

Comment on Proceeding 14-28, Protecting the Open Internet

I am a private U.S. citizen.

I have no objection to content providers (here Netflix, for example only) and Internet Service Providers (e.g. Comcast) making hardware arrangements for more efficient transfer of large amounts of data from the content provider to the ISP. They should be allowed to share the cost of such arrangements in any way they find equitable. However, the payment arrangement should only cover the actual cost to the ISP of adding and maintaining the hardware arrangement. It should not include additional payments that offer the ISP an incentive alter the flow of content to its customers. Moreover, the ISP should be required to allow all content providers to make similar hardware arrangements at similar cost.

I do object to any arrangement that would alter the priority of packets being fed from the ISP to consumers. The probability that the next packet transmitted to each end user by Comcast comes from Netflix should be proportional to the fraction of Netflix packets among all those waiting for delivery. Netflix should not be allowed to pay Comcast to give its packets any more priority than those of any other content provider in the "last mile" of connection to Comcast's customers.

This approach does mean that if a content provider arranges for more bandwidth to the ISP, for example by installing its own fiber into the ISP's switching centers, then it may benefit from faster packet delivery to the consumer. However, nothing should prevent other content providers from making similar arrangements.

Consumers pay the ISP (e.g. Comcast) for Internet access, and that should be the ISP's main source of revenue. The ISP should not be allowed to alter the priority of packet delivery based on payments from upstream providers or to promote its own content.

Regards,

William B. Herdler  
150 Lands Way N  
Wilmington DE 19803-6408  
fcc@herdler.com