

Additional comments:

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. I sign a mobile phone contract expecting the price agreed to stay that way (apart from the number of calls made variable). It is unfair to be trapped in a contract where the communications provider can increase pricing at will, yet not offer an exit route.

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?:

No. Communications providers should be aware of their projected costs & set pricing accordingly.

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?:

Of course if there is going to be a price increase, then the consumer will suffer material detriment!

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

No. Ofcom should set a standard for this.

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?:

It would contribute to a level playing field, so that all providers would have an equal view on the subject.

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

Yes. I never knew prices could be increased mid-contract until I heard about it happening in the news, & then it happened to me / my contract.

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, it is the fact that it is allowed to happen at all which is offensive, not just that the practice is not widely publicised in the first place.

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?:

To dictate different rules for different services would make the process far too complicated, & reduce transparency. It should apply to the whole contract.

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?:

It applies to everyone, but is maybe felt more keenly by individuals & owners of small businesses who are less likely to read or understand the small print in a contract.

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?:

Yes.

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?:

Yes.

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?:

There should not be any situation where a communications provider is allowed to increase pricing without offering an exit clause. They offered a product for the length of the contract specified & should honour that accordingly. Any increase in their own costs is their own

responsibility, not the responsibility of the consumer who signed up at a fixed price in good faith.

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?:

There are no good reasons - in 5.29 or otherwise - which provide a good reason for a communications provider to increase pricing without an exit clause.

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

No. Obviously their method of communicating this will be skewed to benefit them.

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?:

No. Formal regulation of this practice is needed to put a stop to it.

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?:

Contracts, once signed, should not be 'varied' without the agreement of both parties. Non-agreement on either side should render the contract void.

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? :

2 months after notification of intended price rise.

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?:

There should be guidance to provide an industry standard.

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?:

Yes.

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?:

This is a good thing.

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?:

Yes.

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

This is very unfair. It should apply to all 'live' contracts.