

In short,

1. I do not believe that the FCC should allow broadband providers to establish internet "fast lanes."
2. I do believe that broadband providers should be reclassified as a Title II common carrier.
3. The FCC should define strict and modern criteria for what services classify as "broadband."
4. No Data Caps

The internet should be a place of free communication where consumers should have unrestricted access to the contents of the internet and it is becoming increasingly apparent that broadband companies can no longer be trusted to maintain a fair and competitive service without government oversight and regulation.

No Internet Fast Lanes Reasoning:

I have many problems with the proposed fast lanes. I will elaborate on my greatest concerns.

First, I am already paying for a particular bandwidth. I expect to receive that bandwidth for all content I pursue on the internet, or at least to the best of my broadband service providers ability. By creating fast lanes, my provider is telling me that I could better access content, but it is denying me that service.

Second, I fear that creating fast lanes will stifle the innovation, creativity, and freedom of expression that is currently available on the internet. Fast lanes create artificial barriers that automatically give higher priority to content providers that are willing to pay to get their content to users. This means content providers who lack the capital to overcome these barriers will suffer. In terms of funding innovative endeavors on the internet, this means that startups must not only fund their content but this additional cost of getting their content to consumers. All content providers, regardless of size, will find themselves in this situation and the internet will no longer be a place of equality where quality sells content but instead a place where money sells content regardless of quality. That money would be better spent improving the quality of content rather than selling the content itself. In other words, innovation will suffer and content quality will stagnate or decline.

Third, it is the job of my broadband service provider to provide me with a means of obtaining content. Asking a content provider, whom I may already be paying to provide me content, to pay them for delivery of their product is similar to mailing someone a parcel and then asking the recipient to pay for receiving it. I have paid my broadband service provider to deliver me content, my content providers should not also have to pay.

Title II Common Carrier Reasoning:

My current view of large broadband service providers is rather bleak because I believe that current broadband service providers have no desire to innovate or improve customer services. Compared to other nations, our broadband services are sub-par. We are one of the wealthiest countries in the world and information services is one of our strongest markets, so how is that broadband services in many other countries are more competitive with better services and lower rates? I believe the answer lies in competition within the American broadband service market. There is very little competition in this market because of the massive capital costs required to enter it and this means that there is no incentive to innovate or improve services. The current broadband providers have the powers of natural monopolies and, as have previous natural monopolies, it seems that they are abusing these powers to collect funds from customers without seeking to improve their products.

7521183102.txt

This lack of competition has been made clearer by the attempted merger of Comcast and Time Warner Cable, both of whom have claimed the merger is legal because they are not directly competing with one another. These are the two largest broadband services in America, but if they are not competing, then how much competition is really in their market? Furthermore, the only company that is currently trying to break into the market is the incredibly wealthy Google, which attests to the enormous capital costs required to enter the market. Then comparing the service of Google Fiber, which is a modern service by all accounts, makes all other large broadband services look archaic. Google Fiber is a model of the type of service that modern broadband services should provide, and I believe that the only way other broadband services would adopt to that model, or generate similarly competitive models, is by reclassifying broadband service providers as Title II Common Carriers and adhering to the restrictions and motivations set forth by government regulation.

Redefining Broadband Reasoning:

I do not believe that this is specifically mentioned in 14-28, but the FCC has recently mentioned that it is considering redefining what is considered a broadband service. First of all, I want to be very clear that any redefining of broadband service should not motivate broadband service providers to decrease the quality of their services or attempt to route their classification as a Title II Common Carrier.

The current definition of a broadband service is 4 megabits per second. By today's standard, that is not a broadband service. Based solely on my experience with broadband services, I believe that 15 megabits per second would be a more appropriate definition of broadband with some level of quality assurance.

No Data Caps Reasoning:

I am already paying for my bandwidth. I should be charged again for the amount of data I traffic. Cable companies are already toying with this idea and it is a scary concept. One of the ways content providers are considering bypassing fast lanes is by peering connections, but a data cap would charge the users for allowing connection peering. It's wrong and combined with the current fast lane proposal is a predatory practice intended to punish users for accessing content.