

To whom it may concern,

I would like to formally submit my response to your questions in regards to retaining metadata for civil court proceedings.

As a bit of background, I am a professional musician, web developer and educator, so intellectual property is 100% of my income source.

It still oppose this proposed change completely.

My reasoning is:

1: Everyone has the right to privacy. Tracking data about people's browsing habits is already a gross violation of that right, and can only be justified for a minuscule percentage of the population (ie for security risks, like it was intended). Even then, it is not ok to betray the privacy of the majority to better hunt down the law-breaking minority.

2. Another pointless law is not going to change the behaviour of the entire userbase of the world. Legislation is not the answer. For example, if copyright infringement is the concern, look at region blocking laws. Steam, Netflix, Spotify, are all examples of SOLUTIONS to copyright infringement, and they've worked. However, region locking is far more problematic and encourages piracy. (as an independent artist, I have very little problem with piracy. Yes, it happens, but generally only by those who wouldn't pay anyway, and this can be justified as a marketing expense by our businesses).

3. Everyone who is responsible for giving up our private information for civil cases (ie to businesses with the legal teams prepared to monitor the population for potential monetary gain) will have to live with that decision for the rest of their life. I don't want to be responsible for letting this future become a reality, so I'm giving up my time to oppose it.

So, in answer to the questions listed, it's never ok to use this data in civil cases. It's unjustifiable. Civil proceedings will continue as they have. Evidence of damages should not require specific metadata.

Kind Regards,
Ben Plant