



## Submissions to Consultation

**General Authorisation - Amended proposals to attach new conditions in relation to telecommunications service disruption minimisation.**

### Submissions received from respondents

<b>Document No:</b>	08/27s
<b>Date:</b>	5 November 2008

<b>Consultation:</b>	07/45
<b>Response to Consultation:</b>	08/27

**Contents**

1 .....BT Ireland  
2 ..... Department of Social and Family Affairs  
3 ..... eircom  
4 ..... Meteor  
5 .....Vodafone

## **1 BT Ireland**



**BT's Response to ComReg Further Consultation  
On Amended Proposals to Attach New Conditions to the General  
Authorisation in relation to Electronic Communications.**

**Reference: Submission Document No: 08/27**

**Q.1 Do you agree with the text of the conditions proposed for attachment to the General Authorisation? If not, please indicate which of the proposed conditions you do not agree with and why.**

BT welcomes the proposed Amendment to the General Authorisation.

BT notes the new approach by ComReg in relation to the proposed Amendment, i.e. the raising of the bar from 'possibility' to 'probability' and withdrawing the suggestion of the requirement for a Minimum Disruption Plan. However, given the events of 2006 which led to this Consultation process, BT is still of the opinion that Operators with SMP should have additional obligations placed on them by virtue of the bottleneck services that they provide. We believe that this is particularly relevant in the fixed markets.

We note that ComReg states that they do not believe that a General Authorisation condition could be made specific to an SMP Operator. If this is the case, BT suggests that additional obligations be placed on the SMP Operator in the fixed market via remedies in the relevant fixed markets. BT believes that these additional requirements could be imposed further to the Access Regulations, as a remedy, applicable to the SMP Operator in each relevant fixed market.

The additional requirements on the fixed SMP Operator should include:-

- The requirement to publish a draft Minimum Disruption Plan (MDP) for OAO comment.
- The requirement to allow Operators to make representations in relation to the Draft MDP before it is finalised.
- The requirement to update the MDP as appropriate.
- The requirement to update the RIO, as required, as a result via the ComReg change management process.
- A rolling daily update and notification of developments in the event of industrial action or any other event.

In relation to the text of the proposed Amendment at Appendix A, BT makes the following observations:-

**(1)** We believe that the definition of "Substantial Number of Consumers" is still slightly problematic as it does not define the time period in which the 2000 consumers would be at risk, i.e. does the 2000 refer to a number at a point in time or to 2000 with a probability of being at risk in say one year. The assumption would be that it is 2000 consumers at risk at any given point in time, but the definition is currently silent in relation to this.

**(2)** In Clause 18.4 and 18.5, where the phrase Cessation of Service is used, for completeness, we believe that the phrase "affecting a Substantial Number of Consumers", should be inserted as per the practice in the rest of the proposed Amendment.

**Q.2. Do you agree that the text of conditions 18.2-18.5 proposed for attachment to the General Authorisation can be classified as conditions providing for ‘Consumer protection rules specific to the electronic communications sector including conditions in conformity with the Universal Service Regulations’?**

Yes, BT agrees.

**Q.3 Do you agree that the text of the conditions proposed for attachment to the General Authorisation are objectively justified, nondiscriminatory, proportionate and transparent?**

Yes, BT agrees, however, please refer to our response in relation to Q1 with respect to fixed SMP Operators.

**Q.4 In your view do the conditions proposed for attachment to the General Authorisation constitute Specific Obligations, or conditions which are applicable to undertakings by virtue of other laws?**

In our view current law does not adequately address these issues and thus the proposed conditions are warranted. We also refer to our suggestions in response to Q1 in relation to SMP Operators in relevant fixed markets.

**Q.5 Respondents are requested to provide views on whether the proposed specifications are proportionate and justified and offer views on other factors (if any) ComReg should consider in completing its Regulatory Impact Assessment.**

BT believes that the proposed specifications are proportionate and justified, however, as per our response to Q1, in order to ensure proportionality, additional obligations (as described above), should be imposed on SMP Operators in relevant fixed markets via specific remedies, as per the Access Regulations.

**end**

## **2 Department of Social and Family Affairs**

I refer to the consultation; General Authorisation Response to Consultation Document 07/45 and Further Consultation on Amended Proposals to Attach New Conditions to the General Authorisation in relation to Electronic Communications (08/27) as discussed at a recent meeting with ComReg and DSFA on 2 September. The Department would like to have the attached paragraph accepted for inclusion with or additional to Paragraph 18.3 of Appendix A, under New Proposed Conditions.

