

I am very concerned that the social value of public wifi should be protected. It is ridiculous to hold wifi operators responsible for the acts of their users and even more so to suggest that they should install expensive and ineffective filters. Public libraries, hotels, coffee shops and public houses all add value to their core products and services by offering wifi and this should be encouraged, not discouraged because some users may infringe copyright this way.

Moreover, the wrong questions are being asked although admittedly ofcom's hands are partly tied. There is NO EVIDENCE that copyright infringement on the Internet is hurting the entertainment industry. There is much evidence to suggest that it is not and that it is actually helpful in terms of increasing awareness of entertainment products. Either way, online infringement is not going to go away and equally plenty of artists have developed business models that can cope in this environment.

The original purpose of copyright was to encourage creativity by offering as a carrot to creators the temporary monopoly on the distribution of their works. Now it seems policy has lost sight of this and the sole purpose of copyright IS the monopoly itself, rather than the reason for granting it. We should look to repeal the Digital Economy Act and have a proper debate about what copyright means in the Internet age (for example is it logical to award near-perpetual distribution monopolies when there is no special qualification needed to be a media distributor in the current age?)