

Forename:

Name

Surname:

Withheld 7

Representing:

Self

Organisation (if applicable):

What do you want Ofcom to keep confidential?:

Keep name 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:

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.:

Yes, also believe that Copyright Owners should be strongly encouraged to follow DEA procedures, rather than engage in the deplorable conduct of Tilly, Bailey & Irvine, ACSLaw, Davenport Lyons and others.

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.:

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?:

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?:

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?:

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?:

Needs to be some reasonableness clause. Where, for example, an unknown third party has committed the infringement, due to limitations with a subscribers hardware (for example, equipment that does not support newer wireless encryption standards), must not be punished for infringements they are unable to prevent.

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?:

Need multiple forms of evidence. The current methods merely log an allegation, with no corroborating evidence. Firewall logs from a separate machine, for instance, would demonstrate that the allegation has been logged correctly.

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.:

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?:

Since the evidence gathering process is automated, there seems little reason why the CIR should not be sent within 10 minutes. Then the ISP would most likely have the chance to verify the infringing activity is indeed occurring.

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.:

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.:

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. :

Largely, yes.

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?:

The IP session details of the alleged infringements also need to be included. That way, those subscribers (particularly public wifi providers etc) with several potential infringer will be able to adjust firewall rules etc to inhibit further infringement.

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. :

Such low thresholds could easily cause massive backlogs. It would seem sensible to, if the scheme is expected to work (rather than collapse in a heap of paperwork), start with thresholds only slightly below current levels, decreasing monthly or so. It is probably also advantageous to initially keep those being sent letters, and potentially appealing, to low levels.

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.:

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.: