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## 1 Overview

## Current Situation for Service Providers

- Consumer use and Internet traffic are skyrocketing
- Fixed broadband ARPU has stagnated
- Usage-based pricing may provide SPs with tool to manage traffic and spur new revenue
- However, SPs must proceed carefully

Monthly Internet Consumption per U.S. User (in GB)


Source: Cisco Visual Networking Index (VNI) Global Forecast, 2011

North American Cable Broadband ARPU


Base: Range between 8 and 13 companies reporting
Source: Infonetics, Worldwide Service Provider Update, September 2010

# Usage-Based Pricing Can Be a Tool To Catalyze New Revenue 

Consumers are using the Internet more and are protective of their broadband access


Usage-based pricing ties pricing to the value consumers receivetheir use of the Internet
"Data revenue growth was $3.8 \%$ for our residential services business. . . driven through an increase in Internet ARPU of 3.3\%-almost all of that increase now coming from usagebased billing as the demand for Internet use explodes."


George Cope CEO, Bell Canada Enterprises

August 2010
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# Consumer Spending for Fixed Broadband Access Has Stagnated 

- SPs' focus on bundling and speed has molded consumers' perception of broadband value
$-92 \%$ of fixed broadband in U. S. is provided as part of a bundle
-Speed is second in importance only to price as a purchase consideration when choosing a broadband provider
- However, speed is no longer a factor that can drive ARPU growth

Consumers could select all that apply. Total does not equal 100\%.

## Proceed Carefully: Consumers and Regulators Are Wary

- Public outcry has resulted in significant regulatory and market actions:
-2008: U.S. FCC orders Comcast to halt throttling
-2009: Time Warner Cable revokes its experimental usage caps
-2011: Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) is reexamining all usage-based policies in response to consumer outrage sparked by January 2011 CRTC decision


## Consumer Perception of Usage-Based Pricing



## Proceed Carefully: Consumers in Western Europe Are Also Wary

While broadband consumers in the United Kingdom are more likely to accept usagebased pricing, the majority of Western Europeans still consider it unfair

Consumer Perception of Usage-Based Pricing



Italy


## Usage-Based Pricing Can Support Both SP and Consumer Objectives

Broadband Consumer Segments by Usage

| Non-Users |  | Low-Volume Users | Average <br> High-Volume <br> Users |  |  | BB Cap Abusers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consumer Concerns |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Impact to Consumer | Lower barriers to adoption | Some consumers will save money | No disruption for most users |  | Some consumers will spend more | Preserve experience for whole and enable access for largest users |
| Service Provider Concerns |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Impact to <br> Revenue | Gain new adopters | Initially some revenue increase due to highest tiers <br> Greatest impact over time as consumers self-migrate to higher tiers |  |  |  |  |
| Cisco IBSG © 2012 Cis | and/or its affliates. Al | Whis reserved. | Cisco Public | $\rightarrow$ | net Business Solution | Group |

## Usage-Based Pricing Strategies Support SPs' Overall Strategies

- SPs must tie consumer value to consumer broadband use or risk commoditization
- Usage-based pricing can be a flexible tool in every SP's toolkit, supporting varied SP strategies:
-For SPs focused on maximizing revenue from existing assets, usage-based pricing optimizes ARPU as consumers move to higher-priced tiers
-For SPs who see OTTs as potential partners, usage based-pricing creates a need for third parties to partner with SPs to eliminate usage concerns for their end users
-For SPs who see OTTs as direct competition, usage-based pricing provides SPs with a lever they can use to curtail OTT activity
- Usage-based pricing enables SPs to align their customers' perception of value more closely with the underlying broadband service delivered


## Usage-Based Pricing in the United States \& Canada

# U.S. Broadband Providers Move Toward Usage-Based Pricing 

|  | Throttling | Usage Caps | Usage Tiers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Timeline | 2007-2008 | $2008 \rightarrow$ | $2011 \rightarrow$ |
| Impact | Consumers' experience degraded if they overused the service | Customers' service terminated for using too much of the service; revenue opportunity lost | Matches price paid to most valued factor-volume of usage-providing reasonable options for heavy- to low-volume users |
| Market Activity | - Comcast began throttling heavy P2P users <br> - Following public outcry, FCC investigated and ordered Comcast to cease throttling | - Majority of U.S. ISPs have usage caps. Comcast instituted 250GB cap in 2008. Other ISPs followed suit, including AT\&T, with 150GB cap for DSL and 250GB cap for U-verse. $56 \%$ of consumers covered by a cap. | - Time Warner Cable has invested in capability to enable usagebased price and is considering it - FCC chairman supports usagebased pricing, but FCC is divided on the issue and there are questions about its legal authority here |
| Key <br> Lessons <br> Learned | - Stay clear of practices that discriminate against users or Internet destinations; can violate net neutrality. <br> - Minimize consumer disruption and confusion. Avoid rollouts that differ by territory, or consumption caps that vary significantly from consumers' usage behavior. <br> - Consumers will need tools to accurately estimate consumption. |  |  |

Source: Cisco IBSG, 2012

| Cisco IBSG © 2012 Cisco and/or its affiliates. All rights reserved. | Cisco Public | Internet Business Solutions Group |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

## Lack of Understanding Likely Fuels Poor Consumer Perception

- Consumption is a sophisticated calculation; it will take time, education, and tools for consumers to feel comfortable estimating consumption
- Actual consumption will vary based on many factors (mostly technical), fueling consumer distrust and frustration:
—File type (email vs. video)
—File format (HD vs. SD)
—Time x Network Throughput (time alone will not provide clear estimate)
-Compression standards (such as Codec)

Consumption Varies by Device \& Service
Consumption $=2.5 \mathrm{~GB}$


Consumption Varies by Providers' Content-Management Policies
Consumption for 30 hours of Netflix viewing


## U.S. Broadband Providers Inch Toward Tiered Pricing

## Example

## CABLEONE ${ }^{\circ}$

Watch us make you smile:

- Tier 2 integrated service provider (phone, TV, Internet)
- Operating in 19 states
- 720,000 customers

|  | Economy | Standard | Preferred |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Price | $\$ 20$ | $\$ 50$ | Bundle <br> pricing |
| Download Speed | 1.5 <br> Mbps | 5 Mbps | 50 Mbps |
| Consumption | 1 GB | $3 \mathrm{~GB}^{\star}$ | 50 GB |

- Introducing consumption tiers with speed-tier pricing
- Positioned to drive consumers toward bundle
- Fair-use policy sets "excessive usage" limits on economy / standard packages
- Users who exceed their plan's data allocation will be charged $\$ 0.50$ per additional gigabyte
- Provides tools to estimate data usage, as well as ability to monitor consumption each month


## Usage-Based Pricing in Canada

## Timeline of Usage-Based Pricing Developments

| 1999 | CRTC refrains from regulating <br> retail Internet |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | Shaw introduces usage caps and <br> overage charges |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | Bell introduces broadband tiers tied to <br> both speed and usage |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | CRTC reviewing SP options to manage <br> Internet traffic |
| 2011 | CRTC rules that carriers can charge <br> usage-based overage pricing to <br> resellers on a per-end-user basis |
|  | Consumer advocacy groups use ruling <br> as focus for public outcry on UBB |
|  | UBB becomes an "election platform" issue |
| Fed Gov't reverses CRTC reseller ruling; |  |
| CRTC considering alternate proposals |  |

## Lessons Learned

- Despite consumer attitude, new revenue can be gained
- Usage can provide a better link to consumer value than speed
- Match consumers' expectations and allow them to self-upgrade
- To minimize regulatory scrutiny, avoid cost-based arguments


# Canada: Response to Usage-Based Pricing Dominated by "Do Nothing" 

## 72\% of Canadians See Usage-Based Pricing as Unfair, Yet....



## Example from Canadian Market: Rogers Tiered Pricing

Orogers

| Package | Download / Upload <br> Speed | Email <br> Addresses | Additional <br> Usage <br> Charge | Monthly <br> Fee | Monthly <br> Usage |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ultra-Lite | $500 \mathrm{kbps} / 254 \mathrm{kbps}$ | 3 | $\$ 5.00 / \mathrm{GB}$ | $\$ 27.99$ | 2 GB |
| Lite | $3 \mathrm{Mbps} / 254 \mathrm{kbps}$ | 5 | $\$ 4.00 / \mathrm{GB}$ | $\$ 35.99$ | 15 GB |
| Express | $10 \mathrm{Mbps} / 512 \mathrm{kbps}$ | 9 | $\$ 2.00 / \mathrm{GB}$ | $\$ 46.99$ | 60 GB |
| Extreme | $15 \mathrm{Mbps} / 512 \mathrm{kbps}$ | 9 | $\$ 1.50 / \mathrm{GB}$ | $\$ 59.99$ | 80 GB |
| Extreme <br> Plus | $25 \mathrm{Mbps} / 1 \mathrm{Mbps}$ | 9 | $\$ 1.25 / \mathrm{GB}$ | $\$ 69.99$ | 125 GB |
| Ultimate | $50 \mathrm{Mbps} / 2 \mathrm{Mbps}$ | 9 | $\$ 0.50 / \mathrm{GB}$ | $\$ 99.99$ | 175 GB |

