

Response:

Your details	
Full name:	[<]
Representing:	Individual
Contact phone number:	[<]
Organisation (Optional):	
Email address:	[<]
Confirmation:	I confirm that the correspondence supplied with this form is a formal consultation response. It can be published in full on Ofcom's website, unless otherwise specified below, and I authorise Ofcom to make use of the information in this response to meet its legal requirements.
Confidentiality	
We will keep your contact number and email address confidential. Are there any additional details you want to keep confidential? (Optional):	Keep name confidential
If you want part of your response kept confidential, which parts? (Optional):	
Confidential Responses Only:	(Confidential Responses Only) Please TICK to allow Ofcom to publish a reference to the contents of your response (including, for any confidential parts, a general summary that does not disclose the specific information or enable you to be identified)
Ofcom may publish non-confidential responses on receipt:	Ofcom may publish non-confidential responses on receipt
Your response	
Question 1: Do you agree with our framework for assessment?:	Yes. However, in 3.13, you state: "While we consider that over time, and as technology progresses, networks are likely to improve...". On the face of it, this seems entirely plausible, but my own recent experience (Sky / Openreach's inability to provide me with a working landline over the last 6 months, despite many attempts to fix it, and despite the broadband service provided over the same copper wires working perfectly) suggests that the "legacy" services such as POTS may in fact be becoming less reliable as new entrants focus on their broadband offerings. Given the previous very high levels of availability for POTS, and the fact that many consumers still require it, even in the age of mobile phones, any such trend should be closely monitored.

<p>Question 2: Do you agree that in landline and broadband markets consumers are insufficiently protected from poor quality of service and that intervention is required?:</p>	<p>Yes. Reporting of faults is difficult and time-consuming, especially if the faults are recurrent. In my experience, there is no meaningful internal escalation process, and Ombudsman Services (Communications) are of no utility in attempting to persuade a UK telecommunications operator to provide a working telecommunications service, so there is currently no effective ultimate recourse for the consumer. In my case, the only "remedy" offered by the Ombudsman was that I should be able to find another telecommunications operator in the hope that they might be able to provide me with a working landline!</p>
<p>Question 3: Do you agree that it is appropriate for automatic compensation to be introduced for landline and broadband consumers?:</p>	<p>Yes. I expect that an automated compensation scheme would provide the necessary incentive for telecommunications operators to better serve their customers. However, in the case where the blame is shared between Openreach and the telecommunications operator, there needs to be some way of apportioning the financial penalty between them!</p>
<p>Question 4: Do you agree with our proposal to provide automatic compensation when a loss of service takes more than two full working days to be restored?:</p>	<p>This seems reasonable.</p>
<p>Question 5: Do you agree with our proposal to provide automatic compensation when there are delays in provisioning a landline or fixed broadband service?:</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>Question 6: Do you agree with our proposal to provide automatic compensation when missed appointments take place with less than 24 hours of prior notice?:</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>Question 7: Do you agree with our proposals on transparency?:</p>	<p>Yes, but only in addition to automatic compensation. The existing "compensation policies" in Figure 3 of your document are rather vague. And in Sky's case (my particular interest at the present time) amount to little more than "weasel words".</p>
<p>Question 8: Do you agree with our proposals on the method and timing of payment?:</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>Question 9: Do you agree with our proposal not to have a payment cap (and our assessment of the reasons for and against it)? - If you consider</p>	<p>Probably. I wouldn't want the incentive to improve to disappear once the service has become egregiously bad!</p>

there should be a payment cap, what should it be and why?:	
Question 10: Do you agree with our proposed exceptions?:	Yes
Question 11: Do you agree we should not allow for a blanket exception for force majeure-type events?:	You should not allow a "blanket" exception, but there ought to be a recognition that extreme events can sometimes hinder repairs. Perhaps the compensation rates should be reduced in some circumstances, or the onset delayed.
Question 12: Do you agree with our proposal on complaints and disputes?:	I'm not sure. My own experience with the ADR scheme has been singularly uninspiring. Perhaps they are competent to deal with simple financial disputes.
Question 13: Do you agree with the impacts we describe? Please wherever possible give your reasoning and provide evidence for your views.:	
Question 14: Do you agree with our provisional conclusions on residential landline and broadband services?:	
Question 15: Do you agree with our proposal of 12 months to implement automatic compensation?:	
Question 16: Do you agree with our proposal to monitor the impact of automatic compensation?:	
Question 17: Do you agree with our proposals for greater transparency regarding service quality and compensation for products targeted at SMEs?:	
Question 18: Do you agree with our provisional conclusions not to introduce automatic compensation for delayed repair of mobile loss of service?:	
Question 19: Do you have any comments on the draft condition set out in Annex 14 to this document?:	