

<p>Question 1: What are your views on the strategic principles that Ofcom proposes to apply to its numbering policy decisions?</p>
<p>Question 2: What do you think are consumers' key current views on numbering, how do you think those views will change, and how should Ofcom's current decisions take those changes into account?</p>
<p>Question 3: What do you think are the main ways in which technological developments will change the focus of numbering policy decisions, and how should Ofcom's current decisions take these developments into account? NOT GOOD ENOUGH</p>
<p>Question 4: Do you have any comments on Ofcom's assessment of the current challenges to the Numbering Plan, in terms of a) number availability, b) transparency, or c) consumer abuses? NEW CODES SHOULD BE ADDED IF NECESSARY</p>
<p>Question 5: Do you agree that the extension of conservation measures is the best approach to take before the impact of NGNs eases the pressure on geographic number demand? NGNs SHOULD NOT BE USED AS THE ONLY SOURCE OF NUMBERS. ANY 03 NUMBERS SHOULD ALWAYS MAP A GEOGRAPHIC 01 OR 02 NUMBER IN THE SAME WAY AS 08 AND 09 NUMBERS DO NOW.</p>
<p>Question 6: Do you agree that the use of overlay codes is the best backstop approach in the event that extended conservation measures are not sufficient to meet demand for geographic numbers? NO. THIS WOULD MAKE CALLS EXPENSIVE BY THE BACK DOOR. ALL NGN NUMBERS SHOULD BE MAPPED TO A REAL 01 OR 02 NUMBER.</p>

Question 7:

Do you agree that Ofcom should continue to respect the geographic identity of numbers until consumer understanding of the impact of technology change evolves further, and what do you consider is the best way to develop that consumer understanding? GEOGRAPHIC IDENTITY IS ESSENTIAL AT ALL TIMES TO AVOID CONFUSION. MAKING PEOPLE THINK THEY CAN ONLY DIAL NGNs MAY RESULT IN MISLEADING INFORMATION BEING GIVEN OUT IN FUTURE WHEN THE REAL ANSWER IS DIFFERENT.

Question 8:

Do you agree with Ofcom's proposal to open a new '03' number range for non-geographic, non-revenue sharing services? PROVIDING IT IS NOT USED TO EXPLOIT THE PUBLIC. ANY 03 NUMBER SHOULD BE MAPPED TO AN 01 OR 02 NUMBER AND ANY 03 NUMBER SHOULD BE CHARGED JUST LIKE 01 OR 02 NUMBERS AND INCLUDED IN PACKAGES.

Question 9:

How should the '03' range be structured, in terms of tariffs and services ?

AS 01 AND 02 NUMBERS ONLY.

Question 10:

How should the '08' range be structured, in terms of tariffs and services?

NO CONNECTION CHARGES
NO CHARGES WHICH DIFFER FROM 01 OR 02 NUMBERS

Question 11:

Which broad approach should Ofcom take to structuring the '09' range, and if a re-structured '09' range is preferred how would you arrange the different types of '09' services (e.g., according to price per minute, price per call, inclusion of adult content)?

PRICE PER MINUTE – IE 0901 WOULD BE 1p PER MINUTE – 0999 WOULD BE 99p PER MINUTE ETC

Question 12:

Should any specific PRS service categories be identified or segregated in order that parents can block access by their children (e.g., sexually explicit content, gambling)? Is there merit in having a general 'adults only' classification, including a range of services to which access might be restricted on the grounds of content, or might consumers wish to apply different rules for different types of content?

<p>YES AND ALSO PHYCHIC LINES. ALL CHARGABLE NUMBERS SHOULD BE BLOCKABLE – BUT 01 OR 02 NUMBERS SHOULD BE LEFT FULLY OPEN IF THE CUSTOMER IS ON AN ALL INCLUSIVE PACKAGE MEANING 01 AND 02 NUMBERS (AND POSSIBLE 03) NUMBERS ARE FREE BY DEFAULT</p>
<p>Question 13: Are there any practical means by which the Numbering Plan could provide improved mobile tariff transparency?</p>
<p>RE-ASSIGN CODES TO SPESIFIC COMPANIES</p>
<p>Question 14: Do you agree that personal numbers should have a tariff ceiling (or recorded message) to restore trust in those numbers? If so, what level, and should that ceiling include the cost of recorded messages?</p>
<p>YES. RECORDED MESSAGE SHOULD BE PUT ON BEGINNING AT NO CHARGE AND ANY RECORDED MESSAGE ON THE NUMBER SHOULD INDICATE THAT A CHARGE WILL FOLLOW IF YOU CONTINUE WITH THE CALL.</p>
<p>Question 15: Do you agree with Ofcom’s proposals to move personal numbers (with the same consumer protection provisions) to the ‘06’ range and to pursue the direct allocation of numbers to end users as proposed at some point in the future?</p>
<p>PROVIDING THEY ARE NOT USED TO EXPLOIT CUSTOMERS. 06 (CURRENTLY 070) NUMBERS SHOULD NOT BE USED BY BUSINESSES.</p>
<p>Question 16: Do you have any comments on the use of the 05 number range?</p>
<p>SUCH NUMBERS SHOULD BE PUT IN THE PHONE BOOK. VOIP NUMBERS IN THE 055 AND 056 RANGES SHOULD BE CHARGED LIKE 01 AND 02 NUMBERS AND INCLUDED IN SERVICE PROVIDER PACKAGES. 0500 SHOULD REMAIN UNCHANGED.</p>
<p>Question 17: Do you agree that Ofcom’s overall proposals for a future Numbering Plan are coherent and comprehensive, and do you have any comments on the timescales in which the changes should be implemented ?</p>
<p>WITHIN 2 YEARS</p>
<p>Question 18: Do you agree with the principle of using consumer protection tests in numbering in order to limit consumer abuses, as long as the relevant legal tests are met? Do you have any suggestions for what tests would be appropriate or any conditions that should be met to pass such tests?</p>

