

I strongly object to the FCC proposed rule which would allow internet infrastructure providers and content delivery corporations, such as Comcast and similar, to charge higher fees for so called “fast lanes” to content and service providers using their network. Here are the reasons I oppose the proposed rule:

1. The proposed rule would allow a small number of companies to monopolize the internet and control content that can be delivered to providers. Independent developers of content and services will be heavily disadvantaged by the proposed rule.
2. The proposed rule will limit innovation. New companies without large capital resources will be disadvantaged because they will not be able to compete successfully with established internet companies who can afford and dominate “fast lane” internet transmission.
3. The proposed rule would fundamentally alter the internet as Americans have known it. Everyone should have the same opportunities to use the complete potential of the internet without access being controlled by a few content or infrastructure service providers.

A more appropriate rule would do the following:

1. Regulate the internet as a public utility. Fund infrastructure development and maintenance as is done with other common carriers.
2. Classify broadband access as a Title II common carrier.
3. Disallow all “fast lanes” on the internet.

This is a turning point in the development of the internet. United States citizens deserve free and open access to the internet and the opportunity to develop products and engage in commerce using it. The proposed rule would compromise these principles and should not be adopted in its present form. The FCC should regulate broadband internet access as a Title II common carrier.

David Heal