

I am writing to comment on the proposed changes to the Net Neutrality and Competition rules.

I am in the process of setting up what is currently a small business. The business will rely very heavily on distribution of our products through the Internet. With true Net Neutrality in place, my business won't have to worry about being charged different rates than other companies using the same service providers. We won't have to worry about induced latency issues. We won't have to worry about being out prioritized by companies paying premium rates over us or service providers prioritizing their own services over ours.

Without true Net Neutrality in place our company, which we expect to be delivering over 500 terabytes a day to customers within five years from today, could spend tens of millions of dollars a year in additional fees on a "pay for priority" or "pay for minimal latency" system. Without Net Neutrality rules in place our business could be **extremely** negatively impacted.

This is not hyperbole, it is a realistic, future probability. Our investors are worried that the loss of true Net Neutrality may severely impact our business in the future, and this potential future loss is already negatively impacting the company.

Today our fledgling company pays for bits to transit the Internet. Bits are bits and the cost is bit neutral. As is likely with no true Net Neutrality rules and regulations in place, some bits will be considered "better" than others. It harkens back to the story "Animal Farm": All animals are equal just some animals are more equal than others.", i.e., sure, all bits are equal but those bits sent by users that are willing to pay more are more equal and those bits deemed best by the service provider are deemed the most equal of them all.

The FCC must represent not just the service providers but also all the users. The FCC must keep rules and regulations in place that enforce true Net Neutrality for all users.