

Ms S. Evans, Consumer Policy Mgr.
OFCOM, Riverside Hse, 2A Southwark Bridge Rd
London SE1 9HA.

u.
408.

Dear Ms Evans, Your ref. 1-38161605.

May I just thank Mr Emadi for his letter of 5 March 08 enclosing OFCOM's Review of BT's and the Industries' charges.

I must next make the point that I have still not received any letter from Sir Christopher Bland or his successor Sir Michael Rake, in response to mine of 8 Jan 08 (copy to OFCOM 21 Feb 08). This follows a total lack of response from Mr. D. Hukbuck, his assistant, to my letters of 4 Aug 07 and 4 Sep 07. So clearly there is a total arrogance and discourtesy in the organisation emanating from the very top. Obviously no single ordinary little customer (even of 50 years' standing) has any effect whatsoever on such people, so I regard it very much a matter for the Regulating Authority to occupy that rôle.

The nearest I have to a response from BT was a telephone call from Mr. P. Kiwan, assistant to the Chairman, at 1700h on 4 March 08. He said the Chairman had replied to my letter, and I stated, quite clearly, none whatsoever had ever arrived here. Even now, still none has arrived, original or copy. I am guessing therefore that no such may ever have been written.

Mr. P. Kiwan had already received a copy of your Report, which apparently, fully backed BT in their £4.50 quarterly charge, so he said, even to pensioners, and even to customers of 50 years' standing no account naturally! being taken of these factors.

Your Report (and Mr. P. Kiwan following your lead, as he said) stated the charge was due to BT's extra costs in processing non-direct debit payments. It is not clear from your Report whether you think BT's £4.50 charge is reasonable or not: nor do they seem to have proved it.

As you recall, I was told by Mr. D. Hukbuck that BT had 23 different payment options, so I asked why there could not be just one more for customers like me paying by Debit card.

I asked Mr. P. Kiwan (4 March 08 above) how my payment by Debit card was any more expensive than by Direct Debit. He replied that BT averaged out ~~at~~ the costs of all the 23 different ways of paying BT's accounts, and that my method by Debit card was effectively not specifically costed.

Since BT claim it is unfair to charge Direct Debit customers the same as non-Direct Debit customers, because of different costs, it is clearly unfair to charge Debit card customers the same as non-Debit card customers.

I therefore strongly urge you to challenge BT to prove that Debit card customers cost £4.50 each time, indeed that they cost any more than Direct Debit customers. As I pointed out to Mr. P. Kiwan, by Debit card my money is immediately and automatically, fully in BT's account, as with Direct Debit.

Yours sincerely

P.S. I do not wish to complicate my complaint, but, reading your Report it also seems unfair that customers have to pay for cancelling a service even if it is after the minimum period of service. Clearly it is wrong for BT to 'lump in' bad debt costs with those of handling payments.

I fully agree that BT allows insufficient time to customers to pay. Commercial businesses often pay their suppliers monthly/bi-monthly, so a matter of days only for BT's customers to pay is quite unfair and unreasonable. What other customer 'fleeing' can BT possibly concoct!

Please continue to 'get a grip' on BT!