Question 19: Do you support the proposal to extend the tariffing provisions of the Numbering Plan so that they apply to customers of all providers on all types of network?
Question 20: How do you think the new Numbering Plan could be effectively communicated to consumers?
IN PLAIN ENGLISH
Question 21: What are your views on Ofcom's analysis and the different options for number charging ?
RATHER CONFUSING AT PRESENT
Question 22: Which, if any, numbers might appropriately be allocated using a value-based charge ?
09
Question 23: Do you have any other comments on Ofcom's proposals for numbering as discussed in Section 5, or any other suggestions for how Ofcom might revise the current Numbering Plan or its administration?
Question 24: What do you think of Ofcom's proposed general approach to managing geographic numbers?

CODES COULD BE CHANGED AGAIN IN FUTURE IF NEED BE. IE IF ALL 0151 NUMBERS ARE USED, NEW NUMBERS SHOULD BE GIVEN 0251 AND THE SAME SHOULD APPLY ACROSS THE COUNTRY. IN THE CASE OF COVENTRY AND GRANTHAM COVENTRY SHOULD CHANGE TO 02203 AND GRANTHAM WOULD THEN GET 02476 FOR NEW NUMBERS. BRISTOL WOULD BE 0217 ETC, BIRMINGHAM WOULD GET 0221. READING GET 0218 ETC. IN AREAS SUCH AS CARDIFF 02920 SHOULD BECOME 022220. BELFAST WOULD BECOME 022320 – IE THE OLD CODES WITH A 2 AFTER THE FIRST 0. EXTENTION OF NUMBERS COULD BE USED IF A 0 WAS ADDED TO THE END OF THE CODE. ADDITIONAL NUMBERS ONCE THE 0 RANGE HAD BEEN EXCEEDED HAVE A 1 AT THE END ETC. THIS WOULD VASTLY INCREASE THE NUMBER OF POTENTIAL LOCAL NUMBERS – 121 DIGIT NUMBERS IF DIALED IN FULL.

Question 25:

Do you have detailed evidence or suggestions on the variables likely to influence demand for geographic numbers, how those variables will change over time, and how Ofcom should develop a demand model?

Question 26:

Do you agree with the specific proposal for how to extend conservation measures, including the extension to areas with a number shortage predicted in the next five (rather than two) years?

CODES COULD BE CHANGED AGAIN IN FUTURE IF NEED BE. IE IF ALL 0151 NUMBERS ARE USED, NEW NUMBERS SHOULD BE GIVEN 0251 AND THE SAME SHOULD APPLY ACROSS THE COUNTRY. IN THE CASE OF COVENTRY AND GRANTHAM COVENTRY SHOULD CHANGE TO 02203 AND GRANTHAM WOULD THEN GET 02476 FOR NEW NUMBERS. BRISTOL WOULD BE 0217 ETC, BIRMINGHAM WOULD GET 0221. READING GET 0218 ETC. IN AREAS SUCH AS CARDIFF 02920 SHOULD BECOME 022220. BELFAST WOULD BECOME 022320 – IE THE OLD CODES WITH A 2 AFTER THE FIRST 0. EXTENTION OF NUMBERS COULD BE USED IF A 0 WAS ADDED TO THE END OF THE CODE. ADDITIONAL NUMBERS ONCE THE 0 RANGE HAD BEEN EXCEEDED HAVE A 1 AT THE END ETC. THIS WOULD VASTLY INCREASE THE NUMBER OF POTENTIAL LOCAL NUMBERS – 121 DIGIT NUMBERS IF DIALED IN FULL.

