

Your response

Zero-rating

Question	Your response
Question 1: Do you agree with our assessment of zero-rating offers and our proposed approach?	Confidential? – N
Question 2: Do you agree with the criteria we use to define Type One, Type Two and Type Three zero-rating offers and our proposed approach to such offers?	
Question 3: Do you agree with the approach in our guidance in Annex 5 in relation to zero-rating?	Yes. Charitable organisations should be a part of the zero-rating for data, due to the need for many vulnerable people (who may not have access to a swathe of data) are able to access much-needed services without restrictions.
Question 4: What are your views on whether zero-rated content should be able to be accessed once a customer's data allowance has been used up?	These should still be accessible.
Please provide any further evidence you have to support your responses.	

Traffic management

Question	Your response
Question 5: Do you agree with our assessment of retail offers with different quality levels and our proposed approach?	NA
Question 6: Do you agree with the approach in our guidance in Annex 5 in relation to differentiated retail offers, including transparency requirements, improved regulatory monitoring and reporting of retail	

offers with different quality levels as well as the general quality of the internet access services?	
Question 7: What are your views on a more permissive approach towards retail offers where different quality levels are content and service specific?	
Question 8: Do you agree with our assessment of how traffic management can be used to address congestion and our proposed approach?	
Question 9: Do you agree with the approach in our guidance in Annex 5 in relation to the use of traffic management to address congestion, including transparency requirements, improved regulatory monitoring and reporting of general network performance metrics, the use of traffic management and the impact on service quality?	na
Question 10: What are your views on a more focused approach to traffic management to address congestion?	NA
Please provide any further evidence you have to support your responses.	

Specialised services

Question	Your response
Question 11: Do you agree with our assessment of specialised services and our proposed approach?	Confidential? – Y / N
Question 12: Do you agree with the approach in our guidance in Annex 5 in relation to specialised services, including transparency requirements, improved regulatory monitoring and reporting of the need for optimisation of a service, the general performance of internet access services and	

the impact of specialised services on the quality internet access?

Please provide any further evidence you have to support your responses.

Scope of the net neutrality rules, terminal equipment and public interest exceptions

Question	Your response
Question 13: Do you agree with our assessment of the terminal equipment rules and our proposed approach?	Confidential? – Y / N
Question 14: Do you agree with our assessment of internet access services provided on aeroplanes, trains, buses and coaches and our proposed approach?	Yes I agree
Question 15: Do you agree with our proposed approach to emergency 999 communications services and that we should consider amending the GCs to achieve this?	Yes I agree
Question 16: Do you agree that ISPs should be allowed to block scams and fraudulent content and provide in-network parental controls and content filters?	<p>Yes. As an organisation that support victims of intimate image abuse, that does not only share content without consent, but also will use scamming methods for such thing as sexual extortion, we know how important this is to block scams. We also believe it is in the public interest for a lot of content that is illegally shared to be considered for blocking as well as per section 9.52 of the review.</p> <p>As per 9.55 we believe intimate image abuse should be considered under a general condition and should block content across all providers of services within the UK.</p> <p>Intimate image abuse, or adult content shared without the person consent has long lasting impacts on victims. The victims' content can be reshared for years to come, and many victims akin it to "cyber rape". A lot of victims never are able to move past what happens due to the continuous sharing of the content.</p> <p>The team have worked alongside thousands of victims to support them in the removal of intimate content, though few feel able to</p>

report it to the police. Those who do complete the criminal proceedings still have their intimate content out there, with no reprieve. For instance, one large-scale crime the team support with was that of perpetrator [AE](#) who impacted hundreds of victims. Though our charity removes around 90% of content, we would like to see the blocking of this remaining 10% of illegally shared content would provide more support to victims.

Please provide any further evidence you have to support your responses.