

# The war over how content providers assignment



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

The other opponents are the large electrification companies and the Internet Service Providers who will be referred to as Sips. These companies have a new business plan that if allowed to be implemented by the FCC will change the way Content Service Providers Caps and the end users, which are anyone using the internet today, will have their data routed and how they must pay for it. What will happen if the large Corporations win this “ War” and how will it affect the status quo that we’ve all become used to as the Internet standard? Net Neutrality: The War over How Content Providers and Users Will Pay for Speed and

Routes of internet traffic. What is the real problem being debated? The new laws governing internet traffic if passed will give the large Sips the right to dictate how internet traffic is routed, and how they will charge the content service providers (Caps) and Internet end users (Sis’s). Net neutrality has been a core principle of the Internet since its inception. According to (Vogue, 2014) Internet service should be very similar to telephone service. As an analogy, the phone company cannot make the connection poorer if they do not like the person you are ailing.

The Sips and the large telecommunication companies don’t like this concept and are working very hard to change it. Advocates of this policy are licking their wounds because the FCC recently reported they would likely leave Broadband services deregulated. Many activists for this movement had hoped that the Obama administration would not allow Internet Service Providers (Sips) to charge individuals by the amount of bandwidth they consume (Hudson, 2010). “ Does this threaten freedom and openness on the

Internet as net neutrality activist's claim? How would net neutrality impact future investments in broadband?

Here are two opposing views on the issue" (Hudson, 2010). It seems as if the favoritism game has begun. A group of Internet service providers, mainly Comcast has already begun to raise, and overcharge certain websites for their service. Yet other service providers who are subsidiaries of theirs, like Hulu who provide the same types of service have not had their fees increased (Cry, 2014) This is a growing concern of AN supporters. What is net neutrality? Law professor Wm (2003) coined the term " net neutrality". Lawrence (Lessee, 2001, p. 68175) can trace the idea of Internet neutrality back to the open access movement that was led.

The debate on AN centers on the potential consequences of network owners exercising control over the data traffic in their networks. The meaning of " control" can mean anything from blocking certain types of traffic (Wm, 2007), to termination fees (Lee & Wm, 2009), to offering preferred services to customers willing to pay a fee for it (Hahn & Walcott, 2006). To date, there is not a generally accepted definition of AN. Consumer rights groups have among others; put a strict definition of AN forth. The internet has developed at a tremendous rate of speed. It provides users with a platform for information, entertainment, and communication.

The role of content providers has shifted to an essential gatekeeper position on the information superhighway. " Therefore, the public and politicians alike are concerned about how Internet service providers (ISPs) are going to noontime access and usage of the networks in the future. The discussion on

the future of the Internet is known as the net neutrality (AN) debate” (Kramer & Warrior, 2013, p. 1). Definition 1 Strict Net Neutrality. Net neutrality prohibits Internet service providers from speeding up, slowing down or blocking Internet traffic based on its source, ownership or destination.

As mentioned above, the Sips are already planning to implement these prohibitions in their networks. This will endanger the “openness” of the Internet that has been the standard since its inception. (Kerr & Warrior, 2013). Definition 2 How AN Applies To Service Providers. “Net neutrality usually means that broadband service providers charge consumers only once for Internet access, do not favor one content provider over another, and do not charge content providers for sending information over broadband lines to end users. (Hahn and Walcott, 2006) The Pros and Cons The Cons: Sips can block any derogatory statements said about their company. They can block peer-to-peer technologies, even those used by software developers used to enhance and grow technology. They can also block certain “Blobs” because of deals they have made with other higher paying “Blobs”. Just to name a few, and this list is growing by the day. If the Sips continue with the new business model they have landed they will not only change the face of the internet as we know it, they will lose all trust in the public and customer relations will suffer greatly.

No one will trust or buy service from a company who wants to undermine an institution standard that’s been in place since its inception. Most customers will lose trust in them and the customer relations departments of the Sips will be working overtime to try to regain the public’s trust and convince them

to come back and be a loyal customer once again. I myself hope that it sparks a whole new line of smaller ISP startups who will epithelial on the public's distrust and resentment of the large ISPs for betraying the public's trust.

If I had the capital, I would start an ISP that would NOT use the new business model they so desperately want to implement. I am sure any company who could do this would grab a huge share of the market. The pros, which in my opinion are few and far in between, and are practically meaningless in my opinion. Congress claims its Constitutional authority to set interstate communications policy, the Constitution's protections, and court precedent, as well as encourage private investment and innovation just proves Congress' bipartisan Internet policy.

It fails to keep a competitive free market, which is not hampered by government regulation. Congress also claims it respects the rule of law, and it also encourages public and Private Corporation's to get the fastest broadband to all Americans under the National Broadband Plan. Smoke and mirrors I say. Legislation, Regulation, and Constitutional Rights Since 2005, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has been working towards a set of principles that will ensure the open and interconnected character of the Internet, a restriction to try to avoid the biased term AN.

The FCC is seeking to maintain the current status quo and has followed the presented views in this section. There exist several examples of ISPs that have blocked voice over IP (VoIP) traffic, which is in competition to their regular telephone service. The most prominent example is that of Madison

River Communications, which was subject to an investigation by the FCC in 2005 for exactly such practice. The case was settled under the old common carrier powers of the FCC, which applied at that point in time to DSL service (c. F. FCC, 2011).

Traffic management techniques may be used by the ISP to avoid or limit traffic that, in their view, generates nothing but higher costs. Here, the most prominent example is that of Comcast, the largest cable company in the US, which was subject to scrutiny by the FCC in 2008 because it had restricted the flow of peer-to-peer (P2P) traffic. The FCC issued a cease or desist order against Comcast in 2008, which was overturned by the US Court of Appeals in 2010, because it was found that the FCC has failed to tie its assertion of regulatory authority to an actual law enacted by Congress (McCullough, 2010).

