



Call TV Quiz Services Review: A Revised Statement of Expectations

A STATEMENT BY ICSTIS

Issued by ICSTIS on 4 April 2007

Contents

Section		Page
1.	Executive Summary	3
2.	Background	5
3.	Summary of Responses	7
4.	Conclusion and Next Steps	13

Annex One **Organisations Responding to the Consultation**

Annex Two **Revised Statement of Expectations for Call TV Quiz Services**

Section 1

Executive Summary

We worked very closely with Ofcom to produce the first Statement of Expectations for Call TV Quiz Services in early 2006¹. When we published our consultation document reviewing the Statement on 29 January 2007 we acknowledged that now was the right time to review that document one year on and in light of the recent recommendations helpfully made by the Culture, Media and Sport Select Committee². Many of the recommendations made by the Select Committee related to ICSTIS' regulation and our consultation document appeared to have captured the essence of the main concerns identified by the Select Committee.

Issues of transparency have been at the heart of the review. This has been both in terms of their cost and the chance of being successful in getting through to the TV presenter. These issues must be clear so that consumers can exercise choice fairly and in a way that provides them with trust and confidence. This has also been a matter, understandably, of much media, political and public interest.

In the last few weeks, the media and public interest in the generality of premium rate services provided through broadcast output has grown considerably following on from a number of well-reported allegations about the practices of some of these programmes as they have related to the provision of competitions or votes as part of the editorial output of a TV programme. ICSTIS and Ofcom are working closely together and have a number of services under investigation using the relevant provisions of our respective Codes of Practice. At the same time, Ofcom has announced an inquiry into premium rate telecoms services in television programmes. We very much welcome this inquiry, which has a focus on compliance concerns, and we will be making an extensive input into it. The scope of that inquiry does not in any way conflict with moving forward with finalising the ICSTIS Statement of Expectations for Call TV Quiz Services.

We believe the proposals and enhancements to our expectations address the specific concerns that many commentators and the Select Committee identified with the current operation of Call TV Quiz Services. Specifically, we are proposing to tighten provisions in the following areas:

- **Transparency as to chance of getting through to air:** the chances of acceptance or rejection of an attempt by a viewer to get beyond the first stage must be shown on-screen in near real-time. This will be achieved as a minimum by a prominent permanently visible stand-alone display (whether static, crawling or scrolling) showing the total number of entries (paid and free) to the service in the preceding 15-minute period. This must be updated at no more than 10-minute intervals. This minimum standard would mean showing six updates within the space of an hour.
- **Pricing information:** as well as the other obligations in the Statement for pricing information to be provided, we now require that pricing information must be spoken by a presenter or voice-over at intervals of no more than 10 minutes. The pricing announcement must make clear that the cost will apply regardless of whether the entrant is successful in getting through to the studio. The ICSTIS Help Note on pricing information provides further general guidance.

¹ Such services are defined in Annex 2 to this document and should not be confused with general premium rate services which may be an additional component in a TV programme.

² Ofcom and ICSTIS' joint submission to the Select Committee Report on TV quiz shows can be found at http://www.icstis.org.uk/pdfs_news/Calltvquiz_jointresponseDCMS.pdf

- **Call cost warnings:** must be provided to all callers (other than where the number is withheld) at intervals of no more than each £10 spent in each calendar day. Alternatively, warnings may be provided at set call intervals in any calendar day that equate to accumulations of £10 of call spend (for example, call warnings at every tenth call where the cost of each call is £1). Such warning must make clear the number of calls, the cost of each chargeable call and that this may vary across different networks.

The revised Statement of Expectations is set out in full at Annex 2 to this document. The document takes effect **four weeks** from the date of its publication. This is in order to allow time for providers to make necessary changes to their systems and procedures, taking account of the enhanced consumer protection requirements being introduced.

We will work with Ofcom to keep this revised Statement of Expectations and these services under review, especially over the coming weeks and months. This includes random monitoring to ensure compliance with the ICSTIS Code of Practice and individual conditions in permission certificates. We will also be remaining in close contact with the Gambling Commission as it finalises its review and consultation on Prize Competitions and Free Draws.

