

Title:

Mr

Forename:

Craig

Surname:

Cable

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

Craig Cable

Representing:

Self

What do you want Ofcom to keep confidential?:

Keep nothing 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?:

100% competition one to another.

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

100% unlikely.

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?:

Sky's objective in all this is to squash all effective competition. That said there is some scope for sustainable competition. Setanta have shown that both on Sky and DTT with their subscription sports channels. Top up Tv to a much lesser extent.

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?:

The key aspect/purpose is to remove available bandwidth and to thus make DTT/Freeview a less attractive proposition. As a secondary consideration for those that do subscribe Sky will be hoping to convert subscribers to their full satellite offer. Pay TV on DTT can be likened to a Trojan Horse or to mix metaphors, like a sprat to catch a mackerel !

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?:

Monopoly providers by definition operate against public interest in any given field of activity. And Sky in particular has consistently shown itself to be anything but altruistic in its dealings with would be competitors.

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?:

Everything concerned with this proposal is of concern and is potentially detrimental to the greater public interest as it potentially diminishes choice.

As is consistent with the answer given above relating to monopoly suppliers in any field.

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

100% likely for reasons which are obvious and relate to the now established DTT/Freeview concept which successfully relaunched DTT in the UK.

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?:

I would have thought that this was an important consideration in the overall scheme of things.

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

Yes of course it will. Sky is correctly perceived to be a bully boy operation that ultimately gets what it wants by throwing its considerable weight around. Allowing this proposal to be ratified will further reinforce that public perception.

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?:

Yes Sky should be referred to the OFT for continuing to promote non-competitive business practices. One only has to look at the blocking stake they have taken in ITV to see how far they are prepared to go to protect what they see as their interests. This particular issue is another example of what they are prepared to do to further their own interests and justify it on the basis of a disingenuous and spurious argument.

Additional comments:

Only that it should be as obvious as the day is long that this is a majorly flawed submission and one that runs completely counter to the public interest.