- Consumption tiers tied to existing speed tier
- Matches consumers' expectation \& existing behavior
- No unlimited plan currently available
- Consumers can self-migrate to higher-tier plans as their consumption increases


# Usage-Based Pricing Varies Widely Among Canadian SPs 

## Summary of Fixed Broadband Packages at Major Canadian SPs

| Carrier | Low | Medium | High |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bell (QC) | \$27.95/month 1 GB / month $500 \mathrm{kbps} / 500 \mathrm{kbps}$ $\$ 2.50$ / GB over | \$47.95 / month 60 GB / month 7 Mbps / 1 Mbps $\$ 2.50$ / GB over | $\$ 72.95$ / month 100 GB / month 25 Mbps / 7 Mbps $\$ 2.50$ / GB over |
| Bell (ON) | $\$ 36.95$ / month $2 \mathrm{~GB} /$ month 2 Mbps / 800 kbps $\$ 2.50$ / GB over | \$46.95/month $25 \mathrm{~GB} /$ month 6 Mbps / 1 Mbps $\$ 2$ / GB over | \$76.95/month 75 GB / month 25 Mbps / 7 Mbps \$1/GB over |
| Rogers (ON) | \$27.99 / month <br> $2 \mathrm{~GB} /$ month <br> $500 \mathrm{kbps} / 256 \mathrm{kbps}$ <br> $\$ 5$ / GB over | $\$ 46.99$ / month <br> 60 GB / month <br> $12 \mathrm{Mbps} / 512 \mathrm{kbps}$ <br> \$2 / GB over | $\$ 99.99$ / month 250 GB / month $50 \mathrm{Mbps} / 2 \mathrm{Mbps}$ $\$ 0.50$ / GB over |
| Telus (West) | $\$ 30$ / month $30 \mathrm{~GB} /$ month 1 Mbps / 256 kbps \$2/GB over | \$49/month 250 GB / month $15 \mathrm{Mbps} / 1 \mathrm{Mbps}$ \$2/GB over | \$54 / month 500 GB / month $25 \mathrm{Mbps} / 2.5 \mathrm{Mbps}$ \$2/GB over |
| Shaw (West) | \$37 / month $30 \mathrm{~GB} /$ month 1 Mbps / 256 kbps | \$49/month 125 GB / month 7.5 Mbps / 512 kbps | $\$ 74.90$ I month Unlimited 7.5 Mbps / 512 Mbps |

- Consumers and regulators are reexamining SP approach to usagebased pricing
- SPs introduced usage tiers for each speed tier
- Wide variance in pricing per GB has driven CRTC and public skepticism
- CRTC is questioning the relationship between the cost to carry traffic and usagebased pricing


## Usage-Based Pricing Around the World: Sample Pricing, Telstra (Australia)

Telstra Home Broadband Plans, November 2011

| Plan | Usage Allowance | Cost per Month |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ADSL / Cable Elite: Up to 20 / 1 Mbps ADSL, 30 Mbps / 1 Mbps Cable |  |  |
| BigPond Elite ${ }^{\circledR} 5 \mathrm{~GB}$ Liberty | 5 GB <br> (then slowed to 64 kbps ) | From \$29.95 |
| BigPond Elite ${ }^{\circledR} 50 \mathrm{~GB}$ Liberty | 50 GB <br> (then slowed to 64 kbps ) | From \$49.95 |
| BigPond Elite ${ }^{\circledR} 200$ GB Liberty | 200 GB <br> (then slowed to 256 kbps ) | From \$69.95 |
| BigPond Elite ${ }^{\circledR} 500$ GB Liberty | 500 GB <br> (then slowed to 256 kbps ) | From \$89.95 |
| BIGPOND UNMETERED |  | - 8igpond |
|  |  |  |

- Tiered pricing
—From 5 GB to 500 GB
-When users exceed consumption limit, Telstra throttles the speed
- App-based differentiation
—Selected content, including games, movies, news, music and sports, is exempt from bandwidth limit