In the meantime, we will be developing an enhanced prior permission regime for all premium rate services which are broadcast and these will be the subject of a separate consultation shortly. In developing these proposals, we will continue to work closely with Ofcom to ensure that our approach is consistent with its policy development for Participation TV more generally.

Section 2 Background

On 10 October 2006 ICSTIS announced that it was to carry out a review of the Call TV Quiz sector. In making the announcement, we made clear that our recent monitoring of Quiz TV programming, combined with evidence from complaints, has highlighted a number of issues that need to be explored with the industry and others. This has been supported by consumer research.

Services that use premium rate as a form of payment need to be clear on the cost of taking part and transparent as to how the services work. There is a concern at present that this is not always the case with all Call TV Quiz Services. Users are entitled to the protection of our Code of Practice – and we confirmed that our review would look at all Call TV Quiz Services and the effectiveness of current safeguards.

We made clear that we would report on our findings and any regulatory action as soon as we could. Any action will be in keeping with our commitment to good regulatory practice and be evidence-based. Finally, we specified that the review would cover:

Transparency

Do consumers actually understand what's involved – the cost of taking part, the element of chance and the fact that all callers pay even if they fail to get through to the studio?

On-screen statements

Do the on-screen statements made by presenters always match records of calls to the programme (for example, statements that no calls are being received)?

Excessive use

There appears to be some evidence of problems with repeat calls and bad debt. Should call/spend limits exist, be mandated or left to the industry?

Prize fulfilment

Do operators have efficient arrangements in place to ensure prizes are issued quickly and with certainty?

Free web entry routes

Are we confident that these are genuine alternatives?

It should be noted that our review is not primarily designed to touch upon editorial content issues such as the perceived fairness of the quizzes and the quiz questions. While we recognise that there have been some well-reported cases in the media about this issue, the regulation of this aspect of the services rests with Ofcom. Our regulatory responsibility arises where the on-screen content amounts to the promotion of a premium rate service. This, along with the respective division of responsibilities in the regulatory sphere of Call TV Quiz Services, was made clear in the joint submission ICSTIS and Ofcom made to the Culture, Media & Sport Select Committee for its hearing on 28 November³. A copy of our joint submission is at http://www.icstis.org.uk/pdfs_news/inquiry_calltvquiz.pdf.

ICSTIS' *Call TV Quiz Services Review – Analysis and Consultation Document* was published on 29 January 2007. In all, 16 responses were received. We are grateful for all of the organisations that took the time and effort to provide constructive comments and suggestions. A list of

³ Ofcom's Broadcasting Code Rule 2.11 states: "Competitions should be conducted fairly, prizes should be described accurately and rules should be clear and appropriately made known."

respondents is at Annex 1 and all non-confidential responses have been posted on the ICSTIS website.

The consultation identified six questions on which specific responses were requested from respondents.

Section 3 provides a summary based on the responses to each of the six questions. Where respondents had more general comments regarding proposed changes, the evidence from the ICSTIS monitoring review or ICSTIS' approach to this issue, they are included under a separate heading.

Section 3

Summary of Responses

Set out below is a summary of the responses provided to the six questions which were posed in the consultation, each of which relates to how the Statement of Expectations for Call TV Quiz Services could be enhanced in order to provide greater transparency and consumer protection for users of these services.

Q1. Do respondents agree that the provisions for pricing transparency should be strengthened by requiring pricing information to be spoken by a presenter or voice-over at intervals of no more than 10 minutes and by making clear that the cost will apply regardless of whether the callers gets through to the studio?

Positive responses were received from all broadcasters and nearly all service/content providers of Call TV Quiz Services, who stated that their current practice is in line with ICSTIS' proposal. However, one response suggested ICSTIS should be mindful of its own evidence, showing that 87% of consumers are aware of charges and that 78% are aware of the random element to call selection, before introducing further regulation.

Two respondents saw no reason to change the current requirement that pricing information is spoken every 5-15 minutes and one warned that pricing announcements may not be accurate given that the actual cost of a call would vary according to network rates.

