

AMAZON FIRE TV

RESPONSE TO OFCOM'S CONSULTATION RE:

PROMINENCE AND ACCESSIBILITY ON CONNECTED TV PLATFORMS

DATED 14 JANUARY 2026

FAO: Content Policy Team, Ofcom

Email: mediaact.part2@ofcom.org.uk

By email

Dear Sir/Madam,

Response re: Consultation: prominence and accessibility on connected TV platforms - draft code of practice and draft guidance on the agreement objectives published 14 January 2026

I. Introduction

1. Amazon Fire TV ("**FTV**", "**we**" or "**us**") writes in response to Ofcom's "*Consultation on Prominence and accessibility on connected TV platforms - draft code of practice and draft guidance on the agreement objectives*", published on 14 January 2026 (the "**Consultation**").
2. We welcome the opportunity to comment on the Consultation, and in particular, on Ofcom's draft "*Code of Practice for Regulated Television Selection Services – Appropriate Prominence and Accessibility*" (the "**Code**").
3. FTV dedicates significant resources toward ensuring prominent placement of public service broadcaster ("**PSB**") content, services, and channels. PSBs already enjoy significant visibility across multiple areas of the Fire TV user interface ("**UI**"), including dedicated rows, app placements, and content integration - including for live TV offerings, within search and recommendation features and in the electronic program guide. We remain committed to working constructively with PSBs within a framework that respects both the objectives of the Media Act 2024 and preserves the innovation that has enabled connected television services to serve UK audiences successfully.
4. However, we are concerned that elements of Ofcom's draft Code are more prescriptive than Parliament intended as regards the obligation on regulated television selection services ("**RTSS**") to afford designated internet programme services ("**DIPS**") "appropriate prominence" for PSB content, channels and services. In some areas, the proposed approach risks constraining the ability of connected TV providers to develop their UIs in line with evolving consumer expectations and fails to account for the technological realities of modern, dynamic connected TV services. This could ultimately be detrimental to both the British public, and to the PSBs whom the measures are intended to support.

5. [Redacted]

II. [Redacted]

6. [Redacted]

a) [Redacted]

b) Ofcom's own audience research reinforces this characterisation. Paragraph 3.35(e) of the Consultation states: "*the hero banner is typically perceived by users as advertising rather than a navigational tool [...]*". [Redacted]

c) [Redacted]

d) [Redacted]

e) [Redacted]

f) Ofcom acknowledges in the Consultation that: "*There could be reductions in RTSS providers' ability to generate revenue from the sale of prominence in primary content areas, although the flexibility allowed by our proposed recommended actions may enable providers to mitigate such impacts*" (Paragraph 3.142). [Redacted]

7. Overly prescriptive requirements may constrain innovation

a) An approach that materially constrains the ability of RTSS providers to operate commercially viable businesses is difficult to reconcile with the "innovation objective" under the Media Act 2024. This requires that arrangements between RTSS providers and DIPS do not disproportionately restrict how RTSS providers innovate to serve how users discover and access content and services. FTV has invested significantly in developing and maintaining its service with an eye to providing the best and most personalised experience for customers, including continued investment in research and development. It is important for FTV to be able to recoup the substantial costs associated with such investment and continue to use this revenue to support further development initiatives.

b) [Redacted] The FTV UI dynamically personalises itself based on end-user behaviour and preferences, as well as factors such as whether a DIPS has integrated with different aspects of FTV. This personalised, user-responsive approach does not lend itself to the fixed allocation of prominence as suggested by the Code. Ofcom itself acknowledges (at various points in both the Consultation and the draft Code) that RTSS providers may have regard to user preferences and behaviour when determining prominence.

8. Users should have freedom to choose their own settings

a) If a user does not select or engage with a DIPS during their out-of-box set-up journey, it would be incongruous - and arguably contrary to the user-centric ethos of the Code - to subsequently present that user with public service content from that DIPS [redacted]. Where a user chooses not to download a DIPS as part of their set-up journey, their choice should be respected [redacted].

III. Conclusion

9. [Redacted].

10. The level of granularity in the draft Code does not afford RTSS providers the flexibility envisaged by Parliament and risks constraining how connected TV providers may develop their user

interfaces and services to meet evolving consumer expectations. As noted above, FTV already invests significant resources in supporting public service broadcasters, by regularly featuring their content, services, channels and Live TV offerings across several areas within the Fire UI. We consider that this existing support already meets, and in some respects exceeds, the "appropriate prominence" requirements under the Media Act 2024. [Redacted]

11. We continue to believe that the appropriate mechanism for determining prominence arrangements should be commercial negotiations, with Ofcom's dispute resolution powers serving as a backstop where parties cannot reach agreement.
12. We welcome the opportunity to engage with Ofcom on this issue and remain available to discuss or answer any questions you might have.