Source: Telstra website, 2011 (http://go.bigpond.com/broadband/)

## Usage-Based Pricing Around the World: Sample Pricing, BT, $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ (United Kingdom)

| BT | Speed | Usage | Included Calling | Price |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  <br> Evening / Weekend | 20 MB | 10 GB |  <br> Evening | $\mathbf{£ 1 3}$ |
| More Broadband | 20 MB | 40 GB | Weekend | $\mathbf{£ 1 8}$ |
| Unlimited <br> Broadband | 20 MB | Unlimited | Anytime | $\mathbf{£ 2 8}$ |

## BT(b) My Broadband

 Exceeding the limit?- Consumers receive email notice when they reach 80 percent of usage allowance
- After second month of excess consumption, additional usage is charged at $£ 5$ per 5 GB
- BT provides a monitoring tool, online support, and ability to self-upgrade to higher tiers

| $\mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Download <br> Speed | Upload <br> Speed | Usage | Web <br> Texts | Price |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Basics | 20 MB | 1.3 MB | 20 GB | 200 | $£ 13.50$ |
| All Rounder | 20 MB | 1.3 MB | Unlimited | 200 | $£ 17.50$ |
| The Works | 20 MB | 2.5 MB | Unlimited | 500 | $£ 26$ |

## $\mathrm{O}_{2}$

## Exceeding the limit?

- Emphasize that fair-use policy exists, even for unlimited
- Consumers will be notified if they approach or exceed limit
- $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ may terminate service
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## 3 <br> Potential Benefits of Usage-Based Pricing

# Usage-Based Pricing Can Curtail Traffic Explosion for Some Customers 

## Consumers Curbing Internet Use

Percentage of respondents


- When usage-based pricing is introduced, one-third of customers will reduce their Internet usage
- Actual behavior maps closely to anticipated reaction


## Consumers Curbing Internet Video Use

Percentage of respondents


- About half of consumers will reduce their online video watching in response to usage-based pricing
- In Canada, where online video is wellestablished and where usage-based pricing is already implemented, consumers are likely to cut use


# Usage-Based Pricing Can Guide Core Segments Away from Online Video 

In Canada, impact of usage-based pricing on online video reduction is...



Correlated with technology-related behavior


Correlated with strong SP preference

To maximize broadband revenue, SPs should target young, tech-savvy users Source: Cisco IBSG Connected Life Market Watch, 2011

## Usage-Based Pricing Can Guide Core Segments Away from Online Video

In the United States, impact of usage-based pricing on online video reduction is...



Correlated with technology-related behavior


Correlated with age

Only 37\% of 18- to 24-yearolds would reduce online video usage

Source: Cisco IBSG Connected Life Market Watch, 2011

## Usage-Based Pricing Could Unlock Additional Spending

- $41 \%$ say they would pay more for unlimited broadband access if usage-based pricing is introduced in the United States
- However, only 10\% are actually spending more since the introduction of usagebased pricing in Canada
- Similar percentages of consumers in the United States (26\%) and Canada (22\%) would pay more for broadband in order to support their online video use

Revenue Uplift Potential for
Usage-Based Pricing
Percentage of respondents


Would Subscribe to Unlimited Online
Video for a Higher Monthly Fee
Percentage of respondents


# Heavy User Segments Are More Likely To Consider Usage-Based Billing Fair 

## Potential to Monetize Increased Traffic—Canada

## Percentage of Consumers that Perceive Usage-Based Billing as Fair By customer segment

Technology Adoption Internet Video Device Ownership Age


- Early adopters and Internet video device owners are more likely to consider usage-based billing fair
- Consumers aged 40-54 are less likely to consider usage-based billing fair


# Heavy User Segments Are More Likely To Consider Usage-Based Billing Fair 

## Potential to Monetize Increased Traffic—United States

## Percentage of Consumers that Perceive Usage-Based Billing as Fair

 By customer segmentTechnology Adoption
Internet Video Device Ownership
Age


- Early adopters and Internet video device owners are more likely to consider usage-based billing fair
- Consumers aged 40-54 are less likely to consider usage-based billing fair


# Canadian Internet Video Device Owners Are Willing To Pay for Unlimited Plans. . . 

... And Are Less Likely To Reduce Use
Online Video: Consumer Reaction to Usage-Based Billing Internet Video Device Owners-Canada