Conclusion

While ICSTIS acknowledges that the majority of Call TV Quiz Service providers require presenters to give pricing information at 5-15 minute intervals, it is not currently always made clear to viewers that their call will be charged regardless of whether they get through to the studio. In addition, the majority of respondents, especially those involved in the broadcast element, have indicated that they already require announcements at 10- minute intervals or less in line with ICSTIS' proposal.

ICSTIS also acknowledges that the actual cost of calls may vary, dependent upon network charges, especially in respect of mobile phones. However, providing viewers with spoken pricing information, and informing them regularly that they will be charged whether they are put through to the studio or not, will make viewers more aware of the minimum cost of each call and the fact that it applies to every one they make.

In light of the responses, ICSTIS concludes that the updated requirements surrounding spoken pricing information in the proposed Statement of Expectations should remain as worded in the consultation, namely that spoken pricing should be required at no more than 10-minute intervals and make clear that the cost applies to every call made.

Q2. Do respondents agree that requiring no further transparency around the rates of rejection/acceptance of calls is not an option?

While many respondents felt that their programming already provided viewers with clear information to make an informed choice about entry, or that current media attention was out of proportion to the 15-20 complaints about this that ICSTIS receives per month, many respondents felt that the Quiz TV sector would benefit from enhanced consumer confidence and agreed with ICSTIS that doing nothing further was not an option.

Of the responses which disagreed, all concurred that further measures needed to be taken to ensure consumer confidence in the Quiz TV sector. However, some respondents did not accept that ICSTIS needed to increase regulatory requirements, arguing either that ICSTIS could

enforce using the existing Statement of Expectations or that the industry itself could consider and adopt safeguards without further formal regulation. In respect of action that the industry might take, no specific proposals were put forward at this time.

Conclusion

ICSTIS considers that respondents are in general agreement that greater transparency needs to be achieved if Call TV Quiz Services are to sustain consumer confidence and continue to grow. Many respondents, including all broadcasters and a majority of those who generate or provide content, welcome ICSTIS' lead in establishing a standard of greater transparency.

ICSTIS made clear in the consultation document that any changes to the current Statement of Expectations for Call TV Quiz Services should be evidence-based, and considers that the monitoring review carried out in late 2006 has provided evidence that the current Statement is not fully equipped to ensure consumer trust going forward.

ICSTIS further considers that a uniform standard for transparency around call rejection/acceptance rates is needed if viewers are to be fully aware and informed about the Quiz TV sector. If each channel implements a different standard of transparency, viewers will not realise the tangible benefits that many respondents to the consultation desire and see as necessary.

In light of the responses, ICSTIS concludes that further transparency is required and that a standard should be included in a revised Statement of Expectations.

Q3. Do respondents agree that publication on-screen of the real-time odds of getting through to a Quiz TV studio is not justifiable or proportionate, and may further confuse consumers?

The majority of respondents, including all service/content providers and all but one broadcaster, who made no comment, agreed with ICSTIS' assessment that the publication on-screen of real-time odds would be disproportionate and, for the most part, not technically feasible. Respondents gave a number of reasons for this answer, as follows:

- cost of providing such information
- technical difficulty of providing such information
- rapid fluctuations in caller numbers would make such information confusing or unintentionally inaccurate even as it is provided
- concern that to offer real-time odds would bring Call TV Quiz Services closer to being defined as "gambling"

While some respondents indicated that their own technology would allow them to do this, they acknowledged that the majority of other respondents would find it difficult to do without significant cost which was out of proportion to the consequent increased consumer awareness.

The one response which disagreed with ICSTIS' assessment indicated that some live TV events, such as Comic Relief, appear to give a cumulative indication of the number of calls made, and therefore that similar technology could be employed to extrapolate the number of new callers on a real-time basis. However, the respondent concerned also indicated that he would be content with the less demanding principles ICSTIS set out and endorsed as part of Question 4.

