

Introduction:

Hackney's diverse communities make extensive use of the digital resources offered through public PCs in Hackney Libraries. There are 26,000 regular users, more than twice that number of occasional users and a take up of 175,000 hours of use per year. In an authority with some of the most deprived wards in the country, the degree of digital exclusion is high; this is exacerbated by the large number of students living in accommodation without ample access to study facilities and a low uptake of broadband in certain areas of the borough.

More than 50% of visitors to Hackney Libraries believe that the service has helped them increase their qualifications. Libraries are working with other partners to tackle worklessness in the borough and digital inclusion within libraries is a significant strand of that thread. Wifi will be installed in half of our libraries by end of year. In addition, learning is supported through specific initiatives aimed at adults who need to improve basic and English language skills, the elderly, those requiring homework support and people with learning disabilities. All of these require access to web based resources accessed through the library internet.

The Digital Economy Act represents a significant risk to these initiatives to assist the economic regeneration of Hackney. We are very concerned that the lack of clarity in the definitions of the Act will lead to inappropriate and costly measures being imposed on our libraries, museum and archives.

Should public intermediaries be classed as Internet Service Providers under the Terms of the Digital Economy Act, there is a significant risk of increased costs to library authorities both in terms of the adoption of new software and in staff time investigating alleged breaches. In these times of limited resources, it is unlikely that these requirements could be met, leaving the authority with the unpleasant choice of reducing services to the public and therefore the scope for economic regeneration, or taking what may be an unacceptable risk in continuing to supply such a service.

Response to consultation questions

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.*

3.1 Copyright owners should only be able to take advantage of the procedures when they have met their obligations under the Secretary of State's Order.

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.*

3.2 Given their very limited role to date, library authorities are unlikely to be able to estimate the likely period necessary. However, if two months is considered sufficient for commercial ISPs, libraries are likely to need considerably longer

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?*

A critical issues for public intermediaries (schools, universities, local authorities, public libraries and museums etc) is whether they will be defined as "Internet Service Providers" ("provides an internet access service") "Subscribers" (an entity who "receives an internet access service") or "Communications Providers" for the purposes of the Act.

Currently as the Ofcom consultation is envisaged at this point no public intermediary has been named as a qualifying ISP. We are nevertheless concerned that the benchmark for being a qualifying ISP may drop in the future as serial infringers change ISP and their *modus operandi* and therefore at some point in the future our organisation comes in scope as a qualifying ISP. If this is the case we are concerned that the significant obligations, and costs envisaged by the Act are simply not appropriate for bodies as varied as schools, museums, local authorities, universities and public libraries.

However at this point in time we are very concerned that public intermediaries could be viewed as a "subscriber" by a copyright holder or a qualifying ISP upon approval of the Ofcom codes by parliament. Public intermediaries have public policy goals to educate, as well as promote the digital inclusion agenda. Also levels of infringement across public networks are currently very low, in part due to hard work by the sector in implementing practical methodologies and acceptable user terms aimed at minimising online copyright infringement.

Given these low levels of infringement across our networks we are very concerned that being viewed as a “subscriber” and becoming embroiled in the appeals process is not proportionate to the intentions of government as stated in S.124E(1)k of the Act. The Act also essentially envisages a bipartite relationship of commercial Telco giving internet access to a named and contracting householder, who equates often to a single static IP address. Public intermediaries often form consortia or rely on separate legal entities to contract for bandwidth so the entity who faces the user is not necessarily the contracting party. IP addresses are also within the sector often dynamic, and attributed to a whole building, or bank of computers so identifying infringement by a specific individual is often impossible, or at best an expensive manual process. Given the complexity of linking an IP address to an individual we are concerned that, the appeals process envisaged by the Act which requires in order for infringement to be proved that an IP address is proved to equate to a specific “subscriber”, will mean that public intermediaries are more likely to be viewed as a subscriber by a copyright holder for the purposes of prosecution under the Act.

Given the public service role of the public library combined with the fact we act as neutral and “mere conduits” for internet access, not knowingly facilitating infringement, we believe they should be viewed either as a communications provider, and therefore exempt, or as a non-qualifying category ISP as allowed for by S. 5.124C 3(a).

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?*

3.4 Whilst it is obviously sensible to include the biggest ISPs in the code, until the criteria for what is an ISP and what is a subscriber are clarified, it is impossible to judge whether Ofcom’s general approach is sensible or not.

