

What do you want Ofcom to keep confidential?:

Keep name confidential

If you want part of your response kept confidential, which parts?:

Name

Ofcom may publish a response summary:

Yes

I confirm that I have read the declaration:

Yes

Ofcom should only publish this response after the consultation has ended:

You may publish my response on receipt

Question 1: Do you agree with our analysis of consumer detriment on the 070 number range?:

Basically, yes.

Question 2: Do you agree that the costs outweigh the benefits in relation to closing the 070 number range and migrating users to an alternative range?:

No.

These numbers need to be made much more distinct from the accepted normal 07 UK mobile numbers.

Scams, PRS, etc would be more easily recognisable if 070s were given a new number range.

Question 3: Do you agree that Ofcom should keep the 070 range open and monitor the market in light of enforcement action by PhonepayPlus?:

Once the problem of fraudulent misuse of 070 numbers has been looked into, the other existing 070 services such as Hospedia etc, need to be held to account, and their charges capped at a reasonable level.

Question 4: Do you agree that Ofcom should require OCPs to give greater prominence to the cost of calling 070 numbers in published price lists and promotional material?:

Yes

Most people who have an 070 number are already aware that it will cost their contacts more than a normal number to call.

It is the uninformed callers who need to be made aware of the cost.

Question 5: Do you agree that Ofcom should amend its guidance to ensure that PNS providers carry out appropriate due diligence of sub-allocatees of personal numbers?:

Yes.

In many cases, these numbers are allocated to anyone who requests one. The income from call charges makes it very profitable to offer 070 numbers to anyone, from any country. Reasons and motives for requesting an 070 number will rarely be questioned.

If these numbers are requested by online clients, it would not be difficult to check the IPs and refuse allocation to non-uk residents.

<http://www.met.police.uk/fraudalert/contact.htm>

The Sterling Fraud Alert unit of the Met in London have been actively cooperating with the 070 providers in getting numbers shut down.

The 070 range is used by scammers well beyond the 'missed call' scam. Millions of £s and \$ are lost through scams - 419 (Advance fee), charity, romance etc - in which the scammers (usually permanently resident in a foreign country) are given access to a +4470 number and can pretend to be situated in UK. This subterfuge is used extensively to scam people all over the world.

In 2006, it was estimated that UK citizens lost £150 million to online scammers. If only 10% of those scammers were using 070 numbers to disguise their whereabouts, that is still an annual loss of £15million, and rising every year. Add the money defrauded from nationals of other countries by people pretending to be in UK, and the amount has been estimated to run into billions.

<http://www.cybercrimeops.com/forums/showthread.php?t=1633>

Question 6: Do you agree that Ofcom should not bar the presentation of 070 CLI? Please provide evidence to support your response:

Ideally, the CLI should be made to show the number to which the call is routed - or at least make some indication of the fact that the call is terminating outside UK.

Question 7: Should services provided by, for example, Hospedia, Premier Telesolutions and Trader Media be provided on an alternative

number range to 070? Please provide any evidence to support your views.:

Depends on whether or not other services are also going to be offered different number ranges.

Services which require automated calling for a valid reason, or which are used for emergency calls, should have a range free of PCAs. They could retain the 070 range.

Hospedia, PT and TM, and all other personal numbers called by members of the public should have more recognisable numbers, and therefore an alternative number range would be an advantage.

Question 8: Do you agree that Ofcom should withdraw formally the requirement for pre-call announcements on 070 Personal Numbers?:

No.

Hospedia, PT and TM, and all other personal numbers called by members of the public should have PCAs. A phone call is a product/service, and why should callers be expected to buy a product for which no obvious price has been agreed, and the charging system is at the whim of the provider?

Additional comments:

To sum up:

My interest in this subject is from the point of view of someone who is involved with people all over the world who have been scammed - criminally defrauded - usually by permanent residents of certain foreign countries. The use of the 070 numbers is a regular factor in these scams as, for those who do not know otherwise, it appears that the number originates in UK. Their suspicions of a scam are therefore allayed, and they are lulled into a false sense of security.

We have all heard of the 'Nigerian' scams, but who would be suspicious of someone who lives in UK and has a 'respectable' cover story?.

www.cybercrimeops.com
www.internet-love-scams.org

The 070 range of personal numbers needs to be changed by use. Emergency services (or similar), which use automated calling should be offered a number range free of PCAs. They could be left on the 070 range.

All other 070 numbers should then be given another, more recognisable, number range and be subject to PCAs and an announcement that the call is directed to an allocated personal number.

The allocation of those numbers to private individuals in foreign countries should be

limited. If the number is applied for online, it is perfectly possible to check the IPs of the client, and refuse access to non-uk residents.

In these days of global roaming mobile phone ownership, there should rarely be any need to have a UK 070 number permanently forwarded to (for example) a phone number in Nigeria.

For the victims of these scams, it has already been a revelation that the 'respectable businessman in UK' is actually a scammer in an Internet Cafe in some foreign country.

The added (and unannounced) exorbitant cost of calls they had assumed were going to a normal UK number can be a huge shock and heavy financial burden at a very fragile stage of their recovery.