services do not

require an auction. In bands designated for unlicensed use, users can operate under specific technical rules without an FCC licence.

22 Radio spectrum

Is there a regulatory framework for the assignment of unused radio spectrum (refarming)? Do RF licences generally specify the permitted use of the licensed spectrum or can RF licences for some spectrum leave the permitted use unrestricted?

The FCC has the authority to reallocate (change the permitted use or permitted class of user) or reassign (change the entity authorised to use particular frequencies in a particular geography) RF spectrum. The FCC is more likely to consider such changes when changes in technology or the marketplace render its rules obsolete. The FCC may also revoke a licence for failure to meet licensee qualification or fitness requirements, for violations of FCC build-out rules, or in situations when a licensee voluntarily returns its authorisation. FCC rules specify the permitted use of most licensed spectrum. However, more recently the FCC has made spectrum available without detailed use restrictions, instead setting technical rules related to interference, but leaving flexible the use of the spectrum and facilitating spectrum trading.

23 Spectrum trading

Is licensed RF spectrum tradable?

The FCC permits spectrum licences to be transferred or assigned, subject to FCC consent (as explained in questions 50 to 54) so long as speculation is not the principal purpose the transaction. In approving any transfer or assignment of spectrum, the FCC considers competition, spectrum-aggregation, and prior compliance issues. The FCC permits partitioning (assignments of the licence in part of the licensed areas) and disaggregation (assignments of some, but not all, frequencies in the licensed area) subject to FCC consent. The FCC also permits leasing of RF spectrum, with the nature of the FCC review depending on the nature of the lease.

24 Mobile virtual network operator (MVNO) and national roaming traffic

Are any mobile network operators expressly obliged to carry MVNO or national roaming traffic?

The FCC does not require mobile network operators to offer resale or roaming arrangements to MVNOs. The FCC, however, requires facilities-based carriers to offer other facilities-based carriers voice roaming upon reasonable request and on a 'just, reasonable, and non-discriminatory' basis, and data roaming on 'commercially reasonable terms and conditions,' subject to certain limitations.

25 Mobile call termination

Does the originating calling party or the receiving party pay for the charges to terminate a call on mobile networks? Is call termination regulated, and, if so, how?

US carriers generally follow a receiving-party-pays model for termination of calls on mobile networks. The FCC does not regulate carriers' decisions on whether to charge the calling party or the receiving party for origination or termination on mobile networks. Landline termination of mobile originated calls generally follows a calling party's carrier pays model, although the FCC is transitioning to a regime without inter-carrier origination and termination charges.

26 International mobile roaming

Are wholesale and retail charges for international mobile roaming regulated?

The FCC does not specifically regulate wholesale or retail charges for international mobile roaming, though international roaming charges are subject to general just-and-reasonable-offering and non-discrimination requirements for telecommunications services.

27 Next-generation mobile services

Is there any regulation for the roll-out of 3G, 3.5G or 4G mobile service?

The FCC does not require carriers to use particular commercial mobile air interfaces or generations of such air interfaces. Individual RF spectrum bands or licences may include build-out requirements.

Telecoms regulation – fixed infrastructure**28 Cable networks**

Is ownership of cable networks, in particular by telecoms operators, restricted?

Neither the FCC nor state or local franchising authorities impose foreign-ownership or other ownership restrictions on cable networks, though the transfer and assignment of cable franchises almost always requires prior consent of the franchising authority. The FCC restricts acquisition of local exchange carriers by cable operators in the same area, and vice versa.

29 Local loop

Is there any specific rule regarding access to the local loop or local loop unbundling? What type of local loop is covered?

Incumbent LECs must unbundle the entire time division multiplexed function of the loop, or must provide access to spare home run copper loops. Advanced fibre loops and packet-switched features of loops are not required to be unbundled.

30 Interconnection and access

How is interconnection regulated? Can the regulator intervene to resolve disputes between operators? Are wholesale (interconnect) prices controlled and, if so, how? Are wholesale access services regulated, and, if so, how?