In its final Report & Order from December 2010, the FCC adopted the following AN framework. Definition 3 FCC. " A person engaged in the provision of fixed broadband Internet access service, insofar as such person is so engaged, shall 1 . Transparency " C... ] publicly disclose accurate information regarding the network management practices, performance, and commercial terms [... ]. "(FCC, 2010, Section 54) 2. No Blocking not block lawful content, applications, services, or non-harmful devices, subject to reasonable network management. (FCC, 2010, Section 63) 3.

No Unreasonable Discrimination not unreasonably discriminate in transmitting lawful network traffic over a consumer's broadband Internet access service. " (FCC, 2010, Section 68) The FCC acknowledges the

usefulness of reasonable network management, but also says that pay for priority arrangements will raise significant reasons for concern (FCC, 2010, Section 76). They also said that transparency and competition are the main remedies to ensure AN. It is also important to note that wireless network services are not subject to the restrictions of network management.

The main reason for this is the competition between wireless network operators. Because the effect of competition is still unclear, it is going to be interesting to see whether the PC's AN ruling, which took effect on November 20, 2011, is going to lead to changes of the fixed and wireless networks in the US. The New FCC Rulings In January 2014, the DC Court of Appeals agreed with Verizon and said that the FCC cannot stop Internet service providers from blocking or discriminating against websites or any other Internet traffic unless the Internet is reclassified as a public utility.

However, the court also said the FCC does have some authority to implement net neutrality rules as long as it promotes broadband deployment across the country. On May 15, the FCC voted to move forward with their proposed rules for net neutrality, the principle that all Internet traffic should be treated equally. The proposal, which is now open for public comment for four months, would dramatically change the Internet. The new rules would allow Internet service providers (ISPs) like Verizon or AT&T to charge websites like Backbone and Twitter for faster service.

This as a whole range of consequences for all avid Internet users. (Miranda, 2014) The Public Fear The public AN debate it is related to the fear that ISPs may be in the position to limit the freedom of speech. ISPs could block

access to politically controversial (but legal) information, or shut down websites of unwanted organizations, Ex. The websites of labor associations to prevent an assembly of workers (Austin, 2005) Evidence of such practices is not necessarily true, because it will almost certainly cause a loss of reputation for the Sips.

It seems obvious that such limitations of freedom of speech would be addressable by constitutional law of the respective country. However, people are aware that there are remarkable differences in the legal basis for preserving free speech online. The Other Side of the Coin Opponents say that strict AN would be taking a step backwards from the status quo of the Internet. If any network management practices are forbidden it could lead to congestion problems at peak times, which could only be counteracted by over provisioning of a networks capacity.

In any case, Sips' revenues would be reduced because business models that rely on managed services, like PIPIT, could not be liable offered anymore. The likely result of this strict interpretation of AN would be that consumer prices for (full) Internet access will increase, or that the rate of investments in network infrastructure is reduced which will reduce the SO (Quality Of Service) we are all accustomed to. They also claim that customers with limited needs for internet access will not have the opportunity to purchase these services if they want to.

Vice-president of the European commission Nellie Zeroes who said that “ requiring operators to provide only full internet could kill innovative new offers Even worse, it could mean higher prices for those consumers with



more limited needs who were ready to accept a cheaper, limited package” (Meyer, 2011). Conclusion In general what all of this means is that the Sips have an agenda to create a new business model. If the laws are changed that currently govern internet traffic, it can, and will change the way Internet access is routed and how the users are charged for it.

However, for now, they are gunning for the website owner/operators or Caps (Content Service Providers) as they are also called, who provide content to the end users. Specifically the large Caps who rely on fast data transfer rates to provide customers with the services they offer. For Ex. Netting which is a company that offers subscribers a service that allows them to instantly stream TV shows and movies would be put out of business if they did not agree to pay for their data to travel in the so-called “ fast lane”.

This type of service relies heavily on the fast transmission of data packets across a network in order to provide uninterrupted service. If the Sips and large telecommunication companies get their way they can restrict certain kinds of data/traffic at their discretion and direct it into the “ traffic lanes” of their choosing. They wish to divide the Internet into predetermined lanes of slow, medium, and fast data transfer speeds. Then charge Caps (Content Service Providers) according to the speed that they want, or essentially need their data to travel at.

Step 2. Focus on the accuracy of the assumptions and conclusions. I used the scoring guide and the instructions for the assignment to ensure that I have met the requirements and feel confident with my submission. Step 3. Break the problems into workable parts. I used the discussion posts and

suggestions of the other classmates as well as the instructor's comments to tackle each perceived item that was recommended to me that needed revision.

I approached this by looking at them as a whole and then breaking them down and working on them one at a time. Step 4. Do not guess or jump to conclusions. I feel I did not jump to conclusions by using the many credible sources and references to justify my conclusions used in my draft. Step 5. Employ meaningful self-dialogue throughout the process, including written or drawn prompts as well as spoken words. I'll be quite honest here I still have not mastered how to accomplish this step.

I do not talk out loud to myself but do talk silently to myself while writing to make sure my words sound correct and flow nicely together, so in a sense I guess I do implement this process in that way. Step 6. Briefly describe what it felt like to go through the process. Going through this process is a constant learning experience for me. I'm realizing that as my paper develops I find my steps of using the critical thinking process are beginning to change. I'm not sure if this is a good thing but I have noticed a difference in my processes from the beginning until now.