Open and neutral access to the Internet is what's allowed consumers in the European Union to voice their concerns about anti competitive mergers and to some extent even in the U.S. The European Commission having listened to consumer groups made the right call in requiring regulatory conditions on the UMG EMI merger unfortunately for U.S. consumers it's too little and the remedies from EC were insufficient alone. Consumer rights groups representing music fans and in some cases artists ranging from The Future of Music Coalition to Public Knowledge told the FTC that just relying on the EC was not enough. It is good that they didn't rubber stamp the merger like FTC did but put a divestiture order in place requiring EMI holdings to be sold off but why did the FTC rubber stamp it? Did they think EC action was enough? What if the EC hadn't put conditions would the FTC have just followed the EC in unconditionally approving it then? Antitrust regulators in the U.S. need to re-examine after the UMG EMI approval how they review such deals that impact competition not just in the U.S. but globally and not just rely on other regulators to do their job for them.

We need the FCC to do all it can to protect open and neutral access to the Internet and for regulators reviewing mergers with international implications to not just rubber stamp a deal because another country did so. U.S. regulators should consider what's in the best interest of U.S. consumers. At the very least the FTC should have issued similar divestiture conditions requiring breakup of UMG.