

From: [REDACTED]
To: [FN-OMB-IntellectualProperty](#)
Subject: Consumer rights and corporate control
Date: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 4:48:25 PM

Re: Comments on the Joint Strategic Plan

Victoria Espinel
Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator
Office of Management and Budget
Executive Office of the President
Filed via email

Dear Ms. Espinel:

Any strategic plans for enforcement of intellectual property should measure all of the costs and benefits involved. Enforcement has its own costs to citizens and consumers, especially when legal uses of copyrighted works can be mistaken for infringement.

The Joint Strategic Plan should carefully examine the basis for claims of losses due to infringement, and measure credible accounts of those losses against all of the consequences of proposed enforcement measures, good and bad.

Measures like cutting off Internet access in response to alleged copyright infringement can do more harm than good. Internet connections are not merely entertainment or luxuries; they provide vital communication links, often including basic phone service. This is even more clearly unfair in cases where users are falsely or mistakenly accused.

Internet service providers should not be required or asked to violate users' privacy in the name of copyright enforcement beyond the scope of the law. Efforts to require or recommend that ISPs inspect users' communications should not be part of the Joint Strategic Plan.

The anti-circumvention provisions of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act can criminalize users who are simply trying to make legal uses of the media they have bought. Breaking digital locks on media should not be a crime unless they are being broken for illegal purposes. The government should not spend its resources targeting circumventions for legitimate purposes.

Any plans or agreements on IP enforcement, like the proposed Anti Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA) should be made open and transparent. In dealing with questions of copyright and the Internet, too much is at stake for our country's laws and policies to be made out of the public eye.

On a more personal note, I find it particularly distressing on how companies control ownership of product more than the individual who purchases it, this is a process where private companies are invading the personal spaces of home and family in order to enact control in effort to gain more money. This feels not only disturbing that America would move in this direction, but is inherently unamerican, as it is a remote power exerting its strength on individual citizens. Which if I am not mistaken, we broke from Brittan with that express purpose, but what do I

know. I am only a highly trained American Historian.

I leave it in your capable hands to make a responsible decision that will ultimately help make copyright what it was meant to be, a short termed leap in order to help an inventor of a product gain a foothold in the market before competitors may enter. not magical money making legislation that prevents anyone else from ever using anything remotely like it ever again, because that would kill free market forever.

Sincerely,

Matthew MacDonald