All telecommunications carriers are required to negotiate direct or indirect interconnection with all other telecommunications carriers. All LECs (both incumbent and non-incumbent) are required to enter into traffic exchange agreements (often called 'reciprocal compensation agreements') with other telecommunications carriers. All incumbent LECs must negotiate direct interconnection with any requesting telecommunications carrier at any technically feasible point. Interconnection arrangements between incumbent LECs and other carriers are subject to arbitration by state public utility commissions, with prices subject to cost-based requirements. However, these agreements frequently cover only the exchange of local telecommunications traffic. The origination or termination of long distance calls is subject to a separate interconnection and traffic exchange system, called 'access charges,' described further below.

For CMRS, either the CMRS carrier or the incumbent LEC can request arbitration of the formation of the interconnection agreement by the state public utility commission. Interconnection arrangements between CMRS carriers and non-incumbent LECs, and between two non-incumbent LECs, are generally not subject to arbitration by the state public utility commission or any other regulator. Beginning in July 2012, the default traffic-exchange arrangement between a CMRS carrier and an incumbent LEC for traffic within the

boundaries of a major trading area will be bill-and-keep (ie, no usage-based compensation will be paid). Intercarrier compensation for traffic that crosses Major Trading Area boundaries is subject to the 'access charge' system.

'Access charges' is a system of tariffed interconnection and compensation under which LECs charge long-distance or CMRS carriers for the origination or termination of long-distance (but not local) traffic. The rates, terms and conditions for access charges for long distance interstate and international calls are regulated by the FCC. The rates, terms and conditions access charges for intrastate long distance calls are regulated, if at all, by the state public utility commissions. The FCC is phasing out the access charge system, beginning 1 July 2012, in favour of a unified traffic exchange system that will eliminate termination, and possibly origination, charges.

Telecoms regulation – internet services**31 Internet services**

How are internet services, including voice over the internet, regulated?

Internet services are generally not subject to extensive regulation in the United States. Internet access services are not treated as common-carrier services but instead as non-regulated information services, except if a provider chooses to offer internet access transmission as a common-carrier service.

Interconnected VoIP (VoIP services that can place calls to and receive calls from the traditional telephone network) must comply with significant regulatory requirements, including those for law enforcement access, emergency calling, universal service funding, disability access, funding of telecommunications services for the deaf, customer privacy, and number portability. The FCC, however, preempted state PUC regulation of at least nomadic interconnected VoIP services (those that can be used at more than one fixed site). Some PUCs assert authority to regulate fixed interconnected VoIP services.

VoIP services that can only send or receive calls (but not both) from the traditional telephone network (referred to as 'non-interconnected VoIP') are also assessed fees to support telecommunications services for the deaf. The FCC is considering whether to extend additional regulatory obligations to non-interconnected VoIP.

32 Internet service provision

Are there limits on an internet service provider's freedom to control or prioritise the type or source of data that it delivers? Are there any other specific regulations or guidelines on net neutrality?

Yes, the FCC has adopted rules imposing three fundamental obligations on mass market broadband ISPs: transparency; no blocking; and no unreasonable discrimination.

Transparency

Broadband ISPs must publicly disclose accurate information regarding network management practices, network performance and commercial terms governing their broadband internet access services.

No blocking

Fixed ISPs must not block lawful content, applications, services, or non-harmful devices. Mobile ISPs must not block access to lawful websites or applications that compete with the provider's voice or video telephony services, including services provided by entities in which the provider has an 'attributable interest.' Blocking includes degradation that would render content, applications, services, or devices 'effectively unusable' and includes the practice of charging a fee for unblocking. ISPs may, however, engage in 'reasonable network management,' which is network management 'appropriate and tailored to achieving a legitimate network management purpose,

taking into account the particular network architecture and technology of the broadband internet access service.’