Conclusion

ICSTIS considers that respondents expressed broad agreement with our assessment, and concludes that requiring publication on-screen of real-time odds as part of any revised

Statement of Expectations would be disproportionate and may not deliver the benefits that the public and the industry desire. There also appear to be technical constraints.

Q4. What are respondents' views as to how greater transparency about rates of rejection/acceptance of calls can be best achieved?

Option 3, as set out in the consultation document, would change the existing Quiz TV Statement of Expectations to require frequently updated information on-screen as to the actual chances of getting through to the studio, by whatever means of contact (voice, SMS or web), over recent blocks of programming.

Three examples of how this could be achieved, as set out by ICSTIS, were:

- a) on-screen data which advises how many calls were made to a programme in the last 15 minutes, regularly updated
- b) on-screen data showing what proportion of callers have made it through to air in the last 15 minutes, regularly updated
- c) on-screen data showing the total number of calls in the last hour, updated hourly

As this question had asked for views, rather than a simple 'agree/disagree' response, responses were predictably diverse.

The eight respondents who expressed support for Option 3 generally favoured example a), as set out above, or were already putting into practice example a) or a variant of it, such as the number of callers in the last five or 10 minutes.

Other examples were suggested by respondents as to how on-screen data informing viewers of their chances of getting through to the studio could be best provided. These were:

- display of the number of calls this round (i.e. since the last call through to the studio)
- display of the number of unique callers taking part in any given round

Responses which did not express support for Option 3 generally expressed concern that requiring live or near-live statistics would burden Call TV Quiz Services, especially network operators, with a significant cost that was disproportionate to the actual number of complaints that ICSTIS receives about such services. However, the majority of network operators and service/content providers confirmed that they would have no problem providing some form of on-screen display of near-live statistics. Those who objected on cost grounds provided no data to support their claim.

One provider, who was generally supportive of the need to display some information regarding the odds of being put through, signalled that to publish the actual number of callers to their programmes would give out commercially sensitive information, and break confidentiality agreements they have with the broadcasters whom they supply. They also suspected that the same would be true of other service/content providers. However, no other provider or broadcaster who responded suggested that this would be a problem for them.

While supportive, some respondents stressed the need to be given time to test different types of information display in order to ensure that they work for different styles of shows. In addition, ICSTIS was urged not to set a standard that does not allow different types of information for different formats of programme. For example, a programme that requires viewers to all phone in at once, with one caller being picked from those who call, may need a different type of on-screen display than a programme where viewers can phone in over a longer period of time.

Conclusion

It was obvious from the responses received that the majority had carefully considered this issue. Many have begun to trial on-screen data of this type, and reported the success or otherwise of their experience so far.

ICSTIS concludes that the majority of respondents have accepted that more information is needed regarding the chance of getting through to a programme after which skill in answering the quiz question will determine whether the caller wins a prize. There was, however, considerable debate around how this can be best achieved. It is important to balance the need for clear information to be given to viewers against the practicability for providers of delivering a meaningful on-screen display. We accept that too much information on screen can create “clutter” and lead to viewer confusion.

A number of respondents suggested that they would be willing to take part in a Working Group to take this forward. We welcome this offer. However, given the public interest and concern in these services, we believe that too much time would be needed to undertake such an exercise. Therefore, we have decided to press ahead with a revised Statement of Expectations, especially as there was general support for the proposals put forward in the consultation. On balance we have concluded that prominent and permanently visible information in a stand-alone display about the total entries made in the preceding 15 minutes should be provided on-screen and this should be updated at no more than 10-minute intervals. We believe this is proportionate given that this is key information which should aid transparency for viewers.

Q5. If respondents do not agree with any of the three options ICSTIS set out for ensuring greater transparency, what alternatives do they suggest?

There were fewer suggestions in response to Question 5.

Such suggestions as were made included:

- displaying the total number of calls and average number of calls going through to the studio from the last edition of the same programme
- for ICSTIS to publish its research findings about the chances of callers getting through to the studio, and make this known to the general public
- to give equal prominence and treatment to free web entry routes

In respect of the first of these propositions, we believe that the suggestions made by a number of respondents in answer to Question 4 above were preferable from a transparency perspective.

