

Additional comments:

This questionnaire is far too long winded and uses too many industry words, meaning it is inaccessible for the majority of consumers. How will you get a fair response to the consultation when most people cannot access the language it contains?

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?:

A contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.

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?:

A contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.

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 contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.

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

A contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.

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?:

A contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.

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

A contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.

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?:

A contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.

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?

:

A contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.

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?:

A contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone

providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.

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?:

A contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.

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?:

A contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.

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?:

A contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.

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?:

A contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.

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?:

A contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.

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

A contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.

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?:

A contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.

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?:

A contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.

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? :

A contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be

illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.

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?:

A contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.

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?:

A contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.

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

A contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.

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

A contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.

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?:

A contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.

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?:

A contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.

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

A contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.

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

A contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.

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?:

A contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.

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

A contract sold as "£20 per month for 24 months" should cost £480 over 2 years. Not more than that. The clause which permits the provider a small increase is unfair and should be illegal. No other type of business is permitted to get away with it, so why should phone providers? Costs don't increase that much, and if they do, then the business should take the fall for poor financial projections, **JUST AS EVERY OTHER COMPANY HAS TO DO.**