Your response

Question Your response Chapter 3.1 Confidential? - N Consultation question 1: Do you Per OSA section 226.2, LinkedIn Corporation is the proagree with our proposed approach vider of the regulated service since it controls user access to the LinkedIn service. to determining QWR? We would welcome comments in particular on: LinkedIn Corporation requests further clarity regarding apportioning revenue to regulated services addressed in a) Our proposal to define QWR by 3.1.22 and 3.1.23. reference to worldwide revenues. Ofcom's consultation notes that a provider's revenues b) Our proposals in relation to apmay sometimes arise in connection with both regulated portioning revenue to the regulated and non-regulated services. But the consultation does service. not acknowledge that many providers regularly consolic) Our proposed approach to requirdate revenues from regulated and non-regulated sering QWR to be aggregated across all vices in their established financial records, enterprise reregulated services provided by the source planning and financial accounting software modprovider. ules, and other internal infrastructure, which are customized at great expense to align with applicable regulad) Our proposal to take account of tory financial reporting and securities laws in relevant jurevenues received by another group risdictions. This can create a challenge when apportionundertaking in the determination of ing revenues to only regulated services. QWR. The consultation proposes that in situations where reve-Consultation question 2: Do you nues are attributable to regulated and non-regulated agree with our proposed definition services, providers apportion revenues to the regulated of 'qualifying period'? service using a "just and reasonable approach" (section 3.1.22). Given our comment above, we recommend that Consultation question 3: Do you have Ofcom include guidance permitting providers to apporany views on our proposal not to istion revenue to regulated services based on the maxisue a statement to Part 4B services mum level of disaggregation which they report in their fi-(VSPs) (under paragraph 21 of nancial records. This was the same flexibility afforded to Schedule 17 to the Act)? providers in the 13 March 2024 Information Notice seek-Please provide evidence to support ing information for the online fee regime for Questions your responses. 8a and 8b, which noted: "We are asking for information which you can provide which reflects the maximum level of disaggregation which you report in your financial records." Doing so would achieve one of Ofcom's primary

(section 3.3.2).

goals stated in the consultation: "reduce compliance burden and administrative complexity for providers"

Question	Your response
Chapter 3.2	Confidential? – N
Consultation question 4: Do you agree with our proposal for determining the QWR of a group, when calculating the maximum penalty that may be imposed on a provider and one or more group undertakings which are jointly and severally liable for a breach under the Act, i.e. that it is determined as the sum of the worldwide revenues of the provider and each of its group undertakings, whether or not attributable to the provision of a regulated service? Please provide evidence in support of your response.	Ofcom has observed in the consultation document that "it would be disproportionate to charge fees based on the provider's total revenue" where "providers operate in-scope online services which contribute only a small amount to the provider's total revenues " (Fn 30, section 3.1.7). As above, we note that Ofcom may wish to consider what additional guidance can be provided on this point with respect to charging. We also recommend that Ofcom consider how a similar approach might be taken when assessing potential penalties.
Chapter 3.3	Confidential? – N
Consultation question 5: Do you have any comments on our proposed advice to the Secretary of State to set a QWR threshold figure within the range of £200m to £500m, with a preferred figure of £250m, for all types of regulated services? Consultation question 6: Do you have any comments on our proposed exemption for providers with UK revenue less than £10m in a qualifying period?	N/A
Consultation question 7: Do you agree that an exemption for services contributing to the public interest is not required at this time given the proposed QWR threshold and UK revenue exemption? Please provide evidence to support	
your responses.	
Chapter 3.4 Consultation question 8: Do you agree with our proposed approach to setting the amount of fees payable by	Confidential? – N N/A

. .

Question	Your response
providers above the QWR threshold? Please provide evidence to support your response.	
Chapter 4	Confidential? – N
Consultation question 9: Do you agree with our proposals relating to supporting evidence, documentation and other information, and manner of notification, as reflected in our Notification Regulations (Annex 10)?	N/A
Consultation question 10: Do you have any comments on the proposed Manner of Notification document in Annex 11 accompanying the Notification Regulations?	
Chapter 5	Confidential? – N
Consultation question 11: Do you agree with our assessment of the potential impact of our proposals? If you disagree, please explain why.	N/A
Overall	Confidential? – N
Consultation question 12: Do you have further views / comments that you wish to make in respect of this consultation?	N/A
Please provide evidence in support of your responses.	
Annex A7 questions	
Consultation question A1: In relation to our equality impact assessment, do you agree with our assessment of the potential impact of our proposals on	Confidential? – N N/A

equality groups? If you disagree, please explain why. Consultation question A2: Are you currently aware of any providers of regulated services targeting or provid-	
currently aware of any providers of	
ing support in any way to specific equality groups that are likely to generate a QWR that meets or exceeds the proposed threshold?	
Consultation question A3: In relation to our Welsh language assessment, do you agree that our proposals are likely to have positive, or more positive impacts on opportunities to use Welsh and treating Welsh no less favourably than English? If you disagree, please explain why, including how you consider these proposals could be revised to have positive effects or more positive effects, or no adverse effects or fewer adverse effects on opportunities to use Welsh and treating Welsh no less favourably than English.	

Please complete this form and return to OSFeesRegime@ofcom.org.uk.