



**ICSTIS consultation paper
“Call TV Quiz Services Review: Analysis and Consultation Document”**

**Response of British Sky Broadcasting (Sky)
12 March 2007**

Sky welcomes ICSTIS' consultation on the issue of Call TV Quiz Services and the review of the relevant Statement of Expectations. We respond to each of the questions in turn below.

Q1 – Do you agree that the provisions for pricing transparency should be strengthened.. as set out in the revised Statement of Expectations?

A – We agree with and support the proposed amendment made to paragraph 4 of the Statement of Expectations in relation to pricing transparency.

Q2 – Do you agree with our assessment of Option 1?

A – We agree that failing to require any further information in relation to the element of chance will lead to erosion in consumer confidence.

Q3 – Do you agree with our assessment of Option 2?

A – We agree that it appears to be impracticable to require operators to publish the real-time chances of getting through to the programme.

Q4 – We would welcome views as to the best technical means and media through which [Option 3] could be delivered and promoted with minimum disruption to the service quality and potential for customer information overload

A – We feel strongly that the lack of information in relation to the “chances” of getting through is the most significant problem for consumers of Call Quiz TV services. We therefore agree that this issue needs to be addressed. We would support mandatory rules, in line with the examples set out on page 25, requiring providers to provide on-screen information as to the number of entrants who have called in during the last 15 minutes or hour, as well as the inclusion of the word “chance” in presenter scripts.

We do, however, feel that the amendment to the Statement of Expectations does not go far enough. It should be prescriptive, and needs to set out specific requirements. It may be that it is ICSTIS' intention to set out such rules in detail in the Statement of Expectations, in which case we welcome the introduction of such rules. We feel that if the rules are too vague, there is a danger that operators will simply ignore them.



Q5 – If you do not agree with any of our assessments presented in Options 1, 2 o3 above, what alternatives would you suggest?

A – Please see response to Q4 above.

Q6 – Do you agree with our proposal for call warnings and are there any other suggestions as to how the possibility of excessive use by consumers may be minimised?

A – We welcome the proposed introduction of mandatory warnings to customers for every £10 spent. We believe that the Statement of Expectations could, however, go further in protecting customers. We believe that, as it is technically feasible to keep a record of calls made from specific telephone numbers, it should be feasible to allow customers to set their own limits on the number of calls they make, for example per day or per week. We are not proposing setting an absolute limit on spend to cover all customers, on the basis that an arbitrary amount of, say, £100 could be considered a large amount of money by one customer while a very small amount by another. However, we do believe that customers should be able to set limits on the amounts they spend on the Call Quiz TV service and that this facility should help in reducing excessive use.

In conclusion, we commend ICSTIS' proactive stance in relation to Call TV Quiz Services and look forward to the finalising and introduction of the new Statement of Expectations.

Yours faithfully

Martin Le Jeune
Head of Public Affairs

British Sky Broadcasting Limited