



Which? Nuisance Telephone Misses the Point

The **fair telecoms campaign** is very sad to find that Which? is still trying to get people annoyed about nuisance calls, when what is needed is clear and effective action to stop them.

See [Giant 'nuisance' telephone lands at London Victoria](#) and [the Which? nuisance calls tool](#).

Anyone who does not want to stop nuisance calls is clearly missing the point. Providing Which? with more email addresses ([to use for 'solicited' marketing by default](#)), and adding to the massive number of unaddressed complaints held by Ofcom and the ICO, does not solve the problem.

We may feel better by pressing a button on a stage prop, or sending off an angry complaint, but the **fair telecoms campaign** wants to see the long overdue radical action that may help to limit the extent of the problem, where action could make a difference, rather than just feeling good.

It is well known that we are at serious difference with the government and Which? over this issue, because we propose the following actions:

- ft** **The Claims Management Regulator - Ministry of Justice** should change the rules applying to those authorised to handle PPI and personal injury claims, to prohibit use of the telephone as a means of unsolicited marketing.
- ft** **The "Green Deal" Regulator - DECC** should change the rules applying to those authorised to handle the various schemes, to prohibit use of the telephone as a means of unsolicited marketing.
- ft** **The FCA (Treasury)** should change the rules applying to those authorised to provide debt management services, to prohibit use of the telephone as a means of unsolicited marketing.
- ft** **Ofcom (DCMS)** should change the rules applying to the marketing of telecoms services, including call blockers, to prohibit use of the telephone as a means of unsolicited marketing.

These are all sectors where marketing activity (by both licensed companies and their agents) is subject to tight and effective regulation, that has a high rate of compliance.

All of these areas feature strongly in the list of the most complained about topics covered by nuisance calls - see [the ICO statistics](#).

By permitting use of the telephone in their area, regulators and the relevant government ministers must accept direct responsibility for every case where it is conducted inappropriately.

Wherever marketing activity is directly regulated, the relevant regulator must accept responsibility for the way in which it is conducted. If use of the telephone can be deemed to be in the public interest (by offsetting the public advantages with the nuisance caused) then it should continue to be permitted, with the ICO having to deal with cases of abuse.

We believe that the case to continue to permit telephone marketing, with consequential nuisance being inevitable, would not be found to be made in many cases.

EVERYBODY WANTS TO STOP NUISANCE - we may not want to sign up to a Which? mailing list.

Let Ministers and regulators get on with the job that they are there to do - or explain why not!

