

Name	Q1. Do you agree with our updated conclusions that current mobile switch processes create consumer harm <sup>1</sup> ?	Q2. Do you agree that our proposed package of reforms is likely to be effective in addressing the consumer harms we have identified?	Q3. Do you have any comments on the specific process design for the different elements of the proposed reform package?	Q4. Do you agree with our assessment of the likely impacts that we have presented of each of the options for reform <sup>2</sup> ?	Q5. Do you agree with our preferred option for reform <sup>3</sup> ?	Q6. Do you agree with our proposal for an 18-month long implementation period for our preferred reform option?
<b>Deryck Chan</b>	Yes, I agree with the first point on unnecessary time spent and difficulties to progress a switch. Although current regulations require the mobile provider to give a PAC code upon request, the need to call the provider is unnecessary time spent and the call allows the operator's agent to negotiate with the customer. This creates unnecessary emotional duress and permits an opaque pricing structure based on brinksmanship. I agree that the temporary loss of	Yes it does. Moving the PAC process to an automated system removes the emotional duress of switching operators and eliminates time wastage on phone or physical queues. A seamless switch is desirable, but the current level of loss of service (only an hour or two of gap in service, mostly because the consumer needs to notice that the old SIM has stopped service before switching to the new SIM) is acceptable.	The requirements for rejecting a PAC / N-PAC or switching information request are too vague. (re 6.40; Fig.5 of consultation document) If the intention of allowing rejection of PAC / information release is to cater for business accounts and MVNOs who specialise in them, Ofcom ought to specify a definite range of circumstances in which switching information requests may be rejected.	Yes, I agree.	Yes, I agree.	Whether the process takes 18 or 24 months is of limited impact to consumers. Rather, Ofcom should propose a detailed timetable for the switches and mandate all mobile providers to adhere to it, so that consumers are sufficiently informed about which process they are following and see a smooth reform process.

<sup>1</sup> in terms of: Unnecessary time and difficulties progressing a switch, including contact with the losing provider to request a PAC or cancel a service; Requirements to pay notice after the switch has taken place; and Loss of service that can occur when switching?

<sup>2</sup> Prohibiting charging for notice after the switching date; Auto-Switch; GPL End-to-end management; and Transparency requirements?

<sup>3</sup> i.e. a requirement to offer an Auto-Switch process, a requirement to prohibit charging for notice beyond the switching date, and a requirement to provide transparency of switching processes

Name	Q1. Do you agree with our updated conclusions that current mobile switch processes create consumer harm <sup>1</sup> ?	Q2. Do you agree that our proposed package of reforms is likely to be effective in addressing the consumer harms we have identified?	Q3. Do you have any comments on the specific process design for the different elements of the proposed reform package?	Q4. Do you agree with our assessment of the likely impacts that we have presented of each of the options for reform <sup>2</sup> ?	Q5. Do you agree with our preferred option for reform <sup>3</sup> ?	Q6. Do you agree with our proposal for an 18-month long implementation period for our preferred reform option?
	service causes harm, but I believe this is a technical issue rather than a regulatory issue.					
<b>Jonathan Ringrose</b>	I agree 100% with above.	Indeed this will be a welcome change I hope is implemented.	This proposal will be brilliant if implemented I have changed my network twice over the past 8 years and both times involved lengthy phone calls to be passed across multiple departments and "begging / pleading" to stay.	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Michael Coley</b>	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Stephen Bell</b>					Excellent idea, I believe it should be a lot easier to switch any time you want and not be forced to stay when you don't want to	
<b>Name withheld 1</b>	Yes, it's always a major issue to switch providers and this idea sounds ideal, as long as	I would hope so	It sounds ideal	Fully agree	Yes	Yes.

Name	Q1. Do you agree with our updated conclusions that current mobile switch processes create consumer harm <sup>1</sup> ?	Q2. Do you agree that our proposed package of reforms is likely to be effective in addressing the consumer harms we have identified?	Q3. Do you have any comments on the specific process design for the different elements of the proposed reform package?	Q4. Do you agree with our assessment of the likely impacts that we have presented of each of the options for reform <sup>2</sup> ?	Q5. Do you agree with our preferred option for reform <sup>3</sup> ?	Q6. Do you agree with our proposal for an 18-month long implementation period for our preferred reform option?
	the company does what's expected					
<b>Steven Mcdermott</b>	Yes it is a long process. Working in the industry you can be on hold for anywhere up to 2 hours because the current provider is wasting time.	Yes	My only question is proof of ownership	Yes	Yes	Yes it should be a trial
<b>Stuart Latham</b>					<p>This looks like one of OFCOM's best ideas for Mobile Contracts to date.</p> <p>Will the transfer Text PAC from one Mobile provider to the other include the Unlocking of the transferring Mobile.</p> <p>My recent experience from moving our Business Mobiles from EE to Vodafone in 2016 was delayed by EE's locking to their</p>	

Name	Q1. Do you agree with our updated conclusions that current mobile switch processes create consumer harm <sup>1</sup> ?	Q2. Do you agree that our proposed package of reforms is likely to be effective in addressing the consumer harms we have identified?	Q3. Do you have any comments on the specific process design for the different elements of the proposed reform package?	Q4. Do you agree with our assessment of the likely impacts that we have presented of each of the options for reform <sup>2</sup> ?	Q5. Do you agree with our preferred option for reform <sup>3</sup> ?	Q6. Do you agree with our proposal for an 18-month long implementation period for our preferred reform option?
					Network of the Mobile phones even though they were not part of their Contract on a SIM only deal.	
YCJ Wong	Agree with all of the conclusions. Calling the hotline of some carriers is a headache. It takes forever to put through.	Yes	Yes.	Agree	Agree	The shorter the better. 12 months should be sufficient?