- Internet video device owners are evenly split across getting unlimited plans, keeping plans and reducing usage, and keeping plans and same usage
- Internet video device owners are more likely than average to adopt unlimited plans and are less likely than average to reduce usage


# U.S. Internet Video Device Owners Are Willing To Pay for Unlimited Plans. . . 

. . . And Are Less Likely To Reduce Use
Online Video: Consumer Reaction to Usage-Based Billing Internet Video Device Owners-United States


- Internet video device owners are evenly split across getting unlimited plans, keeping plans and reducing usage, and keeping plans and same usage
- Internet video device owners are more likely than average to adopt unlimited plans and are less likely than average to reduce usage


## 4 <br> Examining Usage-Based Offers

## Package Ideation: Nine Potential Options for Usage-Based Plans

|  | Service Option | Description | Impact |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Usage-Based Tiers | Provide several levels of increasing GB usage for <br> increasing prices, with overage fees | Capture increasing ARPU as users graduate <br> to next tier and usage increases |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | Unlimited-Bandwidth Tier | Create top-tier expensive unlimited plan | Monetize top users of data rather than cutting <br> them off |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | SP OTT Video Offer | Offer OTT VoD managed service along with pay- <br> TV offering for video service | Avoid cost of OTT delivery by providing SP <br> OTT service, allowing revenue capture |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | Per-Bit Metered Plan | Users pay on a flat per-bit plan | High users churn away due to higher costs; <br> low users pay less, eliminating subsidization |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | Cross-Device Data Plan | Consumers buy one bucket of data and can use <br> for home, mobile, any device | Lost ARPU difficult to replace with churn <br> improvements, market share gains, and fees |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | Time-Based Usage | Consumer pay flat per-minute fee for usage of <br> Internet | High users churn away due to higher costs; <br> low users pay less, eliminating subsidization |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | Time-of-Day Usage Fees | Consumers pay more per bit at peak use times, <br> and less off-peak | Reduce peak traffic, attract users with time- <br> of-day unlimited offers |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | SP I OTT Partnerships | Partner with OTT to offer unlimited bandwidth for <br> certain sites; must be made available to all OTTs | Defend against OTT threat, replace some <br> lost revenues |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | Activity-Specific <br> Usage Plans | Consumers purchase unlimited usage for specific <br> applications, gaming, backup, music, etc. <br> Offerings must cover all types. | Strong partnering ability with third parties, <br> improved customer loyalty and market share |

Source: Cisco IBSG, 2012
List is illustrative. Not intended to be comprehensive.

## Evaluation Methodology: Assessing SP Options for Usage-Based Pricing

This process tested individual pricing strategies in isolation. In reality, most strategies will be implemented simultaneously in combination with other strategies.


Using the model to test various approaches with each usagebased strategy, the team identified pros \& cons for each

## Usage-Based Broadband Tiers

- Pricing increases by tier, as do gigabyte allowance and speed
- Overage fees charged per GB until user has paid enough to graduate to next usage tier
- ARPU increases as users consume more data and graduate to higher tiers

Example: Broadband Consumer Tiers by Usage


## Pros

- Opportunity to grow ARPU from broadband as use increases, driving users to next tier
- Ability to manage costs of increased capacity and network investments


## Cons

- Potential consumer backlash from usage-based pricing
- Potential for competitors to steal share by offering unlimited plans

Source: Cisco IBSG, 2012

## Unlimited Broadband Tier

- Provide unlimited tier above last usage tier to capture revenue from heavy users at a price that results in positive economics for entire group of heavy users

Example: Broadband Consumer Tiers by Usage


## Pros

- Capture revenue from small group of customers who have highest traffic
- Focus niche offering at high price to capture revenue or drive costly users to other carriers
- Customers understand value and have better experience; heavy users are no longer penalized

Source: Cisco IBSG, 2012

## Cons

- Potential for abuse; need to consistently monitor for price effectiveness
- Potential to catalyze online video usage, resulting in increased churn from pay-TV and VoD services


## Service Provider OTT Video Offer

- SP offers OTT video package, discrete and separate from broadband packages
- Includes access to online video that is competitive with market offers such as Netflix
- OTT video-related broadband usage will not count against customer's broadband cap



## Pros

- Cross-product benefit for SPs with TV services
- Keeps customers, who might have churned to Netflix, loyal to the SP video offering
- Monetization based on content and value, not just broadband use



