

What do you want Ofcom to keep confidential?:

Keep name confidential

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

My name and the name of my company

Ofcom may publish a response summary:

Yes

Ofcom should only publish this response after the consultation has ended:

You may publish my response on receipt

Question 3.1: Do you agree with Ofcom's proposed revocation of USC7? If you disagree, what are your reasons for this view?:

I strongly disagree; it will contradict the competition law and market deregulation. BT Wholesale without regulation will simply increase their prices, pay little attention to the quality of the data set, which even in its current format is not perfect and simply drive any competition out of business.

Question 3.2: Ofcom considers that the current directory services meet the criteria of comprehensiveness, affordability, quality and availability. Do you agree with this assessment? If not please provide a detailed response as to which criteria is not fulfilled and in what way.:

In part yes, I agree, however there is no provision within the agreement for refunds for non-utilised searches and the data utiliser has to notify BT of any entries which appear to be incorrectly listed, therefore the onus almost reverts to the data utiliser to cleanse the data set.

In addition the data set is not classified so, the data user is required to classify the data itself incurring all of the related cost and then pay an additional fee of £600k if there is a requirement to offset any of the cost by re-selling portions of the cleansed data in addition to continued search charges all be it at a reduced rate.

Question 3.3: Do you agree with Ofcom's analysis [on the removal of the obligations to provide a printed directory]? If you do not agree please provide your reasons.:

I agree with this point, as from an environmental point of view the carbon footprint involved in printed directories is great.

Question 3.4: Ofcom considers that the DQ market is robust and delivering the level of service required by the Universal Service Directive. It also considers that it is appropriate to maintain the condition on Communications Providers to ensure access to a DQ service to ensure that the universality of provision is maintained. If you do not agree please provide your reasons.:

Agreed. However removing BT's obligations will completely change the market and see numerous providers go out of business, therefore minimising consumer choice.

Question 3.5: Do you agree with the redrafting of GC8 set out above [at the end of Section 3]? If you do not agree please provide your reasons.:

No. It will contravene competition and minimise consumer choice.

Economic fact, BT has historically due to monopoly status over charged the consumer.

Not capitalising on zero regulation would be a management failure of BT, therefore it would be a fore gone conclusion that BT would increase its prices, alternatively restrain from the provision of the OSIS service all together which would be detrimental to consumer choice and quality of the directory enquiry industry by driving service providers out of business.

Basically if this was the long term objective of OFCOM why competition by introducing 118 numbers in the first place only to drive potentially drive us all out of business anyway?

Question 4.1: Do you agree with Ofcom's view that GC19 should be modified so as to clarify persons having 'rights of access' as set out above (a redrafted version of condition GC19 and related definitions is set out at the end of this section)? If you disagree, please provide detailed reasons for this view.:

That should remain the same.

Question 4.2: Do you have any other comments about 'rights of access'?:

Having built our entire service from scratch I really cant see the difficulty involved in providing and maintaining the OSIS database, if all telecom providers have their own portal, are trained in the use of it, all information is easily uploaded to the central database under tagged submission and then FTP'ed to the relevant DQ providers. With keyword checks to ensure correct data entry.

Question 4.3: Do you agree with Ofcom's view that GC19 should be modified so that responsibility for the provision of information rests with the Communications Provider controlling the telephone number (a

proposed redrafting of GC19 incorporating this change is set out at the end of this section)? If you disagree, please provide detailed reasons for this view.:

Yes I agree with this point, BT can not be held responsible for data entry as they do not complete this task. BT however alternatively OFCOM should have control of the actual database.

Question 4.4: Do you agree with Ofcom's view that GC19 should be modified so as to capture actual end-users of the relevant telephone numbers assigned by the relevant Communications Provider to its subscribers, where these users are not the same persons as the subscribers themselves (a proposed redrafting of the definition of directory information is set out at the end of this section)? If you disagree, please provide detailed reasons for this view.:

Common sense would say that this already happens

Question 4.5: Do you consider that Ofcom should consider modifying GC19 (and related definitions, such as 'Directory Information') to include non-geographic telephone numbers assigned for use in public Electronic Communications Service (including, but not limited to, PATS)(a proposed redrafting of the condition and definition is set out at the end of this section)? If you disagree, please provide detailed reasons for this view. Or if you disagree in part only (e.g. a reference to public Electronic Communications Service being too wide), how do you suggest that Ofcom should address this matter?:

Yes

Question 4.6: Do you consider that Ofcom should modify GC19 (and related definitions, such as 'Directory Information') such that:

- **end-user name and address are also required to be provided, and**
- **business and non-geographic numbers to replace geographic information in the end-user address with more relevant data that would allow the identification of the number by a third party (a proposed redrafting of the condition and related definitions is set out at the end of this section)?**

If you disagree, please provide detailed reasons for this view. Or if you disagree in part, how do you suggest that Ofcom should address this matter?:

Yes

Question 4.7: Do you consider that there is a requirement for a wider mandated set of information beyond subscriber and end-user name and address under GC19? If so, what additional information do you think should be made available under GC19 ? please provide reasons and any evidence to support why you consider that users regard such additional information as necessary to find the persons they are looking for by indicating what specific circumstances exist in the UK?:

No there is no need, this is where provider can defer from provider in regard to individual USP

Question 4.8: Do you agree with our assessment of Communications Providers responsibilities with respect to the provision of GC19 data? If not, please provide details of your objection to this assessment and your proposed alternative.:

yes

Question 4.9: Do you agree that it is appropriate for the Opt-in approach to assume that not opting-in is equivalent to selecting an unlisted option? If not, please provide your reasons and your proposed alternative.:

no, opt out is better, the consumer is already used to this approach and changing it will generate confusion.

Question 4.10: Do you consider whether there are any issues arising in respect of the DIPs collection of additional data? If so, please provide details of any such concerns.:

Question 4.11: Do you agree that there is no requirement for specific additional protection of end-user information? If not, please provide details of your objection to this assessment and any proposed alternative.:

NO Ex directory listings are sufficient

Question 4.12: Do you have any comments about the operation of the requirements in Privacy Regulation 18(3) and 18(5)?:

Question 4.13: Do you have any comments about the operation of the requirement in Privacy Regulation 18(4) as it applies to GC19? We would also be interested to hear your views on whether Privacy Regulation 18(5) is sufficient to protect end-user data.:

Question 4.14: Do you agree that GC19 should be modified so as to referring also to the word 'objective' in the context of the terms on which GC19 data should be provided (a proposed redrafting of the condition and related definitions is set out at the end of this section)? If you disagree, please provide detailed reasons for maintaining this view.:

Question 4.15: Do you agree with the proposed redrafting of GC19 and related definitions as set out above [at the end of Section 4] and discussed through that section? If you disagree, please provide detailed reasons for this view.:

Question 5.1: Do you consider that BT will have sufficient commercial incentive to maintain the comprehensiveness of OSIS? Or do you consider that Ofcom should consider additional regulation to ensure that it will remain comprehensive?:

Question 5.2: Do you consider that there is no need for further regulation on the maintenance and management of BT's OSIS database and it is sufficient to rely on existing market incentives on BT and the option of drawing on ex post competition powers when competition issues are raised? Or do you consider that regulated access to BT's OSIS database is necessary in order to achieve Ofcom's policy objective? Or do you think that there are other options that Ofcom should consider? Please state your reasons.:

Question 5.3: Do you have any other comments on assessments made or the matters affecting the issues discussed in this Section concerning access to a UK central database?:

Additional comments: