

Representing:

Self

Organisation (if applicable):

What do you want Ofcom to keep confidential?:

Keep name confidential

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

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?:

I agree there is considerable consumer detriment.

I strongly question the principles of PNS and whether the caller should ?in effect? subsidise the called party who has chosen 070 for receiving calls. Especially as (despite current and past regulatory efforts) the called party may also receive a financial benefit for receiving calls.

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?:

YES. The case for a forced migration to a new number range would be difficult to justify.

It is not simply because 070 is in the mobile range that these scams work similar scams work with 0871 numbers. It is mainly due to the weak and ineffective regulation associated with the number range that encourages this abuse

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

I believe that the case for closing the 070 range is very strong and 070 should be closed. There are many mechanisms in other ranges to handle the real users (if there are any). I strongly believe that the Industry will not clean up its act and therefore the range should be fully closed as soon as possible.

If Ofcom does not have the 'bottle' for this they should at least prohibit further allocations of 070 numbers to Networks and so called PRS resellers. Furthermore they should immediately close 070 with a fixed fee element and prevent the forwarding of any 070 CLI.

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?:

I believe that price prominence by OCPs is a non issue. A typical Ofcom approach which will not protect anyone! Most scams do not involve any advertising and therefore no publication of OCP charges will prevent those scams.

Ofcom should impose a pricing message requirement upon the terminating network at the point of the answer signal. Far too many 070 numbers charge whilst the caller still hears ringtone. This is not fair on the caller OFCOM should have stopped this years ago!

If you use an 070 number in a publication or on your business card then it should warn the caller of the higher charge @ BT Rates.

This TCP message could follow the PRS principles and state the BT charge rate.

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

Yes.

Also Ofcom should consider that TCPs who's 070 numbers have featured in AIT retention cases may be less scrupulous than other TCPs. Perhaps any additional requirement in this area could be focused on those TCPs where AIT cases have occurred in say the last year. It appears that Ofcom are totally ignorant of the level and specifics of the AIT cases that occur every month involving 070. Should Industry be able to do what they will with numbers and Ofcom blythly stand by so long as the Public are not affected? Surely the Regulator has a duty to the Industry as well as the Consumer?

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

NO

Ofcom must realise that the vast majority of 070 scams rely on the 070 CLI being presented to the victim often to encourage a 'returned' call.

How then can it be justified to allow 070 CLIs to be presented on outbound calls.

Furthermore it would make determination of scams by PPP that much easier. The CLI Code of Practice should specify that 070 numbers should be subjected to the same strictures as 09 numbers. It is only because of this that scams of that nature no longer

exist on 09 Nos. Remember that the purpose of 070 numbers is for users to receive calls wherever they are. Why then do 070 CLIs ever really need to be presented in legitimate useage situations.

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.:

Yes.

There is no reason why these services could not be provided behind other number ranges, as suggested elsewhere in this response.

IF NOT then the public could be protected by a requirement for TCP pricing messages. Although this would not be free to caller it would still offer a good protection against long and expensive calls. It is important however that that message is given at the point that the Answer signal and hence charging begins.

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

Yes.

However and as stated earlier a good safeguard would be to require TCPs to provide that message albeit not free to caller BUT at the point the answer signal is returned and the caller is charged.

This would prevent callers in missed call scams from ringing more than once. It would also give them enough information to make them realise they were a victim of a scam and then report it to PPP and/or Ofcom.

Additional comments:

I also suggest that Ofcom considers imposing a 10 ppm termination rate maximum for 070 calls.

The higher termination rate in 070 was originally intended to cover mobile or international onward call connection. This has been exploited over the years by some Networks and PNS Resellers. Ofcom have appeared powerless to stop it. Surely Ofcom should admit their inability and pass the responsibility fully to PPP. Unlike Ofcom they seem to have some idea of what 'Policing' is all about.

There is no justification (given the intended function of 070) for any drop charge / fixed fee tariffs in 070 and these should be specifically prohibited. The Missed Call scams are the ONLY users of these particular tariffs. (if Ofcom are told otherwise I would advise them to investigate rather than blindly accept).

To protect callers there should be an immediate prohibition on ringing tone being applied and charged for. Charging should not commence (the Answer signal) until the 070 user actually answers the call.

In this age of making the right person pay it seems wholly wrong to make the Caller to an 070 pay for the recipients benefit. As an example the one who benefits from an 0800 call pays.

Why therefore can Ofcom not simply re-balance that with 070. Are there really any true 070 users out there - getting their friends and family to pay over the odds to call them? Would it not be fairer that the costs fall on the prime beneficiary, the recipient rather than the caller. This change would probably see the death of 070 and good riddance.