

Dear Commission on Net Neutrality,

Please find enclosed my answers on the questionnaire on Net Neutrality, I hope it contributes to your development of policy around the matter.

Q1: Is there currently a problem.

A1: The only issue which arises currently is that providers have the idea that they are allowed to even think about the possibility that they will control content and its distribution over the Internet in the future. The same parallel goes for water providers who may think about who to deliver water and in which volumes. This should not be encouraged.

Q2: How might problems arise in the future.

A2: By opening the discussion how or why to control the data flows it is stated that there might be a reason/discussion on this area. It should be utterly clear to all that free flow of information is one of the basic necessities of our democracy, by challenging the freedom of information flow you challenge democracy (what should not be the intention of the discussion).

Q3: Is the regulatory framework capable.

A3: We are not used to discuss about future regulation of limiting freedom as they usually appear after the limiting factor has been opposed upon us. By opening the discussion at an early stage I hope that we all consider the change of regulation in favor of our democratic rights instead of the limiting force of those who benefit solely from it.

Q4: To what extend is traffic management necessary.

A4: The extend on limiting traffic should be justified by upholding of current law applicable. For instance traffic management to identify terrorism or child abuse could justify the limitation of certain traffic to measure the unlawful acts conducted. Anything else is arbitrary and impossible to challenge, for that the opportunity should not be offered.

Q5: To what extend will net neutrality concerns..

A5: Natural selection will determine the difference between different services. Where a group of customers is not interested in a service it will deminish and disappear in the near future. By upholding certain services on unclear, nor challengeable reasons the service provider will determine instead of letting the free flow of information determine its use.

Q6: Should the principles governing traffic management

A6: There should be no difference in governing traffic management over different media as it is not a determining factor in the openness of flow of information. The reason we now make a difference is due to the technical incapability of provider to deliver the same service over different media. In the future there will be new media where the exception will or can be misused.

Q7: What other forms of prioritisation are taking place.

A7: Currently users choose there providers for the service they deliver, not the content they deliver (unless you live in countries where certain information is prohibited but where there is no choice usually because it is government owned). By accepting the providers into the playing field of content delivery the service provider is no service provider but a content provider with control over the service, which is a contraption of services

which should be untangled as it is not in the best interest of the customer.

Q8: Should the same quality..

A8: Service provider can never pre-select opinions of multiple customers up front. Delivering a mean where a customer can determine its own filtering could help both customer and supplier to allocate more efficient means of distributing data. But by letting the provider determine solely it will be always in favor of the provider.

Q9: If the objective referred to in Question 8..

A9: By opening the possibility that providers would act in best interest of the customer, the provider should consider the actual freedom of data in general. By denying the self right it should realize its usages is limited. By determining on a regulatory bases the access to certain information will cause the unborn information to be stopped at forehand. By not implying any information ban, the free flow of information is guaranteed.

Q10: Are the commercial arrangements..

A10: Currently there are no means to measure the openness of information flow. When sites are off line it is currently noticed but squeezed sites are not recognized. It is the idea that the information provider is responsible for its content and it will notice if its information is squeezed. It currently has no ways to enforce equal rights on the providers side.

Q11: What instances could trigger

A11: Currently the total bandwidth of a provider is a mean to select a provider. If the provider states its limitations by religion, color or number of toes, it is predefined what services to be expected and users may choose this provider on these basis. If a provider chooses to stay open it should be objected to audits where it can show/prove its openness.

Q12: How should quality of service

A12: A foundation where all providers and government (education/University) are part of, audited by an external party could fulfill such a role.

Q13: In the case where NRA's find it necessary

A13: Publishing the measured discrepancies will help to uphold the quality of service.

Q14: What should transparency for consumers

A14: Transparency should be key in the service delivery. Every diversion should be published by the provider itself and proved to be for a limited period (during calamities etc) of time and with reason. If measured differently it will be challenged.

Sincerely,
Huub Knops