## Cons

- Potential for abuse among customers with free broadband usage for video content; may allow users to take lowest tier and drive costs higher through video usage; pricing should cover this scenario
- May cannibalize traditional SP video services


## (1) Parabit Matarac pan

- SP charges flat connection fee to each subscriber
- SP charges flat per-gigabyte fee


## Example: Price paid on a flat-price, per-bit metering method-\$3 / GB

| $0-2$ GB: | 2 GB - 20 | 20 GB - 50 GB: $\$ 60-\$ 150$ | 50 GB -100 | 100 GB +: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\$ 0-\$ 6$ | $G B: \$ 6-\$ 60$ |  | GB: $\$ 150-$ <br> $\$ 300$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Paying more. Churn to competitor: \$50-\$300+
Paying per GB drives costs too high, resulting in churn of medium-to-heavy users

## Pros

- Simplifies management of revenues-to-costs
- Simplifies usage billing
- Ties revenue directly to increase in usage, eliminating concern regarding cost impacts of data traffic forecasts
- Will curtail usage among high-GB users


## Cons

- Average users will churn to competitor due to high costs
- Low users will pay less, no longer subsidizing other users
- If competitors don't follow with per-bit metered plan, they will be able to steal share
Source: Cisco IBSG, 2012


## 

$+2+2$

- Data bucket is shared across consumer's broadband and mobile services
- SP charges flat data-sharing fee to compensate for lost ARPU from mobile data plan



## Potential loss from cross-device data plan <br> Difficult to cover loss of mobile data plan from data-sharing fee, churn improvement, and marketshare gains

## Pros

- Simplifies customer experience and allows users to buy one plan for all their data use
- Prevents churn and ties separate offerings together, particularly for SPs with both broadband and mobile assets
- Increases market share


## Cons

- May reduce total revenue as lucrative mobile broadband and home broadband ARPU decrease for each adopter of shared plan
- Benefits of churn improvement and added market-share gains may not offset losses from reducing combined data ARPU

Source: Cisco IBSG, 2012

## (2) tanc-Matarac pata

- SP charges flat connection fee and flat per-minute usage fee
- By combining per-minute pricing with time-of-day and/or unlimited pricing options, SPs could potentially improve monetization

Price paid on a flat-price-per-minute metering method: \$0.01 / minute

| $0-900$ | 900 min - | 2,700 min $-5,400$ min: $\$ 27-\$ 54$ | 5,400 min - | 9,000 min + |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| min: | 2,700 min: |  | 9,000 min: | $\$ 90+$ |
| $\$ 0-\$ 9$ | $\$ 9-\$ 27$ |  | $\$ 54-\$ 90$ |  |

## Paying too little and not subsidizing other users\$0 - \$27

Revenues from lighter users declines

Paying too much; more likely to churn to competitor-\$60+
Paying per minute drives costs too high, resulting in churn of medium-to-heavy users

## Pros

- Simplifies management of revenues-to-costs
- Simplifies usage billing
- As use of Internet increases, so will revenue
- Will cause high time users to reduce use


## Cons

- Heavy users will churn to competitor due to high costs
- Low users will pay less, no longer subsidizing other users
- If competitors don't follow with a time-metered plan, they will be able to steal share
Source: Cisco IBSG, 2012


## 

- SP charges flat connection fee to each subscriber
- SP charges per-gigabyte usage fee, with pricing varying by time of day (peak times more expensive)



## Pros

- Reduces impact on network by reducing peak usage and maximizing non-peak times
- As consumers use more Internet, SP revenue will increase
- Will cause high-bandwidth users to reduce use, lessening demand on network

Source: Cisco IBSG, 2012

## Cons

- Many heavy users will see massive increase to bill, driving churn to other providers
- If competitors don't switch to a similar plan, they could steal share, increasing competitive threat


## Service Provider / OTT Partner Offer

- SP partners with OTT provider to enable video service usage without counting toward cap
- Partner subsidizes SP for access to customer base



## Pros

- Allows monetization of additional usage on broadband network by partnering with Netflix
- Makes SP offer more relevant to consumers
- Increases functionality of SP offer
- Creates new revenue stream by selling access to base

Source: Cisco IBSG, 2012

Revenue and Costs


Customers' Primary OTT Provider: Netflix via SP (With Usage-Based Pricing)