As stated above it is important that the definitions used in the act are made more specific to the realities of internet provision by public intermediaries. Given the significant obligations / liabilities envisaged by the Act, and the low levels of infringement across our networks combined with our public service role, we believe it is of vital importance for Ofcom to create a de facto exclusion for public intermediaries under the Act.

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?*

3.5 The suggestion that public intermediaries such as universities, libraries or schools will have to collect at some point in the future address details from all

users is onerous on those organisations and users, and is contrary to the Government policy of encouraging people to use the Internet and to develop their digital literacy. This appears to be a major policy shift, and one that has not been approved by Ministers or debated in Parliament. This, together with the potential costs of implementing new measures to remain within the DEA, and technical measures to reduce risks of infringement, as well as potentially 25% of costs associated with potential infringements could lead to some libraries or education institutions no longer offering wifi or other types of Internet connections to their patrons, which totally defeats the Government's intention of a Digital Britain.

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?*

3.6 No.

As outlined above from implementation of secondary legislation it is likely that we will be viewed as a "subscriber" by ISPs and copyright holders and therefore be subject to copyright infringement reports and the appeals process. This could extend in the future to the imposition of technical measures aimed at slowing or temporarily disconnecting "subscribers" from the internet. Given our educational role, combined with our role as a "mere conduit" not knowingly facilitating infringement, brings us to the conclusion that being classed as "subscriber" is wholly inappropriate.

At the same time the lack of clarity in the definitions of the Act as applied to London Borough of Hackney will mean we have to plan for at some point potentially being classed as a "qualifying ISP". This will have significant cost and overhead implications for the organisation, ranging from legal advice, policy decisions, through to workflow and technical systems alterations.

The borough currently provides a number of resources obtainable only through authenticated access, and has an acceptable use policy. In the last year, no notification of infringement has been received from copyright holders.

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?*

4.1 We suggest that the following wording is added to the CIRs "and that to the best of the owner's knowledge the copying is of a substantial part of the work, and that the copying does not fall under any of the exceptions to copyright as provided for in the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act." This change is to

ensure that the copyright owner considers the question whether the copying, even if unauthorised, might be covered by one of the exceptions in the law.

We further recommend that the owner is required to provide supporting evidence that it is the owner of the copyright in the material in question, and that it provides an indemnity to the ISP and to any subscribers affected that should it turn out that it is not, in fact, the owner the copyright in question that it will refund all costs incurred by the ISP and/or subscribers as a result of its complaint.

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.*

4.2 We are content with the quality assurances procedures outlined.

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?*

4.3 We are content with the time period proposed.

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.*

5.1 No. It is important that one reason for not processing a CIR is that the network upon which an infringement is alleged to have taken place is the network of an excluded category / not a subscriber.

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.*

5.2 We are content with the proposed quality assurance approach on subscriber identification.

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.*

5.3 Subscribers that are institutional or organisational, such as public intermediaries are likely to be targeted if they have several employees or customers who have been infringing copyright across their networks. . This risks serious harm to public intermediaries which may find themselves being

inappropriately viewed as “in scope” of the Act for the activities of their users – activity which they have no knowledge or responsibility.

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?*

5.4 We recommend that Ofcom ensure that public intermediaries cannot be the recipients of such codes.

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.*

6.1 We recommend that ISPs have longer than 5 days to respond to a request by a copyright owner.

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.*

7.1 We believe that the appeals process might be helped by giving in-scope subscribers more information about their grounds for appeal and their rights under the Data Protection Act.

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.*

8.1 We have no problems with the proposed approach to administration, enforcement and dispute resolution as long as they are proportionate and make a *de facto* exclusion for public intermediaries who are a crucial conduit for online learning and access to knowledge in the digital world.

Conclusions

We are very concerned about the implications of the DEA and the current Code as is:

These measures will impact detrimentally on digital services offered to those who use Hackney Libraries, Archives and Information Services.

We receive and supply internet access to thousands of individual users, the complexity of our position in relation to copyright infringements must be taken into consideration.

If this is not done, our internet connection as a whole could be jeopardised

We already take rigorous practical measures to ensure that copyright infringement is minimised.

The DEA and accompanying Code risks imposes significant financial and administrative burdens on us relating to appeals, compliance, reporting and dealing with complaints – all of which may not have the desired effect of identifying persistently infringing individuals.

We urge Ofcom to evaluate carefully the costs and benefits of applying such a Code to public intermediaries, such as libraries, universities, schools, local authorities, museums etc without careful consideration of the potential costs, loss of connectivity, and other serious ramifications.