No unreasonable discrimination

Fixed ISPs must not ‘unreasonably discriminate’ in transmitting lawful traffic, again subject to exceptions for reasonable network management. Usage-based or tiered pricing does not constitute unreasonable discrimination as long as it is not anti-competitive. ISPs may also prioritise emergency communications. Because the rules protect lawful content, they do not prohibit efforts to address copyright infringement or other illegal activities.

33 Financing of basic broadband and NGA networks

Is there a government financial scheme to promote basic broadband or NGA broadband penetration?

In 2012, the FCC modified its Universal Service Fund to require carriers that receive support to provide broadband as well as voice services and to expand coverage and throughput speeds. Much of this remains in development.

The Rural Utilities Service of the US Department of Agriculture also provides loans and grants to support next-generation network deployment in rural areas.

Media regulation

34 Ownership restrictions

Is the ownership or control of broadcasters restricted? May foreign investors participate in broadcasting activities in your jurisdiction?

Media ownership is subject to restrictions, including limits on: ownership of multiple broadcast television stations in a single market; ownership of broadcast television stations reaching a certain percentage of the population; ownership of broadcast radio stations within a local market; cross-ownership of broadcast television and radio stations within a local market; cross-ownership of broadcast television or radio stations and newspapers in the same geographic area; service to a certain percentage of the population by a single cable operator; ownership by a cable operator of a certain percentage of the channels it carries; ownership of two or more of the ‘top four’ television networks (ABC, CBS, FOX and NBC).

Foreign investors may own up to 20 per cent directly, or 25 per cent indirectly, of broadcast television, broadcast radio, and direct broadcast satellite systems and may hold greater interests indirectly if the FCC finds such to be in the public interest. However, the FCC has never knowingly authorised greater than 25 per cent indirect foreign ownership of a broadcast licensee.

In enforcing all of these ownership rules, the FCC applies a complicated set of ‘attribution’ rules that include a broad range of financial or other interests denoting ownership, control and influence.

35 Cross-ownership

Are there any regulations in relation to the cross-ownership of media companies, including radio, television and newspapers? Is there any suggestion of change to regulation of such cross-ownership given the emergence of ‘new media’ platforms?

Please see question 34.

36 Licensing requirements

What are the licensing requirements for broadcasting, including the fees payable and the timescale for the necessary authorisations?

Television and radio stations are licensed individually. Cable systems are not ‘licensed’ by the FCC, but instead are ‘franchised’ by state and local governments. Cable systems, however, nearly always use

satellite or wireless infrastructure licensed by the FCC. Direct-to-home satellites and certain satellite earth stations are licensed by the FCC. Licence applicants must pay an application fee, which depends on the asset to be licensed.

As new licences are often unavailable or difficult to obtain, entities typically obtain broadcast, cable, and satellite assets through an assignment of the licence or a transfer of control of the entity controlling the licence, subject to the consent requirements described in questions 50 to 54.

37 Foreign programmes and local content requirements

Are there any regulations concerning the broadcasting of foreign-produced programmes? Do the rules require a minimum amount of local content? What types of media (eg, online, mobile content) are outside of this regime?

The United States does not regulate the broadcasting of foreign-produced programmes or impose local content requirements (except for low-power broadcasters). Cable operators must often carry public, educational, and governmental programming chosen by the local franchising authority. Satellite carriers are subject to a similar public interest allocation. Broadcasters must air certain amounts of children’s programming. Over-the-air broadcasters (but not cable and satellite carriers) are also subject to certain restrictions on indecent programming.

38 Advertising

How is broadcast media advertising regulated? Is online advertising subject to the same regulation?

Broadcast television is subject to FCC restrictions on: advertising in children’s programming; advertising of tobacco products; and advertising of lotteries and certain games of chance. The FTC (among other entities) prohibits all entities from engaging in false and misleading advertising, regardless of the technology used. The FTC also enforces the CAN-SPAM Act, which restricts commercial e-mails.

