

Name and title under which you would like this response to appear:

Anonymous 52

Representing:

Self

What do you want Ofcom to keep confidential?:

Keep name/contact details/job title confidential

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

Ofcom may publish a response summary:

Yes

I confirm that I have read the declaration:

Yes

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

You may publish my response on receipt

Question 1: To what extent do you consider that DTT, DSat, cable and IPTV are in competition with one another for subscribers of pay TV services ? either at present or in the future?:

Yes, they are in competition. Satellite, cable and DTT should be considered as separate service "types". There is sufficient bandwidth on both cable and satellite for suppliers of both free and pay services - DTT is another matter - limited bandwidth and it is totally wrong to block more channels and to give them over to pay services - we already have TUTV and Sentanta - why block more channels by giving some over to Sky who have a near monopoly on their satellite services for payTV. KEEP DTT FREE TO ALL - unless more MUXs are made available after analog switch-off.

Question 2: To what extent do you consider the Proposal is likely to deliver benefits to the consumer?:

None what-so-ever - it becomes restrictive for free-to-air, free-to-view services given the very limited number of channels available on DTT.

At present there are two news broadcasters on DTT (BBC News24 and Sky News) - to retain a freely available alternative news service (Sky News) must be considered to be paramount to allow an even balance of free-to-air news as well as an alternative supplier of news output rather than having a single news supplier.

Question 3: To what extent do you consider that there is scope for sustainable competition in pay TV on the DTT platform and, more broadly, across all pay TV platforms?:

None at all - TUTV have had financial problems in the past - why would anyone want to subscribe to Sky for a DTT service. If anyone wanted to watch and pay for Sky Movies and Sky Sports, they would already have done so using the satellite services currently available.

This idea from Sky to enter the DTT arena with their payTV services is to attempt to push everyone else off the DTT platform and for Sky to gain a monopoly across the board. Look at the issues surrounding Sky's stake in ITV (only 17%, but look at the fuss being made about it) - they want 100% control of all broadcasting services (other than the BBC) - thus eliminate the competition.

Question 4: What are likely to be the key aspects of competition between providers of retail pay TV services on the DTT platform? E.g. what is the role of premium sports and movies content?:

Provision of payTV for such as sports and first-run movies is acceptable - but let's keep it to the satellite and cable services. As mentioned before, if anyone wants these services, there is already the satellite services from Sky.

Question 5: Do you consider that if Sky were to become the only provider of pay TV on the DTT platform it would be likely to have a significant detrimental effect on competition in the long term? How might this affect the development of other platforms for the delivery of pay TV services?:

Detrimental to all other services on DTT. Sky are a big organisation and can throw a lot of money onto whatever they wish if it can be seen that, in the long term, it would eliminate or drastically reduce the competition and give them a greater share of the market.

Basically, I am against any idea of payTV services on DTT - keep it free-to-view/free-to-air for the benefit of all, and not just those who want to/can pay. If I want payTV for such as movies and sports, I'll subscribe to Sky's satellite services - this I have not done and will never do.

Question 6: To what extent, if at all, do you consider that the Proposal would be likely to lead to any of the public policy concerns outlined at Section 4?:

Question 7: Specifically, to what extent do you consider that the Proposal would be likely to lead to consumer confusion?:

There's confusion enough with the different TV services currently available on UHF terrestrial - analog, digital, Freeview, TUTV, with the need for set-top boxes for Freeview for every TV and video in a household (that is to become a must if TV is to be continued to be watched/recorded as is). And to add to this confusion further with

yet another set-top box to receive the proposed Sky DTT service is a little beyond belief

Question 8: To what extent do you consider that it is beneficial for consumers to be able to obtain Sky and existing DTT pay TV content without having to purchase separate STBs?:

TUTV can be received using most Freeview set-top boxes by adding a card; Sky's proposed service will not use the same technology - they need their own set-top box. Why? What's the point? Let's fill our rooms with dozens of set-top boxes so we can receive a channel or two of payTV to this supplier or that supplier of TV services.

Question 9: Do you consider that the Proposal might lead to any additional public policy concerns:

Question 10: If Sky becoming the only provider of pay TV services on the DTT platform were likely to have a significant detrimental effect on competition, do you consider that it is possible to address this through a set of additional conditions and/or directions? If so, what form should those conditions/directions take?:

If Sky want competition - let them compete on an even footing with everyone else - on a FREE-TO-AIR basis. It's the advertisers who essentially pay for the TV services on the current (non-Sky) commercial channels - let Sky make use of these advertisers for their income on DTT (the same as everyone else) rather than make use of subscription/PayTV whereby the consumer also pays.

Additional comments:

Sky have their current three free-to-air services on DTT (News, Sports & Three) which can be seen as "an advertisement" for their services available on satellite - their PayTV services.

TUTV do not have an alternative option for their services (BTVision use broadband, Virgin uses cable) and thus TUTV needs to use DTT.

Let other applicants make use of DTT for subscription services - BUT only if they do not already have an alternative means for the supply of subscription/PayTV.

At this stage, the Sky proposal appears to be full of "unknowns" - what will be the programming content of its non-sports and non-movies channels? will they be primarily made up of "imports" or "home-grown" output? what will its charges be for the services? will the charges be levied on a per-channel basis or the service as a whole? what will be the cost of the new STBs?

No - keep Sky to what it currently has - three free-to-air services on DTT and its subscription/payTV on its satellite services.

Keep Sky off subscription/PayTV on DTT.

Decline, refuse Sky's proposal 100%.

Maybe revisit the whole scenario if and when there are more multiplexes available than the current six, i.e. after the analog switch-off.

Also, keep the DTT platform as it currently is, technically (MPEG2), unless firmware updates can easily be performed on the vast majority of the current STBs. A lot of

people have invested, in comparative terms, a lot of money in purchasing STBs/DTV sets that work with today's technology. It would be a pity to have to enforce newer technologies (MPEG4, etc. as noted in your pdf on Sky's proposal) which would mean new STBs "having" to be purchased simply to continue to watch TV of any description.

We went from 405-line band I single channel TV to having to have a dual-standard TV with band I & III to a TV with a UHF tuner and then to receive colour transmissions. Each time there was a lengthy dual-running process available. Now we have been forced into a digital only scenario (analog being switched off) and we're all buying STBs, etc. only to be told (quietly at this stage) that the current rash of STBs probably will not work with the new technologies such as MPEG4 and the newer and various encryption systems for payTV. And how soon would these be "forced" upon us, the general public? Very quickly if Sky have their way.

Technology will always evolve, but do allow lengthy dual-running time-slots to allow current equipment to reach (or certainly approach) end-of-life before forcing consumers to change to new equipment.