

There are too many problems with this to count but I'll do my best to list a few.

1) £20 to try and prove innocence is a disgusting idea. Innocent until proven guilty is one of the founding principles of our law to dispense with it at the whim of big business is short sighted and dangerous.

2) Our laws already allow copyright cartels to shut down websites and prosecute individuals, they do not need to be expanded at the cost of civil liberties.

3) copyright terms are already too long, 70 years + life is an incredible amount of time and oddly seems to increase whenever mickey mouse's term is about to run out (oddly mickey mouse was a stolen version of Steamboat Willy).

4) Piracy has been shown to increase sales in content industries, there are numerous studies that show this and not one that shows the opposite. A download is not a lost sale.

5) The idea that an IP address can identify an offender is stupid, anyone with a wireless network will be open to unauthorised access (even if it's secure). This also penalises cafes and the like who offer free wifi access.

6) Companies already use tools at their disposal to silence critics and news they don't like (see Google's chilling effects page where they talk about their requests for copyright take downs), adding another power such as this will only chill free speech further.

7) Unless I'm very much mistaken this report doesn't include the ability for users to shift formats, a fundamental right that should be granted to consumers. That this is not included shows only that this recommendation has been written only for rights holders.

8) In the digital age piracy has been shown to be caused by localised releases and profiteering from content creators. Any company that isn't selling it's product to UK consumers over the internet does not deserve to profit from that content in this manner.