

Additional comments:

Ofcom has know about these clause for too long and has not taken any genuine action. it appears that ofcom is no more than a paper tiger which talks but does not act. it appears to be a compete waste of taxpayers money and if it cannot act effectively it might as well be abolished.

Act for consumers or fold up your operation.

-----end of intial comments -----

Please treat this as a formal complain to ofcom.

This survey is appalling - sections do not follow in any numerical order, questions are badly formed and range across numerous issues, duplicating and obsfucating the issue. There are too many questions and they lack any clear meaning.

Has this been assessed by the clear english campaign or any other appropriate assessor?

Please advise why this appalling format has been used.

Question 1: Do you agree with the consumer harm identified from Communications Providers? ability to raise prices in fixed term contracts without the automatic right to terminate without penalty on the part of consumers?:

Yes. The use of these optional clauses allow operator to advertise one rate, despite the clear intention to implement a mid-contract increase (or two). The lack of an equivalent option for the consumer to change their position is inherently unfair.

Question 2: Should consumers share the risk of Communications Providers? costs increasing or should Communications Providers bear that risk because they are better placed to assess the risks and take steps to mitigate them?:

Operators can easily forecast for inflation in their business models. to claim otherwise is a complete deception.

Operators should bear the risk as they have sufficient resources to plan and mitigate for the risk

Question 3: Do you agree with the consumer harm identified from Communications Providers? inconsistent application of the ?material detriment? test in GC9.6 and the uncertainties associated with the UTCCRs?:

A material detriment arises as soon a 1p of extra charge is levied. This is a very simple concept which any accountant would understand. Why you are dilly-dallying and pussyfooting around over this diversionary tactic is beyond me.

Question 4: Should Communications Providers be allowed (in the first instance) to unilaterally determine what constitutes material detriment or should Ofcom provide guidance?:

No. their are already established principle of what is detriment. Advertising regulations would clearly demonstrate that an offer at a price, used to attract custom.which is then

changed unilaterally, is a clear material detriment.

There are 2 aspect to this:-

1. To the consumer by charging more than advertised
2. To other operators by gaining business through the use of rates that will not actually be used

Question 5: What are your views on whether guidance would provide an adequate remedy for the consumer harm identified? Do you have a view as to how guidance could remedy the harm?:

no, guidance is not enough. the operators appear to have effected a "regulator capture" where ofcom are simply defending the industry not the consumer.

Question 6: Do you agree with the consumer harm identified from the lack of transparency of price variation terms?:

Yes.

Question 7: Do you agree that transparency alone would not provide adequate protection for consumers against the harm caused by price rises in fixed term contracts?:

yes

Question 8: Do you agree that any regulatory intervention should protect consumers in respect of any increase in the price for services provided under a contract applicable at the time that contract is entered into by the consumer? :

yes

Question 9: Do you agree that any regulatory intervention should apply to price increases in relation to all services or do you think that there are particular services which should be treated differently, for example, increases to the service charge for calls to non-geographical numbers?:

This is such a poorly worded question - this is a clear display of incompetence.

"Do you agree...." which prompts a yes / no response ; but then followed with an "or do you think..."

how on earth are you going to assess responses?

is this designed to cloud the issue or perhaps confuse the consumer?

Question 10: Do you agree that the harm identified from price rises in fixed term contracts applies to small business customers (as well as residential customers) but not larger businesses?:

?

Question 11: Do you agree that any regulatory intervention that we may take to protect customers from price rises in fixed term contracts should apply to residential and small business customers alike?:

?

Question 12: Do you agree that our definition of small business customers in the context of this consultation and any subsequent regulatory intervention should be consistent with the definition in section 52(6) of the Communications Act and in other parts of the General Conditions?:

?

Question 13: Do you agree that price rises due to the reasons referred to in paragraph 5.29 are outside a Communications Provider's control or ability to manage and therefore they should not be required to let consumers withdraw from the contract without penalty where price rises are as a result of one of these factors?:

?

Question 14: Except for the reasons referred to in paragraph 5.29, are there any other reasons for price increases that you would consider to be fully outside the control of Communications Providers or their ability to manage and therefore should not trigger the obligation on providers to allow consumers to exit the contract without penalty?:

Question 15: Do you agree that Communications Providers are best placed to decide how they can communicate contract variations effectively with its consumers?:

Question 16: Do you agree with Ofcom's approach to liaise with providers informally at this stage, where appropriate, with suggestions for better practice where we identify that notifications could be improved?:

Question 17: What are your views on Ofcom's additional suggestions for best practice in relation to the notification of contractual variations as set out above? Do you have any further suggestions for best practice in relation to contract variation notifications to consumers?:

Question 18: What are your views on the length of time that consumers should be given to cancel a contract without penalty in order to avoid a price rise? For consistency, should there be a set timescale to apply to all Communications Providers? :

Question 19: What are your views on whether there should be guidance which sets out the length of time that Communications Providers should allow consumers to exit the contract without penalty to avoid a price rise?:

Question 20: Do you agree that this option to make no changes to the current regulatory framework is not a suitable option in light of the consumer harm identified in section 4 above?:

Question 21: Do you agree with Ofcom's analysis of option 2? If not, please explain your reasons.:

Question 22: Do you agree with Ofcom's analysis of option 3? If not, please explain your reasons.:

Question 23: What are your views on option 4 to modify the General Condition to require Communications Providers to notify consumers of their ability to withdraw from the contract without penalty for any price increases?:

Question 24: Do you agree with Ofcom's assessment that option 4 is the most suitable option to address the consumer harm from price rises in fixed term contracts?:

Question 25: Do you agree that Ofcom's proposed modifications of GC9.6 would give the intended effect to option 4?:

Question 26: What are your views on the material detriment test in GC9.6 still applying to any non-price variations in the contract?:

Question 27: For our preferred option 4, do you agree that a three month implementation period for Communications Providers would be appropriate to comply with any new arrangements?:

Question 28: What are your views on any new regulatory requirement only applying to new contracts?: