

7521304042.txt

I am writing to oppose the proposal to allow last-mile ISPs to charge content providers a premium for preferential access to customers.

As a home user of a cable company, I pay a monthly fee to access the internet. I have paid for the bandwidth quoted by the ISV, and I expect to get it. If the ISVs are charging some web sites a premium for more bandwidth, then they will implicitly or explicitly be delivering a lower quality of service to those sites that do not. This is purely driven by commercial gain -and at the expense of us consumers, whose choice of web sites are now driven by who pays the ISVs the most, rather than customer popularity. It will mean that sites with the largest check books will win.

The US is already behind most of Europe in its home user bandwidth offerings, and suffers even in urban areas from a lack of choice of ISV. That lack of competitive pressure means that we consumers would not get a choice to switch to an ISV with a better quality of service. Allowing the cable and telcos to now offer a two-tier service to web sites will make for an even worse end user experience -one we would not be able to leave.

It is notable that no other country appears to have a two-tier internet service, so it is hard to see how having it will improve home user bandwidth. Instead it will simply increase market share of the incumbent web sites and cause a worsened end user experience.