

Response to *Geographic telephone numbers: safeguarding the future of geographic numbers* Statement and further consultation published 7 September 2011

Submitted by: Stuart, Mr C

Additional comments:

I wish to object to the proposal to create a hybrid closed/open numbering plan with overlay codes. This system is used in the US and Canada and is unbelievably confusing for travellers. It's not immediately apparent whether one is in a closed system area or an open system area. As a result, trying to make a phone call from a landline has become very hard. I think that Ofcom should reconsider its decision not to seek to close local area dialling nationally. A pure closed system is much less confusing and having to dial a few extra digits on each call is a small price to pay. Furthermore, after a transition period it would be possible to drop the initial zero on all calls.

My criticism of Ofcom is that it's very conservative in its approach to the telephone numbering plan. As a result, there have been several changes over the past two decades, when there could just have been one. If, back when phONEday occurred, Ofcom had taken a radical approach and moved the UK to a closed numbering plan, this consultation would not be necessary today.

Please, Ofcom, correct your past errors and move the whole of the UK to a closed numbering plan in a single move. This will save a lot of confusion and will prevent the need for another consultation of this type for many decades.

Question 1: Do you agree with our proposal to allocate up to 10,000 numbers in blocks of 100 numbers (i.e. 100 x 100-number blocks) in the following 11 five-digit area codes? Appleby (017683) Gosforth (019467) Grange over Sands (015395) Hawkshead (015394) Hornby (015242) Keswick (017687) Langholm (013873) Pooley Bridge (017684) Raughton Head (016974) Sedbergh (015396) and Wigton (016973):

Yes

Question 2-10: (no comment)