An Authorised Person shall also notify the Department of Social & Family Affairs (DSFA) immediately where a final decision has been taken to implement a Cessation of Service and or Termination affecting a number of consumers who are recipients of DSFA Allowance.



### **3 eircom**

**eircom Ltd.**

**Response to ComReg Doc. 08/27**

***General Authorisation - Response to Consultation  
Document 07/45 and Further Consultation on  
Amended Proposals to Attach New Conditions to the  
General Authorisation in relation to Electronic  
Communications***

**27 May 2008**

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- eircom welcomes ComReg's revision of the proposed conditions consulted upon in summer 2007 in response to the comment by eircom and other industry players.
- eircom reiterates its support for the principle that operators take steps to ensure as far as possible that service disruption to consumers is minimised.
- eircom, however, believes that there is merit in clarifying further that the obligations and powers that the new conditions seek to impose have a clearly limited scope of application, namely the protection of consumers, and must be interpreted in this context. In particular, none of the obligations and powers concerned should be allowed to interfere with the legitimate interests of wholesale providers. It is only to this extent that the proposed Conditions can be seen to be legitimate, objectively justified and proportionate.
- eircom also notes that ComReg's ability to intervene where the issues contemplated by the proposed conditions arise is limited and the inclusion of the measures intended by the proposed conditions should not be taken to extend its powers in that regard.

## RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

### Q.1 Do you agree with the text of the conditions proposed for attachment to the General Authorisation? If not, please indicate which of the proposed conditions you do not agree with and why.

eircom welcomes the simplification of the proposed text for new conditions 18-2 to 18-5. eircom would welcome further clarification and amendments, as appropriate, concerning the following:

- it is not clear whether the scope of “Cessation of services” as defined includes cessation of services caused by natural or other disasters, outside the control of any Authorised Person. In view of the fact that such cessations are by nature impossible to predict, cannot be notified, and their remediation is difficult to identify in advance, they should be clearly excluded from the definition of cessation of services.
- The scope of the new text for Condition 18(2)(i) is too broad and gives rise to uncertainties as to the circumstances in which an obligation to notify on the part of an Authorised Person would arise. eircom believes that it would be appropriate to restrict the scope of the obligation of notification to the Authorised Person whose customers would be affected by the cessation of services. eircom suggests accordingly that the obligation should read as follows:

“(i) immediately where it believes there is a reasonable probability of a Cessation of Service affecting a Substantial number of **its** Consumers...”

- eircom does not object as such to the obligation of notification imposed on a wholesale provider such as that envisaged in the proposed text for Condition 18(2)(ii). This is subject however to eircom’s understanding that notifications pursuant to Condition 18(2)(ii) will be without prejudice to the Notifying Authorised Person’s entitlement to exercise its legal, including contractual, rights, including the ability to serve and execute termination notices, as deemed appropriate by the Notifying Authorised Person, in accordance with its business and commercial interests.
- eircom suggests that the requirement included in the proposed text for Condition 18-3 that notification to customers be in writing is unnecessary. eircom considers those are matters which should be left at the discretion of the Authorised Person concerned.
- eircom understands that ComReg’s intention behind the proposed new conditions, including the obligations of notification set out in Condition 18.2, is to ensure that it is properly informed in appropriate time of any Cessation of Services so that it can intervene for the benefit of consumers. It seems to eircom in this regard that the proposed powers for ComReg to request information to be provided to it should be harmonised with Conditions 18-2 and 18-3, that is, should only be able to be exercised in cases of Cessation of Services affecting a Substantial Number of consumers. In addition, the proposed text for Condition 18-4 should be amended to clarify that ComReg can only request information which is necessary and proportionate for the purpose of ensuring the minimisation of the effect of a cessation of services on consumers.
- eircom notes that the proposed text for Condition 18-5 does not differentiate the burden of the obligation concerned depending on the relationship of the

Authorised Persons with the consumers. eircom is of the view that the onus should be placed on the Authorised Person which have a direct relation with the customer, that is the retail provider. The obligations of wholesale providers ought to be more limited and eircom refers in this regard to our comments above concerning proposed Condition 18(2)(ii).