Question 27:

Do you consider there to be any upper limit, in terms of technical feasibility, on the number of areas in which conservation measures could be used ?

NO UPPER LIMIT – 12 EIGHT NUMBERS MAY BE THE ANSWER PLUS MAKING THE 02 RANGE LIKE THE 01 RANGE TO AVOID CONFUSION – SEE ABOVE FOR CONFUSION. CITIES THAT HAD COMPLETELY DIFFERENT CODES LIKE SOUTHAMPTON AND COVENTRY SHOULD NEVER HAVE HAD THEIR CODES CHANGED AND IT WOULD HAVE BEEN EASIER TO GIVE THE OLD CODES BACK SO THAT THE 02 RANGE CAN BE USED PURELY AS AN EXTENSION TO THE 01 RANGE IN THE SAME AREA

Question 28:

Do you agree with Ofcom's assessment of the impact of conservation measures on stakeholders?

Question 29:

Do you agree that Ofcom should pursue these additional ways to improve number utilisation and, if we do, how would stakeholders be impacted and what practical issues are involved?

Question 30:

What are your views on overlay codes, and Ofcom's assessment of them, as a fallback option to increase number supply? What should be the maximum number of areas where overlay codes are introduced?

Question 31:

What are your views on closing the scheme, and Ofcom's assessment of it, as a fallback option to increase number supply?

Question 32:

What are your views on wide area codes, and Ofcom's assessment of them, as a fallback option to increase number supply?

USE 01 AREAS FIRST WITH AN 02 AS EXTENSION TO THE 01 AREA. EXISTING 02 CODES SHOULD REVERT BACK TO THEIR OLD CODES (SOUTHAMPTON WOULD BECOME 01703 AGAIN AND 02703 WOULD BE THE NEW NUMBERS).

Question 33:

Might wide area codes be appropriate in regions with a strong identity and, if so, which specific regions are suitable for wide area codes?

<p>Question 34: Do you agree with Ofcom's assessment of the problems with current 08 and 09 in terms of information clarity and consumer perceptions?</p>
<p>CHARGABLE 08 NUMBERS AND 09 NUMBERS SHOULD ALWAYS HAVE A AWARNING MESSAGE BEFORE CHARGING BEGINS. RADIO STATIONS SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO USE THEM. (EXAMPLE 0871 222 1054 CENTURY NORTH WEST – CHARGED 10p PER MINUTE FROM START OF CALL – NO RING TONE AND YOU ARE CHARGED FOR THE RING TONE WHEN CALLING THE STUDIO BY PRESSING OPTION 1. YOU DON'T ALWAYS GET THROUGH AND AFTER OVER 1 MINUTE, YOU ARE TOLD THE LINE IS ENGAGED WHEN IN FACT THE PRESENTER HASN'T PICKED THE PHONE UP AND IT HAS BEEN RINGING ALL ALONG!)</p>
<p>Question 35: Which of these options for current 08 services do you think is best in terms of a) increasing consumer transparency and b) minimising the costs of re-structuring the 08 range?</p>
<p>Question 36: How might early migration to the '03' range be encouraged?</p>
<p>TO GIVE CONSUMERS A BETTER UNDERSTANDING THAT THEY WILL NOT BE RIPPED OFF CALLING THEM</p>
<p>Question 37: Is it more important to indicate price per minute or price per call, and does this vary for different types of PRS service? What granularity of PRS tariff information should be given to consumers by the Numbering Plan?</p>
<p>PER MINUTE IS BETTER AS IT IS MORE SPECIFIC</p>
<p>Question 38: Should there be any PRS number ranges with no tariff ceiling ?</p>
<p>CERTAINLY NOT. THEY COULD BE USED TO EXPLOIT PEOPLE.</p>
<p>Question 39: What is the typical turnover of 09 numbers, and what does this mean for migration timescales to a new 09 Plan? How could Ofcom structure the 09 range or take other steps to promote voluntary migration of 09 services ?</p>
<p>Question 40: Do you agree that that part of the 07 range which is currently unused (071-075) should be reserved for mobile services, with the aim of establishing 07 as a mobile 'brand'?</p>

