

Dear Mr. Marshall

I wish to participate in this Consultation.
My replies to the Questions are as follows:

Q1: Do you agree with our proposal to create a Statement of Application for the 0871 number range? (If not, please provide your reasons and alternative suggestions)

Yes, in so far as it does not conflict with any of my other answers/comments/suggestions below.

Q2: Do you agree that the current application of Section 1 of the Code is appropriate to apply to the 0871 number range? (If not, please give your reasons)

Yes, in so far as it does not conflict with any of my other answers/comments/suggestions below.

Q3: Do you agree that this is a fair and proportionate application of the network operators' due diligence requirements to the 0871 number range? (If not, please give your reasons. ICSTIS would welcome further information regarding quantification of costs)

Yes.

Q4: Do you have any further information and evidence regarding usual payment times? (Additionally it would be helpful to have responses that indicate to what extent Service providers rely on immediate payments from network operators to cover their operational costs)

n/a

Q5: Do you agree that this is a fair and proportionate application of a delayed payment mechanism to the 0871 number range? (If not, please provide your reasons)

Yes.

Q6: Do you agree that the current application of Section 3 of the Code is appropriate to apply to the 0871 number range? (If not, please provide your reasons)

Yes except that it is mentioned that within section 3 of the code that service providers also hold non-premium rate UK customer service numbers but that you currently think 087x numbers are ok. This is a contradiction as 0871 will be premium rate numbers hence why they will be regulated by ICSTIS. Therefore, it defeats the point of the service provider not holding a non-premium rate number but yet allow them to hold an 0871 contact number. It is suggested therefore that service providers be required to hold a geographical or 0870 number and NOT 0871 numbers.

Q7: Do you agree that the current application of Section 4 of the Code is appropriate to apply to the 0871 number range? (If not, please provide your reasons)

Yes, in so far as it does not conflict with any of my other answers/comments/suggestions.

Q8: Do you agree that it is fair and proportionate to apply ICSTIS' current application of the prior permission regime under Section 5.1 of the Code to the 0871 number range? (If not, please provide your reasons)

Yes.

Q9: Do you agree that Option D is a fair and proportionate application of the undue delay requirements in paragraph 5.4.2 of the Code to the 0871 number range? (If not, please provide your reasons and alternative preferred option. Additionally, please provide details of any other options you feel may be appropriate for ICSTIS to consider)

No. You state that you have received significant complaints concerning 0871 numbers as has Ofcom and at this time Ofcom is currently investigating scams on 0870 numbers. Once 0870 loses its revenue share, most companies/organisations are expected to migrate to 0871 and this means scam artists will also do this. What you propose to basically not do anything about call queuing is not at all in the consumer interest but only in the interest of companies/organisations using these numbers.

It has been stated by ICSTIS that many companies/organisations will use 0871 not for the revenue share (can be as much as up to 6p/min) but for the advanced network features. If this was true then companies/organisations would use other lower-rate non-geographical numbers like 0845 which offer the same advanced network features except in most cases revenue sharing isn't passed to the company instead being retained by the service provider to pay for the advanced network services.

Therefore, the primary interest in using 0871 is for the revenue share in addition to the advanced network features available but the difference is that many consumers currently aren't aware that 0871 is premium rate which is why many companies/organisations have already migrated to 0871.

Many companies/organisations would not dare move to 09x (not even at 15p/min) because in all likelihood they are aware that consumers are aware that 09x is a premium rate and that this would cause many complaints so instead they have opted for 0871 where revenue still exists but without consumer knowledge that they are in fact ringing a premium rate number (albeit lower amounts) and according to your proposal, being able to gain revenue even whilst consumers are held in a queue. It's possible to be held in a queue for over 20 minutes when ringing some companies on their 0870 now. This equates to the company getting over £1 for every call they get that lasts 20 minutes just being in a queue. If a company gets hundreds or even thousands of calls a day then this adds up over the month and year. Therefore there can be an incentive to keep callers waiting.

I believe with the extra revenue possible from 0871 numbers that this is used to ensure that us consumers aren't charged for being kept on hold for undue delays and therefore consumers aren't charged for being in a long queue. I don't believe that with the extra revenue possible from 0871 numbers that this would add any extra financial burden on to companies/organisations operating 0871 numbers.