**Q.2. Do you agree that the text of conditions 18.2-18.5 proposed for attachment to the General Authorisation can be classified as conditions providing for ‘Consumer protection rules specific to the electronic communications sector including conditions in conformity with the Universal Service Regulations’?**

eircom agrees that the proposed conditions can be so classified. Further, eircom would like to point out that the proposed new Conditions 18-2 to 18-5 can only be imposed for the purpose of consumer protection which in turn constitutes a limit to the scope of the obligations and powers they seek to establish.

**Q.3 Do you agree that the text of the conditions proposed for attachment to the General Authorisation are objectively justified, non-discriminatory, proportionate and transparent?**

eircom refers to its response to Question 1 above and submits that it is only if the text of the proposed conditions is amended in accordance thereto that the proposed conditions could be said to be objectively justified, non-discriminatory and proportionate. eircom also refers to its response to Question 2 above concerning the limited scope of application of the proposed Conditions. In this regard, eircom notes that ComReg’s ability to intervene where the issues contemplated by the proposed conditions arise is limited and the inclusion of the measures intended by the proposed conditions should not be taken to otherwise specify or extend its powers.

**Q.4 In your view do the conditions proposed for attachment to the General Authorisation constitute Specific Obligations, or conditions which are applicable to undertakings by virtue of other laws?**

eircom agrees that the proposed conditions do not constitute Specific Obligations or conditions which are applicable by virtue of other laws.

**Q.5 Respondents are requested to provide views on whether the proposed specifications are proportionate and justified and offer views on other factors (if any) ComReg should consider in completing its Regulatory Impact Assessment.**

Please see response to Question 3.

## **4 Meteor**



**Meteor Mobile Communications Ltd.**

**Response to Further Consultation on Amended  
Proposals to Attach New Conditions to the  
General Authorisation**

**(ComReg 08/27)**

**27 May 2008**

## Introduction

Meteor appreciates ComReg's considered response to the views submitted in response to the initial consultation. We also support the decision not to impose a requirement for authorised undertakings to submit a Disruption Minimisation Plan to ComReg. With respect to the remaining requirements, Meteor welcomes the clarity that has been introduced through the proposed definitions.

However Meteor is concerned that the selective use of the proposed definitions has resulted in scope creep beyond incidents that affect a large number of customers to routine suspension of service for non-payment. This is in spite of assurances provided in the executive summary that concerns about the scope extending to normal operational activities such as these would be alleviated.

Provision needs to be made for Cessations that were not anticipated by the network or service provider. Conversely the proposed requirement to notify customers immediately where a final decision is made to cease services to a substantial number of consumers, fails to cater for planned withdrawal of a service which may not take place for some time. Also the requirement to advise customers in writing is not practical in all instances.

With respect to the proposed requirement to use all reasonable endeavours to ensure that the effect of any Cessation is minimised, Meteor welcomes the caveat that ComReg has added, to account for the nature and extent of the disruption. Meteor notes ComReg's reluctance to differentiate between disruption arising from breach of contract (typically non-payment) and disruption for other reasons, however it is vital that such a distinction is made as Cessation in the case of the former should not be unduly delayed for obvious commercial reasons. We would therefore expect that the caveats would allow for disruption due to non-payment to receive different treatment to disruption for other reasons.

In the case of Cessation of service for individual consumers Meteor does not believe that the proposed conditions 18.4 or 18.5 are objectively justified. We therefore call for these conditions to be limited by term "Substantial Number of Consumers" as is the case with conditions 18.2 and 18.3.



**Q.1 Do you agree with the text of the conditions proposed for attachment to the General Authorisation? If not, please indicate which of the proposed conditions you do not agree with and why.**

ComReg has proposed a reduced number of new conditions for inclusion the General Authorisation which has aided clarity in Meteor's view however the revised conditions have given rise to a number of new concerns. Each of the proposed conditions has been reviewed in turn below.

***Proposed Condition 18.2***

***An Authorised Person shall notify the Commission in writing;***

***(i) immediately where it believes there is a reasonable probability of a Cessation of Service affecting a Substantial number of Consumers; or***

***(ii) upon, and at the same time that it takes any action (such as issuing a notice of termination of a contract) against another Authorised Person, if it is of the view, in relation to that Authorised Person, that there is a reasonable probability of any Cessation of Service affecting a Substantial number of Consumers as a consequence of that action; or***

***(iii) in any event no later than ten working days prior to the actual or anticipated Cessation of Service affecting a Substantial number of Consumers, save where action is urgently required to ensure network integrity or safety of life, such that notification to the Commission is not possible. In this situation the Authorised Person shall notify the Commission as soon as possible.***

Condition 18.2 while catering for urgent action does not provide for an involuntary cessation that is not the result of any action on the part of the Authorised Person. While Meteor might assume that similar obligations apply should this not be expressly stated in the condition.

