

Title:

Mr

Forename:

christopher

Surname:

wallis

Representing:

Self

Organisation (if applicable):

What do you want Ofcom to keep confidential?:

Keep nothing confidential

If you want part of your response kept confidential, which parts?:

Ofcom may publish a response summary:

Yes

I confirm that I have read the declaration:

Yes

Ofcom should only publish this response after the consultation has ended:

You may publish my response on receipt

Additional comments:

Its obnoxious that by implication the person who opens his wi fi as a service to others such as a fono, public building or a small business or even a community should be regarded as an ISP. TOTALLY OBSCENE.

Question 3.1: Do you agree that Copyright Owners should only be able to take advantage of the online copyright infringement procedures set out in the DEA

and the Code where they have met their obligations under the Secretary of State's Order under section 124 of the 2003 Act? Please provide supporting arguments.:

I believe the DEA sets out a two-sided contract in law. 1. copyright infringers will be punished 2, BUT only as and when legitimate digital downloads are made available. Apart from Ubuntu cloud I see no attempt by any provider to be agnostic and downloads remained chained to the Microsoft-DRM scenario which surely contravenes the Competition Act. Until downloads are agnostic i.e. allow Linux and Mac access NO one should be punished. ".Secondly If you already own the d/loaded material in another format how can a breach occur?

Question 3.2: Is two months an appropriate lead time for the purposes of planning ISP and Copyright Owner activity in a given notification period? If a notification period is significantly more or less than a year, how should the lead time be varied? Please provide supporting evidence of the benefits of an alternative lead time.:

I do not believe that currently a copyright owner can define accurately who an infringer is I do not believe an ISP or customer should pay for the extra time or technology to provide this accuracy

Question 3.3: Do you agree with Ofcom's approach to the application of the Code to ISPs? If not, what alternative approach would you propose? Can you provide evidence in support of any alternative you propose?:

do.

Question 3.4: Do you agree with the proposed qualification criteria for the first notification period under the Code, and the consequences for coverage of the ISP market, appropriate? If not, what alternative approaches would you propose? Can you provide evidence in support of any alternative you propose?:

I do not agree that the definition of ISP should cover individuals or small business. Patently absurd that a fono is an ISP

Question 3.5: Do you agree with Ofcom's approach to the application of the 2003 Act to ISPs outside the initial definition of Qualifying ISP? If you favour an alternative approach, can you provide detail and supporting evidence for that approach?:

no comment

Question 3.6: Do you agree with Ofcom's approach to the application of the Act to subscribers and communications providers? If you favour alternative

approaches, can you provide detail and supporting evidence for those approaches?:

Individuals are not ISP's definition too deep

Question 4.1: Do you agree with the proposed content of CIRs? If not, what do you think should be included or excluded, providing supporting evidence in each case?:

how are individuals meant to make sense of tech speak. needs to be provided in simple english

Question 4.2: Do you agree with our proposal to use a quality assurance approach to address the accuracy and robustness of evidence gathering? If you believe that an alternative approach would be more appropriate please explain, providing supporting evidence.:

do not allow evidence gathered outside of uk and beyond your control or jurisdiction

Question 4.3: Do you agree that it is appropriate for Copyright Owners to be required to send CIRs within 10 working days of evidence being gathered? If not, what time period do you believe to be appropriate and why?:

no comment

Question 5.1: Do you agree with our proposals for the treatment of invalid CIRs? If you favour an alternative approach, please provide supporting arguments.:

no comment

Question 5.2: Do you agree with our proposal to use a quality assurance approach to address the accuracy and robustness of subscriber identification? If not, please give reasons. If you believe that an alternative approach would be more appropriate please explain, providing supporting evidence.:

no comment

Question 5.3: Do you agree with our proposals for the notification process? If not, please give reasons. If you favour an alternative approach, please provide supporting arguments. :

i think the whole process needs to be constantly reviewed so no slippage occurs.

Question 5.4: Do you believe we should add any additional requirements into the draft code for the content of the notifications? If so, can you provide evidence as to the benefits of adding those proposed additional requirements? Do you have any comments on the draft illustrative notification (cover letters and information sheet) in Annex 6?:

Question 6.1: Do you agree with the threshold we are proposing? Do you agree with the frequency with which Copyright Owners may make requests? If not, please provide reasons. If you favour an alternative approach, please provide supporting evidence for that approach. :

I do not think three strikes gives the ordinary public sufficient leeway especially if the law of unintended consequences applies and some one jumps aboard to restrict access that everyone has to a particular site.

Question 7.1: Do you agree with Ofcom?s approach to subscriber appeals in the Code? If not, please provide reasons. If you would like to propose an alternative approach, please provide supporting evidence on the benefits of that approach.:

no win no fee or fine

Question 8.1: Do you agree with Ofcom?s approach to administration, enforcement, dispute resolution and information gathering in the Code? If not, please provide reasons. If you favour an alternative approach, please provide supporting evidence on the benefits of that approach.:

no comment