

The 111 Contact Code Cross-Submission from the Internet Service Providers Association of New Zealand (ISPANZ)

7th August 2020

ISPANZ provided you with our Position Paper on the draft 111 Contact Code on 11th January 2020. We cannot identify this amongst the documents available on your website, so we are attaching it to this document for your ease of reference.

ISPANZ has considerable sympathy with WISPA NZ's submission of 13th June 2020, however we believe that Spark's measured submission addresses most of the points raised by WISPA. We also support New Zealand Technology Group's submission of 22nd May 2020, particularly where they discuss the costs of providing services to remote customers and the unintended consequences for service pricing that this may have.

In general ISPANZ agrees with Spark's submission of 17th July 2020. In particular we strongly support the following Spark statements:

- It will be important to be very clear in any messaging about who would be considered a vulnerable consumer, making it very clear that anyone with an existing mobile phone would not be eligible.
- The group of consumers who qualify as vulnerable should be limited to those who have medical issues or a threat of harm (such as a court protection order). Accreditation should be limited to professionals who

can make an expert judgment on whether an individual meets the criteria. We therefore suggest the list is limited to medical professionals, social services, justices of the peace and the police only.

- The draft application form focusses on Limb 2, but should also include Limb 3. For Limb 3, the consumer will need to declare they have no appropriate means to contact 111 emergency service in the event of a power failure, and the accrediting person will simply confirm the consumer has made this statement.
- If a business has a voice line that it is sharing with a vulnerable consumer who lives at the same premise then the onus should be on the business, not the RSP, to make sure the vulnerable consumer has an appropriate backup solution in place, or purchase a retail line for the vulnerable consumer.
- The choice of solution provided at no cost to an individual should be decided by the RSP. An RSP may choose to provide a basic mobile handset to a customer providing they have adequate mobile coverage to make a voice call to 111 at their premise. The test for whether a mobile solution is suitable should be whether the device has at least the same level of usability as a copper connected DECT phone in the premise.
- 12 hour battery backup is an unnecessary and disproportionate requirement and would require very large and expensive devices. We expect the size will put consumers off and lead to lower take-up. We suggest 2 hours would be a more appropriate requirement.
- RSPs should be responsible for backing up their own equipment (eg their RGWs) and Chorus/the LFCs should be responsible for backing up their ONT. Being responsible means providing the backup equipment,

managing the equipment during its life cycle and covering all the costs associated with the device.

- As noted above, we expect the vast majority of vulnerable consumers can be served with a mobile device. Chorus and the LFCs should only be required to provide a battery backup when there are no other solutions for the customer.
- Whichever solution an RSP chooses, we agree it only needs to provide a single connection into the premise.
- The requirements to keep records for 5 years is excessive, especially for such sensitive information and the fact that we are required to check in with the customer each year anyway. We suggest records need only be kept for 2 years. It is certainly not appropriate to retain data for the entire time the customer is with the retail provider plus an additional 5 years.

In summary, ISPANZ believes that the current draft code contains many deficiencies and, as it is currently worded, would impose a significant burden on RSPs, particularly smaller ones. We believe that these deficiencies can be largely corrected if Spark's suggestions are adopted.

Because of the extensive nature of the amendments required it would be best if an updated draft were re-circulated for comment.

Best Regards,

David Haynes

Chief Executive

Internet Service Providers Association of New Zealand

+64 21 756601



INTERNET SERVICE PROVIDERS
ASSOCIATION OF NEW ZEALAND