With respect to condition 18.2 (i), Meteor recommends that there should be clear indication that the responsibility to inform ComReg lies with the Authorised Person whose customers will be affected. The proposed conditions contained in the initial consultation were clearer in this respect. This can be addressed through a minor amendment to the wording as follows (change underlined):

(i) immediately where it believes there is a reasonable probability of a Cessation of Service affecting a Substantial number of its Consumers

***18.3 Without prejudice to the provisions of Regulation 17(4) of the Universal Service Regulations, an Authorised Person shall notify its Consumers as soon as possible, in writing, in the event of a Termination affecting a Substantial number of Consumers. Without prejudice to the provisions of Regulation 17(4) of the Universal Service Regulations, an Authorised Person shall notify its Consumers immediately, in writing, where a final decision has been taken to implement a Cessation of Service affecting a Substantial number of Consumers.***

Meteor has identified two significant issues with the proposed condition 18.3; the requirement to notify customers immediately and the requirement to provide notification in writing.

The reference to Termination which carries with it a requirement to notify customers as soon as possible is ambiguous alongside the reference to Cessation which carries a more onerous requirement to notify immediately. This is because the proposed definition of Cessation encompasses a Termination event.

While the proposed wording follows the stated objective of distinguishing between permanent Cessations that are Terminations and those that involve merely a temporary Suspension or Restriction of service it is not clear why the latter should be subject to the more onerous obligation to notify customers immediately when the decision is reached. In Meteor's view such a condition is justified only in the case of an imminent, unplanned Suspension or Restriction of service. Under the proposed wording, the proposed condition fails to cater for a

Suspension or Restriction of services that is planned and scheduled in advance such as network maintenance. In the case of such planned outages, communications to customers may be managed on a scheduled basis and timed so as to best serve the affected customers. Meteor would therefore recommend that in the interest of clarity and consistency that ComReg should apply the same requirement, to notify Customers as soon as possible in both instances.

With regard to the requirement to inform customers in writing, in the case of prepaid unregistered customers the only written communication that can be provided to customers would be in the form of an SMS message. Communications via SMS are limited to 160 characters and therefore SMS may not be a suitable medium for such communications in all instances. Meteor recommends that a less prescriptive approach is taken here.

***18.4 Where the Commission forms the view that there is a reasonable probability of any Cessation of Service, the Authorised Person shall, upon request from the Commission, provide it with any information which the Commission considers necessary.***

Meteor welcomes the assurances provided by ComReg in response to concerns raised in the initial consultation about the proportionality of information requests from ComReg, however the framing of this condition in the context of the definitions provided by ComReg has given rise to a separate concern. The scope of conditions 18.2 and 18.3 have been clearly limited to circumstances involving a Substantial Number of Consumers, however condition 18.4 and indeed 18.5 have not been limited in this way. As a result their scope extends beyond major incidents, such as the one involving Smart Telecom in 2006 to far more insignificant incidents and even to the suspension of service to individual consumers due to non payment of bills. This is entirely contrary to assurances that the definitions would render clearer the scope of the proposed provisions and alleviate concerns relating to normal operational activities such as “cut-off for non-payment”. Meteor therefore urges ComReg to apply the criteria of affecting a Substantial Number of Consumers to each of the proposed conditions.

***18.5 An Authorised Person shall at all times use all reasonable endeavours to ensure the effect of any Cessation of Service is minimised. An Authorised Person shall use all reasonable endeavours to ensure the continuous provision of the Electronic Communications Network or the Electronic Communications Service, where practicable, taking proper account of the nature and extent of the Cessation of Service and the likely Consumer requirement for the Electronic Communications Network or the Electronic Communications Service to continue to be provided.***

In addition to the need for this condition to be limited in its application to incidents involving a Substantial Number of Consumers, Meteor believes that limitations to the obligations placed on wholesale providers should be reflected in this condition.