If this is still not possible then how about an announcement when first rung that states where you are in the queue and how long it's estimated you'll be before being answered.

This would allow us consumers to know in advance that they could be a long time and can choose to ring back later, etc. Again, this could all be paid for out of the revenue from the call they receive which ICSTIS believes is really only used for network features and not to deliberately gain revenue from the call.

Q10: Do you agree that this is a fair and proportionate application of the pricing information requirements under Section 5.7 of the Code to the 0871 number range? (If not, please provide your reasons)

Yes, except that because consumers will not be aware that 0871 is a premium rate number (unlike 09x where consumer knowledge that this is premium rate is greater), companies/organisations should also be obliged to say when they answer the call that "calls will cost 10p/min from a BT landline (other providers may charge more)." This really has hardly any financial impact on the companies/organisations using these numbers in fact the extra 10 seconds or so it takes to say this will cost us consumers but at least consumers would be fully aware that they are paying at least 10p/min.

Q11: Do you agree that it is appropriate to allow a three-month implementation period, as outlined above?

Yes.

Q12: Do you agree that this is a fair and proportionate application of ICSTIS' scope of regulation in respect to content of services provided on the 0871 number range? (If not, please provide your reasons)

Yes.

Q13: Do you agree that the current application of Section 6 of the Code is appropriate to apply to the 0871 number range? (If not, please provide your reasons)

Yes, in so far as it does not conflict with any of my other answers/comments/suggestions.

Q14: Do you agree that the current application of Section 7 of the Code is appropriate to apply to the 0871 number range? (If not, please provide your reasons)

Yes, in so far as it does not conflict with any of my other answers/comments/suggestions.

Q15: Do you agree that the current application of Sections 8 to 11 of the Code is appropriate to apply to the 0871 number range? (If not, please provide your reasons)

Yes, in so far as it does not conflict with any of my other answers/comments/suggestions.

Q16: Do you agree that this is a fair and proportionate application of the funding model in Annex 1 of the Code to apply to the 0871 number range? (If not, please provide your reasons)

Yes.

Q17: Do you agree that this is a fair and proportionate method of collection of the funding levy to apply to the 0871 number range? (If not, please provide your reasons)

Yes.

Q18: Do you agree that a minimum payment amount from each network operator should be £500 per annum? (If not, please provide your reasons)

Yes.

Q19: Do you agree that it is not appropriate for ICSTIS to create and promote a separate brand for regulation of the 0871 number range? (If not, please provide your reasons)

Yes, so long as ICSTIS doesn't try and hide the fact that 0871 is a premium rate number (albeit lower amount than 09x) and that Communication Providers (CPs)/Service Providers do not advertise the 0871 number range as 'national rate' which some CPs currently do this.

Q20: Is there any other way in which ICSTIS' regulatory framework should be amended or otherwise so as to regulate the 0871 number range in a way that is fair and proportionate?

To discourage scams with missed phone calls/silent calls, ICSTIS should ensure that companies/organisations using an 0871 does not display via CLI (Caller Display Identity) their 0871 number. Instead, companies/organisations should use freephone or lower-cost number ranges. This would also save Ofcom having to investigate missed calls/silent calls (whether deliberate or not) as this is potentially in contravention of current Ofcom rules. Currently, Ofcom rules state that companies/organisations making phone calls (sales, etc) should not display any number costing more than the rate of an 0845 on CLI.

Q21: Do you agree that this is an appropriate wording for a Statement of Application based on ICSTIS' proposals? (If not, please provide your reasons and alternative wording)

n/a

Additional Point

I wish to emphasise that it is clearly in the consumer interest and right that there should be a "health warning" whenever any 08 or 09 number is published that this is a revenue sharing number and that the company/body issuing it will be in receipt of money whenever it is used. The only exception would be when the number is a "free" number eg 0800 or when it is categorically stated that there is no revenue sharing. The BBC is a classic example of the failure to make this clear eg for Any Answers on Radio 4. This is in my view disingenuous at its lowest and dishonest at its highest. There must be transparency.

Please acknowledge receipt of this response and confirm that it will be taken into account in the Consultation.

Yours sincerely

Michael King