

Representing:

Self

Organisation (if applicable):

What do you want Ofcom to keep confidential?:

Keep organisation confidential

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

Name, email address, IP and any other information you may or may not be storing.

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:

Yes

Additional comments:

Language used in this response form is beyond most peoples understanding. Hilarious attempt to exclude average people from the process.

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.:

Agreed in principle, but not given the present contents of the DEA.

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.:

Would be fine if the rest of the proposals were workable, given the situation its another cracked cog.

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?:

Less than 400,000 users will cause professional pirates to move to smaller ISP's whilst punishing the vast majority. Part of a flawed system from the ground up.

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?:

Certainly not. Dispute your abilities to prove the status of downloaded material. Not up to me to provide YOU with sound judgements. Very disappointed you can't do that of your own volition.

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?:

Agreed in principle.

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?:

Seems likely public WiFi will be harmed. Application will be tricky and likely to be varied in each case. Flawed.

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?:

Information not conclusive or clear enough for myself and many others to make an appropriate judgement.

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.:

Not at all. Quality assurance is a hugely grey and flexible term. Seems like most of the QA will be done by ISP's. Don't trust rights holders in the slightest to do the right thing with our data. Also we know nothing of data protection procedures in reality.

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?:

Makes no difference. Based on flawed principles.

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.:

Again, component in a flawed system.

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.:

Again. No. Rushed. It's a brave attempt to fall into line with rushed legislation.

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. :

Seems sound if the data collection and establishment of guilt was based on sound grounds.

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?:

Not my place to help you.

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. :

In principle no.

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. Paid appeals etc etc. Joke.

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.:

As with most other answers, it is a component in a failed application of an unworkable piece of legislation.