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H.R. 1189 - Undersea Cable Control Act

Write your analysis in essay format. Be sure to answer the following questions in your analysis:

* What is the policy intended to do? (Explain the purpose of the current or proposed public policy.)

The Undersea Cable Control Act, or H.R. 1189, is a bill pending in the U.S. Congress. The policy seeks to regulate the construction and maintenance of undersea cables employed in international communications. The policy seeks to address national security requirements through the creation of a framework to approve and monitor undersea cable systems connecting the U.S. to countries with adversarial relations with the U.S.

The primary intention of the Undersea Cable Control Act is to deal with threats from foreign ownership and control of key telecommunications facilities linking the U.S. to the outside world. The bill aims to ensure the U.S. government has greater control over the placement and maintenance of undersea cables with the intent to protect sensitive data transmission from foreign surveillance and sabotage. The bill also aims to deal with the problem of dependence on foreign countries in issues concerning key communication facilities in light of increased geopolitical tensions.

* What are the policy’s direct and external costs and benefits for different groups of people? (Explain who benefits and who bears the costs of the current or proposed policy, and how. Include third-party costs and benefits.)

Direct Costs:

The direct cost to stakeholders would be regulation compliance to the operators in undersea cable projects. The telecommunication companies and private contractors would be required to adapt to new regulations and would be required to submit plans to be authorized and may involve additional time and expense and legal costs. The costs may be particularly burdensome to small telecommunication companies or companies with smaller international scope.

Direct Benefits:

The direct beneficiaries would be U.S. national security and the telecommunications industry. The policy would safeguard U.S. government control over undersea cables and reduce the threat to the integrity of telecommunications data posed by foreign powers. It would enhance the security of sensitive information being exported overseas. U.S. telecommunications companies would also be assisted with a less uncertain regulatory framework.

External Costs:

Internationally, the policy would be likely to prod other nations to improve regulation of undersea cables to better secure international data transmission standards. The U.S. allies with similar national security interests would be assisted through the heightened security protection of the global data infrastructure.

* What is your recommendation regarding the current or proposed policy? (Identify whether you support the policy, support it with changes (be specific), or reject it.)

I am in favor of the Undersea Cable Control Act but with amendments so that international communication and economic trade will not be adversely affected.

* What are the reasons for and the evidence to support your recommendation? (Explain your reasoning with specific, verifiable facts and details.)

The rationale in support of the policy arises from the growing threat to telecommunications infrastructure from state-sponsored surveillance and cyber-attacks. A secure and controlled undersea cable system is required to maintain national security.

However, the policy should be revised to have improved approval processes and better guidelines for companies wishing to invest in undersea cable projects. With provisions that allow permits to be processed faster and with less red tape in foreign partnerships, the U.S. will be less likely to dampen technological innovation and global communication.

Furthermore, provisions should be made for international cooperation and agreements with U.S. partners to ensure that the regulation will not disproportionately affect transborder communications. The evidence shows that unjustified delays in telecommunications infrastructure projects can be detrimental to international trade and economic relations, and we have seen that in past instances of over-regulation in other sectors.

The Undersea Cable Control Act confronts significant national security issues but must be refined to not unwittingly hinder international communication and economic transactions. With refinement in the policy process in terms of regulation approval and enhancement in its collaborative aspects, the policy can successfully balance national security with the requirements of the global telecommunications network.
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