SP BB Revenue + OTT Rev Share

> SP Traffic Costs

## Cons

- Potential for abuse
- May cannibalize traditional SP video services
- May allow users to take lowest tier and drive costs higher through video usage; pricing should cover this scenario
- Regulatory concern


## Activity-Specific Usage Plan

- SP partners with third-party provider to enable social, backup, gaming, or music service without counting toward cap
- Partner subsidizes SP for access to customer base



## Pros

- Allows monetization of additional network use by partnering with third parties
- Makes SP offer more relevant to consumers in danger of churning
- Increases functionality of SP offer
- Creates new revenue stream by selling access to base

Source: Cisco IBSG, 2012


Customers' Activity Provider: Xbox via SP (With Usage-Based Pricing)

SP BB Revenue + OTT Rev Share

SP Traffic Costs

## Cons

- Potential for abuse
- May cannibalize competitive SP services
- May allow users to take lowest tier and drive costs higher through video usage; pricing should cover this scenario
- Regulatory concern


## 5 <br> Usage-Based Pricing \& Video

## SP OTT Video Offer: A Deeper Look

- With OTT video, SP captures video revenues from OTT video use vs. capturing only usage-based broadband revenues
- Offers that bundle unlimited broadband with video usage will appeal to particular user segments



# Linking Tiered / Unlimited Broadband Options to OTT Video Offering 

## Online Video / Data Plan Preference

Percentage of respondents

United
States


Canada

## Question:

Imagine you wanted to subscribe to an online video service, such as Netflix, to watch movies on your computer and on your TV. Which option would you select:

- \$16 per month, with unlimited access to video library, unlimited video streaming or downloading; would not count against data limits set by Internet service provider. OR . . .
- \$8 per month for unlimited access to video library, unlimited video streaming or downloading; would count against data limits set by Internet service provider, and could be subject to additional data fees.


## In Both U.S. and Canada, Younger Users Prefer Unlimited Data Option

Online Video I Data Plan Preference
Percentage of Respondents
\$16 Plan with Unlimited Video / Unlimited Data
\$8 Plan with Unlimited Video / Limited Data


Younger consumers skew heavily toward unlimited video / data plan, while older consumers skew heavily toward unlimited video with limited data

# Most Internet Video Device and Service Owners Prefer Unlimited Data Option 

Online Video / Data Plan Preference, by Internet Video Device Ownership CANADA


- \$16 per month unlimited video and unlimited usage
- $\$ 8$ per month unlimited video but limited usage
- Internet video device owners show increased preference for \$16 / month unlimited video and data plan
- Internet video device ownership is likely correlated with higher online video use, indicating that those with significant online video use are more likely to pay to continue that behavior


## Integrated SPs Face Many Threats to Traditional Video Revenue

| Online Video | Drivers <br> (U.S. Impact in 3-5 Years) | Traditional Pay TV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Combination of online video and other video options meeting customers' video needs | Cord-Cutting / Downgrade | Replacement of pay-TV service or downgrade premium channel, paid VoD, and / or DVR / HD |
| Cheaper alternative; more competition | Price Erosion | Perceived value of and demand for pay TV decreases |
| Increasing viewership and interactive capability | Ad Revenue Decline | Advertising revenue decline from ad money shifting to online |
| Per-use "a la carte" pricing model | Pricing Model Disruption | Consumer demand, regulation, and / or competitive pressure impose "a la carte" model on pay TV |
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## Usage-Based Billing Strategies Can Minimize ARPU Loss Due to OTT Video

|  | Scenario 1 |  | Scenario 2 |  | Scenario 3 |  | Scenario 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cut pay TV and VoD, replace with OTT Video |  | Cut VoD, replace with OTT video |  | Cut pay TV, replace with OTA; cut VoD, replace with OTT video |  | Cut pay TV and VoD, replace with SP OTT |  |
| Service | Revenue | Margin | Revenue | Margin | Revenue | Margin | Revenue | Margin |
| Original Pay-TV Usage | \$54.80 | \$13.70 |  |  | \$54.80 | \$13.70 | \$54.80 | \$13.70 |
| Switch to Hulu | (\$54.80) | (\$13.70) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Switch to HD <br> Antenna |  |  |  |  | (\$54.80) | (\$13.70) |  |  |
| VoD Usage | \$20 | \$5 | \$ 20 | \$5 | \$20 | \$5 | \$20 | \$5 |
| Switch to Netflix | (\$20) | (\$5) | (\$20) | (\$5) | (\$20) | (\$5) |  |  |
| Total Video Revenue Loss | (\$74.80) | (\$18.70) | (\$20) | (\$5) | (\$74.80) | (\$18.70) | (\$74.80) | (\$18.70) |
| Switch to SP OTT |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$16 | \$2.24 |
| Upgrade to Higher-Tier BB | \$23 | \$12.65 | \$13 | \$7.15 | \$13 | \$7.15 | \$23 | \$12.65 |
| SP Net Impact | (\$51.80) | (\$6.05) | (\$7) | +\$2.15 | (\$61.80) | (\$11.55) | (\$35.80) | (\$3.81) |

