

## Consultation response form

<b>Consultation title</b>	<b>Directory Enquiries (118) Review</b>
<b>Full name</b>	Michael Wevill
<b>Representing (delete as appropriate)</b>	Self

## Your response

<b>Question</b>	<b>Your response</b>
<b>Question 1: Do you agree with our assessment of harm?</b>	Absolutely. Going back in time the only option for directory enquiries was BT's 192. Despite there being no complaints Ofcom decided we needed competition. Within a year every single directory enquiries service including 118192 charged much more than 192 had. Since then Ofcom have looked the other way as companies have introduced the charges exponentially mainly targeting the elderly. While it is inevitable to point blame at the providers it is Ofcom's indifference at biblical levels that has led to this situation.
<b>Question 2: Do you agree with our view that the proposed cap on the service charge for a call to a 118 number of £2.58 (ex VAT) per 90 seconds of the call is an effective and proportionate to remedy the harms identified?</b>	No Absolutely Not. In 2005 the charge was 51 pence. Allowing for inflation that would amount to 75 pence today. Actually probably much less given the efficiencies in computing.
<b>Question 3: Do you agree with our view that an overall implementation period of four months following Statement will be a sufficient time for providers to introduce the proposed cap?</b>	Absolutely Not. It may be impossible to recover the billions of pounds that customers that have been overcharged it should be possible to make the change immediately. Four months represents hundreds of millions of further overcharging.

**Question 4: Do you have any comments on the notifications at Annex 10 and the draft modification set out within them? Where you disagree with the proposed modification, please explain why.**