I THOUGHT IT ALREADY WAS!
<p>Question 41: Should Ofcom reserve specific sub-ranges within the 071-075 range for new mobile multimedia services, in the interests of promoting consumer awareness and tariff transparency, and if so how?</p>
THE ONLY WAY THIS COULD BE DONE WOULD BE TO EXTEND THE NUMBER BY AN EXTRA DIGIT. 0777 000 1234 COULD BECOME 07770 000 1234. YOU COULD SPECIFY THAT THE CODE ENDING IN A CERTAIN NUMBER COULD BE SPECIFIC TO MULTIMEDIA MOBILE – IE 07771 000 1234 COULD BE PICTURE MESSAGING BUT 07770 000 1234 WOULD BE FOR VOICE.
<p>Question 42: Do you support the use of 100,000-number blocks in allocating mobile numbers to new mobile voice providers?</p>
YES, OTHERWISE THE DEMAND WILL OUTSTRIP SUPPLY
<p>Question 43: Based on the above analysis, if Ofcom were to introduce a charge ceiling on calls to 070 numbers, which of the following levels should be adopted</p>
<p>Question 44: Would a requirement to make tariff information clearly available to purchasers of personal numbering services at the point of sale, either in addition to, or instead of a call ceiling, be an effective means of providing tariff transparency on personal numbers?</p>
TARRIFF INFO SHOULD BE PROVIDED AT POINT OF SALE TO AVOID CONFUSION
<p>Question 45: If a new sub-range is made available for personal numbering services, how long should the current '070' sub-range remain available for existing providers, in order to minimise migration costs ?</p>
2 YEARS
<p>Question 46: What issues do you think would need to be resolved before Ofcom makes individual numbers available for direct allocation to end users?</p>
<p>Question 47: What do you consider to be the main strengths and weaknesses of the current rules-based system of UK number allocation?</p>

Question 48: Do you agree with these principles for number charging?
Question 49: What are your views on Ofcom's assessment of the issues to be considered in setting and reviewing number charges? For example, should other issues be considered in developing charging proposals ?
Question 50: Do you agree that charging for numbers could disincentivise economically inefficient behaviour, and incentivise economically efficient utilisation?
THEY SHOULD ONLY BE ALLOCATED TO PEOPLE WHO HAVE NOT USED CHARGABLE NUMBERS FOR INSUFFICIENT PURPOSES. TOO DEAR AND THEY COULD BE USED FOR SCAMS
Question 51: What internal changes would communications providers have to make, and at what cost, to support charging for numbers? Would these changes be preferable to earlier and more widespread use of conservation measures and (limited) changes to increase geographic number supply?
Question 52: How might existing number allocation rules be reduced if charging for numbers was introduced ?
Question 53: What are your views on this illustrative charging mechanism, and would you suggest any changes or alternatives to it ?
Question 54: How would charging for number blocks affect consumers ?

Question 55:

What impact do you think charging for numbers would have on sub-allocation? Should Ofcom encourage or facilitate sub-allocation and, if charging were introduced, would changes be needed to the process of suballocation to facilitate trading?

Question 56:

Which types of consumer abuse do you think Ofcom should particularly attempt to address through its numbering policy decisions?

PEOPLE WHO USE NUMBERS TO EXPLOIT PEOPLE IE PHYCHICS WHO LIE ON THEIR LINES SHOULD BE BANNED FROIM OPERATING SUCH SERVICES

THE FOLLOWING SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO USE NGN NUMBERS AND SHOULD ONLY BE ALLOWED TO USE GENUINE LOCAL (GEOGRAPHIC) OR FREE NUMBERS:

BBC

BBC LOCAL RADIO STATIONS

GOVERNMENT

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

NHS

NHS DIRECT

LOCAL HEALTH SERVICES

HOSPITALS

ALL UTILITY COMPANIES

CUSTOMER SERVICE

TELEPHNE COMPANIES

ANY FAULT REPORTING LINE – (NTL USE A PREMIUM RATE 0871 NUMBER TO REPORT FAULTS!) SUCH PRACTICE MUST BE ENDED.

Question 57:

Which number ranges and types of originating communications provider do you think should be covered by an extension of the Numbering Plan's tariffing provisions? What practical issues are involved, and how would this vary according to the number ranges and service providers involved?

Question 58:

What do you think of the potential conditions proposed by Ofcom for inclusion in a consumer protection test for number allocation, including the proposals that numbers should not be provided to anyone with a particular track record of persistent and/or serious consumer abuse ?

PEOPLE WHO USE NUMBERS TO EXPLOIT PEOPLE IE PHYCHICS WHO LIE ON THEIR LINES SHOULD BE BANNED FROIM OPERATING SUCH SERVICES

Question 59:

Are there any other circumstances in which it may be appropriate for Ofcom to refuse number allocations ?

IF THEY REFUSE TO MAKE ANY CHARGABLE CALL TARIFFS CLEAR AND/OR HAVE A TRACK RECORD OF MISLEADING THE PUBLIC

Question 60:

Would you support the use of a consumer protection test as a basis for withdrawing number allocations? What kind of considerations should Ofcom apply in any such test, and what would be the practical issues involved in applying such a test?

Question 61:

What consumer abuses do you think might occur in the future, and what steps might Ofcom take now in its numbering policy in order to reduce the potential for such abuses?