39 Must-carry obligations

Are there regulations specifying a basic package of programmes that must be carried by operators’ broadcasting distribution networks, (ie, ‘must-carry obligations’)? Is there a mechanism for financing the costs of such obligations?

Cable operators (and, with slight modifications, direct-to-home satellite providers) are subject to must-carry obligations.

Full-power, commercial broadcast television stations must submit an election to each distributor (cable or satellite operator) in its ‘local market’ every three years. Those that elect ‘must-carry’ receive automatic carriage (with some exceptions), but no money can be exchanged. Those that elect ‘retransmission consent’ cannot be carried by distributors in the absence of a written agreement, but can be refused carriage. In many, but not all, cases distributors must pay such ‘retransmission consent stations’ for carriage rights. Neither the must-carry nor the retransmission consent regime covers copyright issues, which are handled under separate highly complex statutory licences.

40 Changes to the broadcasting laws

Are there any changes planned to the broadcasting laws? In particular, do the regulations relating to traditional broadcast activities also apply to broadcasting to mobile devices or are there specific rules for those services?

With respect to laws governing over-the-air broadcasting, Congress is considering legislation to permit two-sided auctions of broadcast spectrum to allow existing licensees to sell their spectrum through

an FCC-organised process for use in mobile or broadband applications. Major changes are not expected in the laws governing cable or satellite transmission.

Broadcasting to mobile devices is not subject to the same FCC rules as traditional over-the-air broadcasting, but copyright laws apply. As such delivery becomes more common, however, some changes can be expected. Notably, the FCC will now require some programming delivered to certain mobile devices to be close-captioned, and will require such devices to decode and render such captioning.

41 Regulation of new media content

Is new media content and its delivery regulated differently from traditional broadcast media? How?

New media content is very lightly regulated compared to content delivered by over-the-air broadcasting, cable, and satellite. That said, as new media delivery begins to compete with and replace more traditional modes of delivery, we expect the government to increasingly apply regulations. As described above, the first serious effort in this direction has to do with closed captioning.

42 Digital switchover

When is the switchover from analogue to digital broadcasting required or when did it occur? How will radio frequencies freed up by the switchover be reallocated?

The switchover for most broadcast television stations occurred in 2009. Low-power stations, however, still transmit in analogue. The FCC reallocated that spectrum to commercial mobile services, some of which remains to be auctioned, and to a nationwide public safety network.

43 Digital formats

Does regulation restrict how broadcasters can use their spectrum (multichannelling, high definition, data services)?

No, but broadcasters must retain at least one channel of free, over-the-air broadcast programming; and remit 5 per cent of any income derived from ancillary services.

Regulatory agencies

44 Regulatory agencies

Which body or bodies regulate the communications sector? Is the telecoms regulator separate from the broadcasting regulator?

See question 1.

45 Establishment of regulatory agencies

How is each regulator established and to what extent is it independent of network operators, service providers and government?

The FCC, FTC, DOJ, and the CFIUS are all established by federal law. Team Telecom is an informal working group of Executive Branch departments that does not act pursuant to any particular law. State public utility commissions and local cable franchising authorities are established by state law or local ordinance. All of these entities are independent of network operators and service providers.

46 Appeal procedure

How can decisions of the regulators be challenged and on what bases?

Final FCC decisions (including new or revised FCC rules) are subject to judicial review. In reviewing licensing and rulemaking

decisions, courts evaluate whether the FCC acted arbitrarily, capriciously or otherwise not in accordance with the law. Courts defer to the FCC's reasonable interpretation of ambiguous statutory provisions. Decisions by FCC bureaus are subject to review by the FCC's commissioners; such review must be completed prior to any judicial review. Enforcement actions are subject to de novo review in federal trial courts, unless the FCC held an evidentiary hearing.

