

The net should be absolutely equal to all parties that subscribe to an internet service. There are several different reasons for my take on this, by far the biggest reasons are... I think Internet Service Providers(ISP) are already being compensated for the traffic that utilizes thier network; as well as it brings up many issues of Common Carrier status that ISPs currently fall under for protection of traffic on their network.

An example of why I think ISPs are already compensated for traffic is.. ISP A charges the consumer for an alotment of bandwidth usage over a subscription period, normally a month. ISP B charges a company for an alotment of bandwidth usage over a subscription period, normally a month or a direct charge for each unit of bandwidth used. ISP A is already making money off of the consumer's traffic to a companies website by charging the consumer directly. ISP B is making money off the consumer going to the companies website by charging the company. If ISP A or ISP B want to make more money off their services, simply charge more for an alotment of bandwidth. Now, to make things more interesting, lets add in national carriers. ISP A buys bandwidth off of National ISP Z. ISP B buys its bandwidth off of National ISP Y. Both ISP A and ISP B get the bandwidth they sell to the consumer and the company in this manor. National ISP Z and National ISP Y normally have deals with each other to where whichever over-utilizes the others network(sends more traffic than it recieves), they pay some sort of fee to makeup the balance. So what is wrong with this system? In my mind nothing is wrong, everyone gets some slice of the pie and is compensated for the internet usage that goes through thier systems.

The other point is Common Carrier status. An ISP is not held accountable for anything passing over thier network because they are only passing data. If ISPs started to limit network usability in any way I think it would open a floodgate of lawsuits leveled at ISPs. Many ISPs may not have done anything wrong to merit a lawsuit in the first place. For instance, in the above example if the consumer wanted to get to the companies website they had to go from their ISP(ISP A), to National ISP Z, to National ISP Y, to ISP B, to the

company. Now, if National ISP Y starts filtering traffic from ISP A because ISP A isn't one of their preferred partners, the consumer's only course of compensation is to sue ISP A (their ISP) for bad service. ISP A is completely open to a lawsuit of this type now because they filter content from ISP C, so they are no longer a Common Carrier. ISP A did absolutely nothing wrong in this scenario, they gave the exact level of service they said they would to the customer. In court ISP A would probably win because they didn't do anything wrong, but that doesn't keep the customer from having a bad experience with their ISP even though it did nothing wrong, nor will it stop lawsuits of this type from popping up all over the place. The only way around this is to draft the law in such a way to limit liability to ISPs, but if you do that, ISPs are no longer accountable for the level of service they provide.

If ISPs want to make more money, charge more for their service. If there is an actual lack of bandwidth over the national grid, expand the grid and charge more for usage to make up the build costs. All of the alleged problems as I understand them can be done with some sort of cost increases for the consumer, or the company, from their current ISPs. Unfortunately consumers do not like to hear of cost increases but the ISP is simply going to have to bite the bullet and raise prices if it wants to continue to provide good service without crippling the internet as it currently is. That of course assumes network resources are as limited as some ISPs are claiming, I've yet to find a good non-biased review on the current state of the US and World Grids.