

Not only are Republicans in Congress blocking regulations to protect the Internet from a corporate takeover, they're actually calling net neutrality a government takeover. The National Broadband Plan by the way is a disaster in its current form for consumers it does nothing to address the issue of why broadband adoption has been poor -- limited competition in fixed wire-line broadband services which is a duopoly of big cable and phone companies in the U.S. as well as higher prices and subpar service, the threat of a corporate takeover of the Net resulting in less public participation. An Open Internet encourages more participation and we need Network Neutrality to maintain it. Instead of throwing more money at big telecom and cable companies via taxpayer subsidies we should support municipal broadband projects like the one in North Carolina under threat by North Carolina's state legislature and big telecom and cable companies fighting to prevent competition by local governments. Expanding broadband deployment sounds like a fine idea but only if it benefits the users and innovators. AT&T's unfair data caps as I later mention unfairly exempt their own video services from competing alternatives putting them at an unfair disadvantage over users and innovators online. Don't let the status quo be maintained and get worse than you've already allowed it to be by allowing Qwest to merge with Century Link and Comcast to get NBC Universal which I'll explain why they are bad below. Simply expanding deployment is not enough -- by the way AT&T's problem is they don't invest enough in increasing network capacity for their wireless services they have enough spectrum already -- don't let them make the cellular phone market and mobile broadband market(s) also a duopoly. With more competition will come lower prices and better services. A lack of competition results though in higher costs, subpar service and service providers empowered by market dominance develop conflict of interest to discriminate and they can get away with it. They argue users will switch to a competitor if we discriminate but market is an anti competitive duopoly of providers who all want to discriminate. Rework the National Broadband Plan to address its deficiencies and stand up to big cable and phone companies to uphold public interest. Work toward keeping the Net open to all for free flow of communication, commerce, and information to continue -- no one should need ISP permission to compete and innovate online -- future Googles and Yahoos of the world (the upstarts) won't stand a chance otherwise. Nor will noncommercial and independent organizations online. The Open Internet breaks down political and geographic barriers and must remain open. The National Broadband Plan must address lack of competition in wire-line fixed broadband services, wireless mobile broadband service, state the goals of having open universal access to broadband, too high prices, subpar service, and take steps to not just increase broadband deployment but broadband adoption. The National Broadband Plan does nothing to help with adoption and if we lose Network Neutrality it will be a blow to adoption.

Net neutrality is the status quo. It's the way the Internet operates right now: free and open. And it's up to us to make sure it stays that way. I urge the FCC to draft stronger Network Neutrality rules of nondiscrimination along with reclassifying the FCC's definition of broadband as a Title II Telecommunications service to ensure the FCC has the statutory authority and oversight authority to protect the free and open Internet from corporate gatekeepers who want to destroy the Internet as it

has always existed -- destroy the best thing about the Web -- the free and open nature of the web which encourages public participation -- and make it a closed medium. The Internet is the last mile -- last medium in America left free and open to users and innovators. AT&T's proposed data caps on broadband DSL and UVerse service unfairly exempt their own video services from competitors. Likewise without Network Neutrality cable companies could institute data caps to discourage users from accessing cheaper and better alternatives online to their more expensive digital cable TV packages by limiting users ability to use Netflix's Watch Now streaming service, websites like YouTube currently owned by Google and other video sharing sites like Hulu etc. This will hurt competition and innovation. Competition in the wire-line market for fixed broadband connections is already a duopoly between big cable and phone companies. For antitrust reasons AT&T should never have been allowed to re-merge with SBC Communications and/or Bell South and it has done so with both already. As long as Ma Bell remains intact since AT&T was allowed to begin putting Ma Bell back together we do need Network Neutrality rules as incentives have changed and continue to change for these large service providers when they merge with other service providers and reduce competition and consumer choices. Also when content providers like NBC Universal get to merge with Comcast as has been approved unfortunately it also provides a conflict of interest for the combined company to discriminate against content it doesn't own. Comcast could discriminate against users of its digital cable TV and/or high speed Internet businesses accessing content over TV or over the Web preferring content Comcast doesn't own by blocking or slowing down access to said content. What's more Comcast could charge higher retransmission fees to other cable TV providers and even satellite TV providers to broadcast NBCU content Comcast owns on other provider's platforms. Imagine Comcast getting to supply NBCU stations and/or networks for free to their customers but charging high retransmission fees to DirecTV, Dish Network, Time Warner Cable, Cox, etc to do the same. Now its standard practice for TV networks to charge service providers of cable or satellite TV service retransmission fees but when a service provider owns a content provider that service provider can offer it for free and unfairly require other service providers to pay a lot of money in retransmission fees to access the channels. It's worth taking a look even when retransmission fees are charged to any service provider by content providers (independent of a service provider) how much is being charged in retransmission fees so its not too excessive after all those fees get passed onto consumers. Incentives change when big companies get bigger and they develop a conflict of interest. This is also why I oppose the AT&T T Mobil merger. Wire-line broadband services are already a duopoly in the U.,S. between big cable and phone companies and that duopoly has only gotten worse unfortunately in President Obama's Administration as Qwest got to merge with Century Link and Comcast swallowed up NBC Universal. Now AT&T which already has re-established monopoly status in wire-line services and wants to abuse its market dominance there to discriminate on the Internet wants duopoly status in cellular phone and wireless mobile broadband services. If its merger with T Mobil is approved it will be bad for everyone except shareholders of the two companies and the executives. I have already filed comments in the docket on that merger rejecting it. The FCC has already ruled wireless market as not competitive enough the merger would reduce competition

even more and give AT&T a monopoly on GSM cellular phones. Between AT&T and Verizon Wireless they would control 80% of the wireless phone market. In Canada also the situation is bad with an oligopoly for high speed or broadband Internet services but its even worse in the U.S. As President Obama said as a candidate along the 2008 Presidential campaign when you begin to allow packet discrimination by ISPs, and filtering smaller and independent voices especially noncommercial voices get unfairly squeezed out and there's less diversity. Unless these big companies are broken up to create new competition we do need Network Neutrality rules. No regulation after all is just as bad as too much regulation. Yet in the absence of sufficient regulations Republicans in Congress keep saying there's too much regulation and some of the new regulations already passed to protect consumers/taxpayers or the environment need to be removed when in fact we need to preserve them and hold big businesses accountable to the public.