Consistent with Meteor’s response to the initial consultation, we are strongly of the view that the onus to avoid or minimise any negative impact on customers should be placed squarely on the Authorised Person providing the retail service to those customers. In order to create the appropriate incentives, ComReg should not be seen to be placing an undue burden on wholesale undertakings in order to ensure the continuous provision of service to retail consumers where service is in jeopardy due to a failure on the part of the retail provider. To do so would send out signals to less responsible undertakings that their obligations can be carried by their suppliers. This should be reflected in the wording of condition 18.5.

Furthermore, with respect to the degree of burden placed on a wholesale provider in such circumstances, while Meteor welcomes the assurance that ComReg has provided in paragraph 9.2.6 that it would be proportionate when enforcing this obligation, Meteor recommends that the this condition should reflect the short term nature of any such emergency provision.

**Q.2. Do you agree that the text of conditions 18.2-18.5 proposed for attachment to the General Authorisation can be classified as conditions providing for ‘Consumer protection rules specific to the electronic communications sector including conditions in conformity with the Universal Service Regulations’?**

Subject to the concerns raised with regard to some aspects of the text of the proposed conditions 18.2-18.5, Meteor agrees that the general thrust of the proposed conditions can be classified as providing for Consumer protection rules specific to the electronic communications sector including conditions in conformity with the Universal Service Regulations.

**Q.3 Do you agree that the text of the conditions proposed for attachment to the General Authorisation are objectively justified, nondiscriminatory, proportionate and transparent?**

Meteor does not consider condition 18.3 to be transparent. This is due to the ambiguity that has been highlighted in the response to question 1. Also Meteor does not consider the requirement to notify customers immediately in the case of a planned cessation or suspension of service to be proportionate as it does not allow for the practicalities of managing mass customer communications and situations where the relationship is more tenuous such as a prepaid customer relationship.

The proposed conditions 18.4 and 18.5 under their current wording the scope of which extends to Cessations of any kind, in Meteor’s view have not been objectively justified.

**Q.4 In your view do the conditions proposed for attachment to the General Authorisation constitute Specific Obligations, or conditions which are applicable to undertakings by virtue of other laws?**

Meteor believes that the revised set of conditions that have been proposed for attachment to the General Authorisation, do not constitute Specific Obligations.

**Q.5 Respondents are requested to provide views on whether the proposed specifications are proportionate and justified and offer views on other factors (if any) ComReg should consider in completing its Regulatory Impact Assessment.**

Meteor has provided its view on the proportionality and justification for the proposed conditions in response to question 3.

## **5 Vodafone**



**Vodafone Response to the ComReg Further Consultation on Amended Proposals to Attach New Conditions to the General Authorisation in relation to Electronic Communications**

## Introduction

Vodafone welcomes the opportunity to respond to this consultation on the proposal to attach amended conditions in relation to continuity of service to the General Authorisation. While there has only been a single major instance of disruptive cessation of service in the Irish communications market, unexpected non-transitory loss of service imposes significant costs upon, and seriously inconveniences, those customers of authorised communications operators that are affected. Proportionate regulatory measures that seek to minimise the probability of disruptive loss of communications service, and limit the impact of loss of service on consumers where it would occur, may therefore be justified.

Vodafone is in broad agreement with the amended conditions proposed to be attached to the General Authorisation and believes that, overall, they strike the right balance between the benefits to consumers and the costs to authorised operators of complying with the conditions. Our views in relation to all aspects of the proposed conditions are set out more fully in response to the consultation questions below.

## Response to Consultation Questions

**Q.1. Do you agree with the text of the conditions proposed for attachment to the General Authorisation ? If not, please indicate which of the proposed conditions you do not agree with and why.**

Vodafone considers that ComReg's amended proposals to attach new conditions to the General Authorisation are a substantial improvement on the original proposals as set out in ComReg document 07/45. We believe that the text of the proposed conditions could be further improved with some minor amendments, for example to condition 18.4 in respect of the provision of information to ComReg, and that the objectives of the proposed conditions can be met in most instances through the commercial incentives facing operators and the effective enforcement of other existing provisions such as the Universal Services and User's Rights Regulations. However Vodafone is in broad agreement with the text of the proposed amended conditions and considers that these will not impose significant costs on operators.

The withdrawal of the original proposal to include a condition requiring operators to have in place a 'Disruption Minimisation Plan' addresses Vodafone's principal concerns around the serious practical difficulties of implementing this condition. The withdrawal of the proposed Disruption Minimisation Plan proposal would also substantially reduce the costs for operators in complying with the proposed conditions in the General Authorisation and avoid unduly prescriptive regulation.