We are not clear, in respect of the second comment, how this could be achieved in practice in order to aid general consumer understanding.

In respect of the third point, this is a matter which the Gambling Commission is considering as part of its consultation on Prize Competitions and Free Draws which was published in August 2006.

Q6. Do respondents agree with ICSTIS' proposal that cumulative call warnings should be provided at no more than each £10 spent by a consumer over each day, as identified and where available through a phone number which has not been withheld? Are there any other suggestions as to how excessive use can be minimized?

The majority of responses were in agreement with ICSTIS that a call warning at every £10 spent within a 24-hour period was reasonable. However, concern was expressed by a number of respondents about how a £10 call warning would be triggered, given that this definition of

the cost of calls is based on a standard BT rate, and does not reflect the different network charges that might also apply, especially from mobile phones. It was suggested that warning messages received by consumers who have spent £10 should also warn that a further network cost may apply.

Respondents also requested further clarification as to whether a 24-hour period ran from 12am, or whether it would be more prudent to tie this period in with peak viewing times – for example, from 6pm.

Other suggestions as to how excessive use can be further minimised were as follows:

- repeat high-volume users are contacted to ensure their phone bill has been paid before they are allowed further entry
- that callers be alerted every thirteenth call to equate roughly to the equivalent of £10 call spend assuming each call cost 75p from a BT landline
- callers who have withheld their numbers are given the option to obtain warnings every £10 (it was not clear how such an option could be enacted and we strongly believe it is technically not possible).

Conclusion

ICSTIS acknowledges that different network rates mean that no Call TV Quiz Service provider can be certain when a user has spent £10 on calls. However, we consider that warnings at £10 intervals (based on BT rates, as are other ICSTIS Code provisions which prescribe call warnings), with a message stating that network extras may apply, are the most practical method of allowing Quiz TV participants to take responsibility for their actions.

While other suggestions, such as ensuring high-level users can pay their phone bill before allowing further participation are good practice, ICSTIS does not have any power to demand this. We recognise also that network operators take steps to contact customers when unusual call patterns and costs appear on their telephone bills, and we welcome such actions.

On balance, ICSTIS proposes that the updated requirement in the proposed Statement of Expectations to give warnings at £10 intervals (at BT rates) should remain as suggested in the consultation. We believe that for clarity this should refer to a calendar day, not any 24-hour period, as worded in the consultation. We believe that the principle can also be achieved by providing a periodic warning after a certain number of calls closely equivalent to this spend, provided that when this is done, the caller is advised both of the number of calls made and that each has been charged at the advertised (BT) rate subject to the ‘network extras’ caveat.

We understand some service providers have mechanisms in place to identify high repeat callers and a policy of informing these callers that there is a cap on the number of attempted entries they will accept from a caller in a day. It is clear, however, that the technology does not yet exist to bar incoming calls from these individuals. The use of messages making clear that further calling is pointless is a deterrent measure; not one that will prevent further calls with absolute certainty. We are not aware, however, of circumstances in which the deterrent has failed. Insofar as the issue of excessive calling to a number or service of any nature is a general issue that goes beyond Call TV Quiz Services, it is one we are pursuing with network operators as part of our broader work around public information, education and empowerment.

General Comment

While some respondents questioned the need for ICSTIS to update the existing Statement of Expectations, the majority of respondents welcomed the consultation as timely, broadly sensible and proportionate.

The majority of networks, broadcasters, and service/content providers signalled that they would have little technical difficulty in complying with the proposed new Statement of Expectations. The exception to this is the means by which viewers will be more clearly informed of the chance of getting through to the studio when they call.

One respondent questioned whether some aspects of the proposed Statement of Expectations could be clearly linked to Code provisions from which the interpretation was drawn. We recognise that in some cases there may be grounds for ambiguity. To avoid any confusion, we intend to withdraw all current permission certificates issued to Call TV Quiz Service providers in order to provide the live element of the service and re-issue permission certificates to service providers which contain the obligations in the Statement of Expectations. The obligations will be set out as separate conditions of the permission certificate.