Data retention, interception and use

47 Interception and data protection

Do any special rules require operators to assist government in certain conditions to intercept telecommunications messages? Explain the interaction between interception and data protection and privacy laws.

The Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (CALEA) requires telecommunications providers (including interconnected VoIP providers), equipment manufacturers and support service providers to cooperate with authorised electronic surveillance needs of law enforcement and national security agencies. Subject providers must have the capability to enable properly authorised law enforcement officials to intercept communications and obtain call-identifying information from their customers, as well as the capacity to meet the surveillance needs of properly authorised law enforcement officials. Pursuant to a court order or other lawful authorisation, carriers must be able to:

- expeditiously isolate all wire and electronic communications of a target transmitted by the carrier within its service area;
- expeditiously isolate call-identifying information of a target;
- provide intercepted communications and call-identifying information to law enforcement; and
- carry out intercepts unobtrusively, so targets are not made aware of the electronic surveillance, and in a manner that does not compromise the privacy and security of other communications.

CALEA requires carriers to protect the privacy and security of communications and call-identifying information that has not been authorised for interception. Failure to comply with the CALEA obligations can result in civil penalties. The attorney general may enforce these obligations by seeking an order from a federal district court.

Federal privacy statutes generally require carriers and providers to disclose certain consumer information in response to lawful government processes. Statutes differ on whether consumers must be notified and given an opportunity to challenge the disclosure.

48 Data retention and disclosure obligations

What are the obligations for operators and service providers to retain customer data? What are the corresponding disclosure obligations? Will they be compensated for their efforts?

Federal regulations require each telecommunications common carrier that offers or bills toll telephone service to retain billing-record data for a period of 18 months. Carriers are required to protect the confidentiality of such data except as otherwise required by law. Under the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, the US government may require an ISP to preserve communications in its possession for up to 180 days pending issuance of a court order or other legal process.

49 Unsolicited communications

Does regulation prohibit unsolicited communications (eg, by e-mail, SMS)? Are there exceptions to the prohibition?

Federal and state laws prohibit unsolicited communications by telephone, fax, e-mail, or SMS (text message), except for categories of service to which customers already subscribe, although

Update and trends

Reform of Termination Charges

The FCC has commenced a transition of all intercarrier termination charges to 'bill-and-keep.' This substantially alters how local carriers derive revenue. The initial phases of the transition are scheduled to begin 1 July 2012.

Subsidy Reform

The FCC is also revising its subsidies for service to rural areas. The FCC is eliminating most mobile subsidies. The FCC is also limiting subsidies for small carriers, and migrating large carrier subsidies to broadband in addition to voice.

ISP Regulation

The FCC's no blocking and non-discrimination requirements on ISPs took effect in late 2011. Pending court challenges could determine the extent of the FCC's ability to regulate internet access services (and possibly other internet protocol services) in the absence of new legislation.

National Security

The US national security reviews by Team Telecom and CFIOUS continue to generate considerable anxiety among foreign investors considering US entry. Notwithstanding US WTO commitments to make publicly available the licensing criteria and 'the period of time normally required to reach a decision concerning an application for a licence,' there is little predictability in the process or timing for obtaining a new licence or transaction approval involving foreign investment. Reviews

and conditions can affect corporate governance, personnel, and other operational matters. As the CFIOUS scrutinises transactions across all economic sectors, prior concerns about investment from particular countries (eg, China and Middle Eastern countries) or from sovereign wealth funds can have spillover effects in later telecom or media transactions.

VoIP Regulation

The FCC is increasingly imposing traditional telecom regulations on VoIP providers, including, for the first time, not only interconnected VoIP but also non-interconnected VoIP. This trend could result in regulations and payment obligations applying new companies.

Licensed and Unlicensed Spectrum Reform

The government is working to make more spectrum available for commercial use. Important potential changes include giving the FCC the power to conduct incentive auctions to reallocate spectrum assigned to incumbents, and new rules related to unlicensed technology, smart radios, and database-controlled dynamic radios.

