

Title:

Mr

Forename:

Steve

Surname:

Adams

Representing:

Self

Organisation (if applicable):

Email:

sadams_s@yahoo.com

What do you want Ofcom to keep confidential?:

Keep nothing 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:

I wholly object to the objectives of this proposal - i.e. to attempt to restrict access to and make it harder to find innovative and new ways to enjoy the BBC's publicly funded content.

I object to the misuse of the term "Content management" to describe the practice of restricting what license payers can do.

"Content management" is a well understood term and has been misappropriated in this

proposal.

"DRM" is the usual standard term for this kind of approach.

Question 1: Do you agree that copy management would broaden the range of HD content available on DTT and help secure its long term viability as a platform? :

No. This is stupid and restrictive. It stops innovation and closes the market for devices and services.

Question 2: Do you agree that the BBC's proposed multiplex licence amendment represents the most appropriate means for securing an effective content management system on HD DTT? :

The objective is flawed. It's difficult to comment on "the most appropriate means" for something which should NOT be attempted.

Question 3: Do you agree with the proposed change to Condition 6 in the Multiplex B Licence? :

No. Don't let them do anything to restrict the availability of publicly funded content.

Question 4: Do you agree that Multiplexes C and D should be granted a similar amendment to their Licences as Multiplex B?. :

No. Don't let them do anything to restrict the availability of publicly funded content.

Question 5: Do you agree that the BBC's proposed approach for implementing content management would safeguard citizens and consumers legitimate use of HD content, and if not, what additional guarantees would be appropriate? :

No. Don't let them do anything to restrict the availability of publicly funded content. We should guarantee that content created by the BBC and funded from the license fee is available without restriction. If content providers/owners/producers (e.g. 3rd party producers, American shows etc.) aren't happy with this then they should take their content elsewhere (commercial and satellite TV). The BBC should innovate and create content which is funded by the public and open to the public without stupid restrictions.

Question 6: Do you agree that the BBC's proposed choice of content management technologies will have only a negligible impact on the cost of HD DTT receivers and their interoperability with other HD consumer equipment? .:

No. Adding this sort of restrictive requirement adds a burden to all creators of H/W and S/W and is unnecessary and restrictive.

The objective is flawed and the technology unnecessary.

Question 7: Do stakeholders agree that the BBC's proposed Huffman Code licensing arrangements would have a negligible effect on the market for HD DTT receivers? :

No. Why introduce extra license requirements at all. The objective is flawed and the licenses unnecessary.

Question 8: Do the BBC's proposed content management states and their permitted use for different categories of HD content meet the requirements of other HD broadcasters on DTT? . :

I have no idea. However the BBC should be concerned with ensuring open and unrestricted access to publicly funded content... NOT trying to stop us consuming this content however we like.

Question 9: Are there any issues that you consider Ofcom should take into account in assessing the BBC's proposal, that have not been addressed by this consultation?:

Yes. The BBC should foster innovation and open access to publicly funded content. I utilise the Free and Open Source MythTV software. These (stupid, restrictive) proposals suggest that such innovative and public spirited approaches to accessing the BBC content are neither understood or welcomed by the BBC. The objective (to restrict access) is daft and the opposite of what the BBC should be pursuing.