Impact Assessment

The consultation document identified that changes which could arise from any revision to the Statement of Expectations could impact on the costs of those in the value chain who provide such services. We equally hypothesised that, if the market for such services is worth some £120m per annum, a 5% increase in participation by telephone participants (assuming improved trust) would generate an increase in revenues of some £6m per annum. We also identified, but could not quantify, the savings that may arise from reduced complaint handling costs if trust improves.

We sought information from respondents as to any data they could share about both market size and the proper costs that would be involved in the suggested regulatory changes that we outlined. We made clear that the more information we had, the better we would be able to ensure that the steps we propose are grounded in measurable benefits, as well as those we perceive and believe to be proportionate.

It was disappointing to note that few respondents addressed themselves to this aspect of the consultation. Where they did, they welcomed the fact that the issue had been raised but were unable to supply any data which would either support or challenge the hypothesis. In the absence of any new information, we remain of the view that the benefits from the changes to the Statement of Expectations proposed in this statement outweigh the costs to providers for delivering them.

Section 4

Conclusion and Next Steps

The revised Statement of Expectations is set out in full at Annex 2 to this document. The document takes effect **four weeks** from the date of its publication. This is in order to allow time for providers to make necessary changes to their systems and procedures taking account of the enhanced consumer protection requirements being introduced.

We will work with Ofcom to keep this revised Statement of Expectations and these services under review, especially over the coming weeks and months. This includes random monitoring to ensure compliance with the ICSTIS Code of Practice and individual conditions in permission certificates.

In the meantime, we will be developing an enhanced prior permission regime for all premium rate services which are broadcast and these will be the subject of a separate consultation shortly. In developing these proposals, we will continue to work closely with Ofcom to ensure that our approach is consistent with its policy development for Participation TV more generally.

Annex One

Organisations Responding to the Consultation

The 16 respondents to ICSTIS' consultation document were:

- Big Game TV
- BT
- Carphone Warehouse *
- Citizens Advice Bureau
- Five
- ITV
- Kingston Communications
- Mobile Broadband Group
- Network for Online Commerce
- Optimistic Media
- Ostrich Media
- Play to Win
- Premium Rate Association
- Sky
- Thus
- Virgin Media

* Confidential response.

Annex Two

Revised Statement of Expectations for Call TV Quiz Services

1.0 Background

The Statement of Expectations for Call TV Quiz Services has been revised following the review of these services in early 2007. In particular, some consumers misunderstand the nature of the service or the charges levied regardless of whether they are successful in getting through to the studio. Accordingly, ICSTIS wishes to ensure that providers of these services have as much clarity as possible as to the regulatory requirements and the interpretation of the Code that ICSTIS will apply. This Statement should be read in conjunction with the ICSTIS Code of Practice. Service providers and network operators should be aware that this Statement details the likely interpretation of the Code of Practice by the ICSTIS Board. This is particularly so where breaches of the Code are raised by the Executive in relation to Call TV Quiz Services.

2.0 Call TV Quiz services defined

This Statement applies only to broadcast output (programmes, channels and tele-shopping) on television where:

- The primary function and content of the entire output is participation in competitions by viewers.
- Viewers are invited to call or text a premium rate number to give their answer (normally either by being connected to the presenter or via a call back).
- If viewers are not selected initially, they are informed accordingly and have the opportunity to make repeat attempts.

Call TV Quiz Services should not be confused with general broadcast TV output which may include a premium rate competition or vote as part of the editorial content, and which do not form a part of the definition of Call TV Quiz Services.

3.0 The need for prior permission

Where Call TV Quiz Services offer viewers the chance to participate in a live conversation, such services are “Live Services” for the purposes of the current ICSTIS Code of Practice (11th edition) and, as such, require prior permission to operate. An application form for these services, which is designed to be completed on a self-declaration basis by the service provider, is available on our website. It should be noted that the declaration requirements of the application form are not overly prescriptive but do make reference to this Statement of Expectations. Any service operating without having applied for prior permission from ICSTIS will be in breach of the Code. If permission is not granted for the service, it may not operate a live element thereafter.