Accessibility Regulation

The government is aggressively increasing obligations on service providers and manufacturers to make telecommunications and media services and devices accessible to people with disabilities. New rules impose technologically specific mandates, tight time frames and substantial penalties for non-compliance.

telecommunications service providers may, subject to certain restrictions, send marketing communications to their customers. Enforcement occurs through FCC, FTC, and state-government actions, and through private lawsuits.

Competition and merger control

50 Competition and telecoms and broadcasting regulation

What is the scope of the general competition authority and the sectoral regulators in the telecoms, broadcasting and new media sectors? Are there mechanisms to avoid conflicting jurisdiction? Is there a specific mechanism to ensure the consistent application of competition and sectoral regulation? Are there special rules for this sector and how do competition regulators handle the interaction of old and new media?

The DOJ and FTC regulate vertical and horizontal anti-competitive effects in the telecoms, broadcasting and new media sectors pursuant to general US antitrust laws, particularly the Sherman and Clayton Acts. The FTC also regulates unfair and deceptive trade practices in these and other sectors pursuant to the Federal Trade Commission Act. The FCC regulates competition-related issues in the telecommunications and broadcasting sectors under the Communications Act's public interest standard. State attorneys general enforce state-level competition and consumer protection laws, and private litigants enforce federal and state competition laws through damages claims. While there is no single mechanism to ensure the consistent treatment of competition-related issues, the DOJ, FTC, and FCC regularly coordinate their reviews in an attempt to avoid conflicting results and undue delay. State and local authorities generally operate independently of the DOJ, FTC, and FCC.

51 Competition law in the telecoms and broadcasting sectors

Are anti-competitive practices in these sectors controlled by regulation or general competition law? Which regulator controls these practices?

Anti-competitive practices are controlled both through ex ante and ex post, sector-specific regulation, and by general competition (ie, antitrust) law. Jurisdiction among all regulators is concurrent.

52 Jurisdictional thresholds for review

What are the jurisdictional thresholds and substantive tests for regulatory or competition law review of telecoms sector mergers, acquisitions and joint ventures? Do these differ for transactions in the broadcasting and new media sector?

All mergers, acquisitions and joint ventures that involve the transfer or assignment of FCC licences (including service under the blanket domestic common carrier authorisation) require prior approval under the Communications Act, regardless of whether such transactions involve the telecoms, broadcasting or new media sectors. While the antitrust laws generally do not have a minimum jurisdictional threshold, the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 (HSR Act) requires that the DOJ and FTC receive pre-merger notification if the transaction meets the 'size of transaction' or 'size of persons' thresholds. As of January 2012, a transaction must be notified if it is valued at more than US\$68.2 million or if one of the parties has sales or assets of at least US\$136.4 million and the other party has sales or assets of at least US\$13.6 million.

Other

53 Merger control authorities

Which regulatory or competition authorities are responsible for the review of mergers, acquisitions and joint ventures in the telecoms, broadcasting and new media sectors?

As discussed in question 52, pursuant to the HSR Act, DOJ and the FTC share jurisdiction for reviewing all mergers, acquisitions, and JVs involving providers of telecommunications, broadcasting, and new media, with the lead reviewing agency determined by sector or by transaction. The FCC, PUCs and state or local franchising authorities also review mergers, acquisitions (including asset sales and licence transfers), and JVs that involve authorisations or franchises that they issue. Each of these processes is separate.

The Team Telecom agencies (as described in question 6) conduct national-security reviews of mergers and acquisitions in the telecoms and broadcasting sectors (and the new media sector, if there are FCC licences to be transferred or assigned in the transaction) and often require negotiation of security agreements or assurances letters prior

to consummation. The Team Telecom agencies do not act pursuant to any particular law.