The proposed new definitions of the key terms 'Cessation of Service' and 'Substantial number of Consumers' provide the necessary level of clarity around the scope of the proposed regulations. Vodafone strongly agrees in principle with the quantitative materiality thresholds set out in the definition of 'Substantial number of Consumers' for both 'Suspension or Restriction' or 'Termination'. The inclusion of thresholds is consistent with the principle of proportionate regulation, however ComReg should clearly set out its reasoning for the specific customer number thresholds chosen to trigger the proposed notification requirements.

In our response to ComReg document 07/45 Vodafone recommended amendment of the proposed condition requiring provision of information by operators upon request by ComReg. We continue to believe that the relevant condition should be amended to the effect that the authorised operator should provide information to the regulator only where ComReg has objective grounds for believing that there is a reasonable probability of a cessation of service. It is not sufficient for ComReg to request information from authorised operators merely where it is of the view that there is a reasonable probability of cessation of service occurring. ComReg should have some objective basis for its opinion that potential cessation of service is probable prior to making information requests under this condition.

Vodafone believes that the proposed condition 18.5 set out in Appendix A of the consultation document is proportionate. The requirement for authorised operators to use all reasonable endeavours to minimise the impacts of service disruption and ensure continuous service provision will not impose a significant regulatory burden on operators such as Vodafone that, in the context of the existing commercial and reputational incentives to maintain continuity of service and minimise the impact of any cessation of service, already have comprehensive business continuity and disaster recovery plans in place. It is appropriate that any authorised operators that may not have plans in place should be required to develop these in light of the proposed obligation to use all reasonable endeavours to ensure continuity of service.

**Q2. Do you agree that the text of conditions 18.2-18.5 proposed for attachment to the General Authorisation can be classified as conditions providing for 'Consumer protection rules specific to the electronic communications sector including conditions in conformity with the Universal Service Regulations?**

Yes.

**Q3. Do you agree that the text of the conditions proposed for attachment to the General Authorisation are objectively justified, non-discriminatory, proportionate and transparent?**

Vodafone believes that the intended objectives of the proposed conditions to be added to the General Authorisation, the protection of consumers against unanticipated and costly loss of service, can be satisfied in most cases by the commercial incentives facing operators to ensure continuity of service and the effective enforcement of other existing provisions such as the Universal Services and User Rights Regulations. Vodafone accepts that, as indicated by the disruptive cessation of service by an authorised operator in 2006, these factors do not ensure that the possibility of such incidents occurring can be completely eliminated. As ComReg's amended proposals for the addition of conditions to the General Authorisation to address cessation of service issues would not impose a significant regulatory burden on authorised operators, and would provide benefits to consumers, Vodafone considers that they are both objectively justified and proportionate.

Vodafone agrees that the text of the conditions proposed for attachment to the General Authorisation is non-discriminatory as it would apply equally to all authorised operators. The text of

the proposed conditions is also transparent as it includes clear definitions of key terms used and also includes specific quantitative thresholds that would trigger notification requirements.

**Q4. In your view do the conditions proposed for attachment to the General Authorisation constitute Specific Obligations, or conditions which are applicable to undertakings by virtue of other laws?**

**Q5. Respondents are requested to provide views on whether the proposed specifications are proportionate and justified and offer views on other factors (if any) ComReg should consider in completing its Regulatory Impact Assessment.**

The withdrawal of the original proposal to include an onerous condition in the General Authorisation requiring authorised operators to prepare Disruption Minimisation Plans on particular terms set down by ComReg will substantially reduce the potential costs to operators while not in any way undermining the capacity of the remaining proposed conditions to achieve their intended objectives. Vodafone also accepts ComReg's position in paragraph 9.2.9 that many of the obligations will not be crystallised until such time as there is a reasonable probability of a Cessation of Service that relates to a substantial number of customers. The nature of the amended conditions is such that their costs are largely contingent on the emergence of a reasonable probability of Cessation of Service by an authorised operator. This takes account of Vodafone's point, as expressed in our response to consultation document 07/45, that the probability of occurrence of cessation of service must be considered in the Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA).

Vodafone agrees that the proposed conditions would provide benefits to consumers that would significantly exceed the low costs to authorised operators. We therefore believe that the amended proposals to attach conditions to the General Authorisation are both proportionate and justified.