4.0 Expectations

The following points and attempts by service providers to meet them, based on the Board’s interpretation of the Code of Practice in the context of Call TV Quiz Services, will be taken into account when considering a complaint about any such service and applying the Code of Practice:

- As required by the Code, pricing information on-screen must be easily legible, prominent, horizontal and not require close examination. If it crawls or scrolls, it should never be off-screen for more than 60 seconds.

- Pricing information on-screen must make clear that the charge applies to **all** calls, regardless of whether the viewer is successful in getting through.
- Pricing information must be spoken by a presenter or voice-over at intervals of no more than 10 minutes. The pricing announcement must make clear that the cost will apply regardless of whether the entrant is successful in getting through to the next stage of the service. The ICSTIS Help Note on pricing information provides further general guidance.
- Pricing information, in a basic format, making clear to consumers that all calls are being charged, should be announced in the message at the beginning of every call to the service. An equivalent return text message should be sent to viewers who use premium SMS to participate.
- Call cost warnings must be provided to all callers (other than where the number is withheld) at intervals of no more than each £10⁴ spent in each calendar day. Alternatively, warnings may be provided at set call intervals in any calendar day that equate to accumulations of £10 of call spend (for example, call warnings at every tenth call where the cost of each call is £1). Such warning must make clear the number of calls, the cost of each chargeable call and that this may vary across different networks.
- The chances of acceptance or rejection of an attempt by a viewer to get beyond the first stage must be shown on-screen in near real-time. This will be achieved as a minimum by a prominent permanently visible stand-alone display (whether static, crawling or scrolling) showing the total number of entries (paid and free) to the service in the preceding 15-minute period. This must be updated at no more than 10-minute intervals. This minimum standard would mean showing six updates within the space of an hour.
- The identity and contact details in the UK of the provider, where not otherwise obvious, must be clearly stated. Contact details may be in the form of a website, a PO Box address or full postal address. In addition, customer service arrangements must be in place via a non-premium rate customer service phone number.
- Key terms and conditions (Ts&Cs) must be provided on-screen periodically. Full Ts&Cs must be provided via the contact means provided. Key Ts&Cs are considered to be:
 - cost per call/minute, regardless of getting through to the studio
 - any age limit
 - the quiz question and any rules specific to the quiz, where applicable
 - details of any alternative free entry route (if one is provided)
 - information as to the broad chances of acceptance or rejection when making a call to attempt to get to air.
- When offering cash prizes, and as a precautionary measure, a warning that entrants must be 16 years or over should be stated on-screen at regular intervals.

⁴ The cost of the call will need to be linked to a standard price point such as the BT rate, unless the service provider is targeting callers exclusively from another network, in which case the standard rate from that network should be quoted.

- The use of clocks and other countdown triggers must be clearly explained and must not mislead consumers into making more calls than they might otherwise have done because they think the competition is about to close.
- Providers of Call TV Quiz Services will need to ensure that they have complied with Ofcom's Broadcasting Code (Rule 2.11 states: "Competitions should be conducted fairly, prizes should be described accurately and rules should be clear and appropriately made known."). Ofcom has issued separate guidance about compliance with the Broadcasting Code.

5.0 Enforcement and monitoring

ICSTIS will be proactively monitoring Call TV Quiz Services. If the Code appears to have been breached, an investigation will follow and sanctions may be imposed.

6.0 Compliance advice

We remind service providers that a free compliance advice service is available from ICSTIS with a usual turnaround of two working days. Please contact compliance@icstis.org.uk.

7.0 Transitional arrangements

In order to allow service providers, and others in the value chain, to make changes to their service in order to accommodate changes made in this Statement of Expectations, service providers are allowed a period of **four weeks** from the issue date of this Statement of Expectations to bring themselves into compliance with it and the Code of Practice.

Issued by ICSTIS on 4 April 2007

Effective date: Wednesday 2 May 2007