Pursuant to question 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, the CFIUS reviews acquisitions of control (including mergers, acquisitions of stock or assets, and JVs) by foreign persons of existing US businesses engaged in interstate commerce in any economic sector (known as 'covered transactions'). The CFIUS scrutinises the impact of a transaction on national security and gives particular attention to foreign (and foreign-government) ownership of the acquirer and the US business's contracts benefiting US government agencies. CFIUS reviews are initiated by parties to a transaction or the CFIUS itself. Failure to obtain CFIUS clearance for a covered transaction gives the president the power to unwind the transaction at any point in the future. Unlike the FCC, which defines 'control' as majority equity ownership, voting control, or management control, the CFIUS may consider as 'control' any prospective investment other than the acquisition of an outstanding voting interest of 10 per cent or less acquired solely for the purpose of passive investment. For a transaction involving CFIUS or Team Telecom review, the FCC will generally not grant consent without prior clearance by Team Telecom and the CFIUS.

54 Procedure and timescale

What are the procedures and associated timescales for review and approval of telecoms and broadcasting mergers, acquisitions and joint ventures?

DOJ and FTC reviews are generally subject to a minimum 30-day initial review period. In transactions subject to a 'second request' of the parties, the review can take significantly longer.

For 'major transactions' involving significant competition or public-interest issues, the FCC reviews transactions pursuant to a suggested 180-day time frame, though it often stops and later restarts the clock, resulting in a lengthier review. For routine transactions, the specific procedures and timescales for approving licence transfers and assignments vary by licence type and by FCC bureau. The procedures and associated timescales for state and local reviews of transactions involving intrastate telecommunications providers and cable operators vary greatly from jurisdiction to jurisdiction; these state or local reviews, however, can take longer than the FCC's review.

There are no formal procedures or established timescales for Team Telecom reviews, which can last from a few weeks to 18 months. The CFIUS conducts an initial 30-day review of a covered transaction (as defined in question 53). It may subsequently conduct a 45-day investigation for a transaction involving more significant national security issues (and must do so for transactions that would result in foreign government control of a US business), with a further 15 days for presidential action to block a transaction. In total, the CFIUS process should not last more than 90 days, although parties sometimes withdraw and refile transactions in order to provide the CFIUS with additional time for review.

* *Contributing authors to this article also include Wiltshire & Grannis partners Madeleine Findley and Jonathan Mirsky, and associate Darah Franklin.*

Wiltshire & Grannis LLP

John Nakahata
Kent Bressie
Paul Margie
Brita Strandberg
Michael Nilsson

jnakahata@wiltshiregrannis.com
kbressie@wiltshiregrannis.com
pmargie@wiltshiregrannis.com
bstrandberg@wiltshiregrannis.com
mnilsson@wiltshiregrannis.com

1200 18th Street, NW
 Suite 1200
 Washington, DC 20036
 United States

Tel: +1 202 730 1300
 Fax: +1 202 730 1301
www.wiltshiregrannis.com



Annual volumes published on:

Air Transport	Licensing
Anti-Corruption Regulation	Life Sciences
Arbitration	Merger Control
Banking Regulation	Mergers & Acquisitions
Cartel Regulation	Mining
Climate Regulation	Oil Regulation
Construction	Patents
Copyright	Pharmaceutical Antitrust
Corporate Governance	Private Antitrust Litigation
Corporate Immigration	Private Equity
Dispute Resolution	Product Liability
Dominance	Product Recall
e-Commerce	Project Finance
Electricity Regulation	Public Procurement
Enforcement of Foreign Judgments	Real Estate
Environment	Restructuring & Insolvency
Franchise	Right of Publicity
Gas Regulation	Securities Finance
Insurance & Reinsurance	Shipping
Intellectual Property & Antitrust	Tax on Inbound Investment
Labour & Employment	Telecoms and Media
	Trademarks
	Vertical Agreements



For more information or to purchase books, please visit:
www.GettingTheDealThrough.com



The Official Research Partner of
the International Bar Association



Strategic research partners of
the ABA International section