As online video takes users away from pay-TV services, usage-based pricing may replace lost revenues and margin Source: Cisco IBSG, 2012; Strategy Analytics, 2010

## 6 Lessons Learned from Mobile

# More Than a Third of Mobile Operators Have Moved to Value-Based Pricing 

## Usage-Based Pricing Plans Are Commonplace for Mobile

Survey of Mobile Data Pricing Plans
Across 100 Global Mobile Operators
Percentage of operators offering plan
Value-Based Mobile Broadband Pricing, by Plan Type
Percentage of operators offering plan


Also, 26\% of mobile operators have revenue-sharing models in place

## Consumers View Usage-Based Billing for Mobile Broadband as Unfair

- Most consumers consider usage-based billing for mobile data to be unfair
- Consumers in the United Kingdom are more likely than their Western European counterparts to consider mobile usage-based billing fair


Consumer Perception of Usage-Based Billing for Mobile Broadband


## W. Europe: Usage-Based Billing Viewed More Positively for Mobile than for Fixed

- French consumers show the greatest disparity in their view of mobile vs. fixed usage-based billing
- British consumers are most consistent in their views of usage-based billing for mobile and fixed broadband

Perception of Usage-Based Billing Fairness: Mobile vs. Fixed Broadband


## Mobile Data Users Are Unprepared To Make Buying Decisions Based on Use

Consumption Awareness Among
Mobile Data Card Users


- 3 out of 4 mobile data card users do not know how much data they consume
- Most don't know their usage cap limit; nearly half are concerned about exceeding it


## Reports of Average Usage Will Lead Consumers to Overpay for Data Plans

Monthly Mobile Data Consumption (in MB), February 2010 - February 2011


- A small percentage of data hogs skew average consumption statistics
- Most consumers are well covered by providers' minimum plans, but many will pay for predictability
-Minimum plan for most companies is 200 MB per month
-60\% of users use less than 200 MB per month


# Consumers Need Better Understanding of Data Consumption 

## FCC Has Asked SPs To Provide Better Information

FCC Wireless Code of Conduct
Updated To include Bill Shock Prevention Measures, October 2011

1. Send alerts to notify consumers when they approach and reach monthly plan limits that would result in overage charges
2. Send alerts when consumers are about to incur international roaming charges
3. Clearly disclose tools to let consumers set their own usage limits and monitor their usage balances

Top 3 U.S. Operators Offer Usage Calculators
Example: Verizon Data-Usage Calculator

## Data Usage Calculator

Calculate your device usage to figure out which plan will best meet your needs.


1 out of 5 U.S. wireless subscribers received unexpected charges on their wireless bill in 2010

## Value-Based Pricing: Sample Plans

## Application-Based

Telus Mobility in Canada offers social pages for BlackBerry handsets that allow unlimited access to Facebook, Twitter, MySpace, BBM, and Windows Live


## Time-Based Usage Pattern over Day

As part of Orange U.K.'s Dolphin plan, customers select one of two "Happy Hour" options for an hour of unlimited data per day

## 7 <br> Considerations for Service Providers

## SP Considerations: Moving Toward Usage-Based Pricing

## Questions to ask:

- Will consumption be a more viable value lever for pricing than speed?
- What can SPs do to steer clear of regulator concerns?
- What can SPs do to make usage-based pricing consumerfriendly?
- What can SPs do to make the migration from unlimited to usage-based pricing as pain-free for their customers as possible?
- How can usage-based pricing be implemented to drive the greatest revenue impact?
- How can usage-based pricing be implemented to provide the strongest control over Internet traffic patterns?


## .1|1.1|0. CISCO


[^0]:    Source: Cisco IBSG, 2011 Base: U.S. broadband consumers

[^1]:    Source: Company websites, 2011

[^2]:    Source: Cisco IBSG, 2010-2011

