From:

Sent: 06 March 2024 14:27

To: Consentorpay

Subject: Clarification on the Equivalence Point

External: This email originated outside the ICO.

Dear ICO

Here, you say that *Equivalence* is a factor to be taken into account in assessing whether 'consent or pay' will constitute valid consent. You elaborate on this by saying:

Are the ad-funded service and the paid-for service basically the same? For example, if a service provider offers a choice between personalised ads and a 'premium' ad-free service that bundles lots of other additional extras together, then this wouldn't be the case.

However, unlike with the other factors (power balance; appropriate fee; and privacy by design) you do not explain the link between this and consent, i.e.

- Is the ICO's view that the services each need to be equivalent for consent to be valid? I assume so but that's not clear.
- If so, why does a differing service (to use the example given by the ICO, the paid for service having more
 features) have a bearing on the validity of the consent (i.e. how does it affect the choice that users have in
 relation to the free service).

Kind regards

Lewis Silkin LLP | Ideas. People. Possibilities. | www.lewissilkin.com

This email is sent on behalf of Lewis Silkin LLP. Lewis Silkin LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC317120. We are authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority and a list of members is available for inspection at our registered office, Arbor, 255 Blackfriars Road, London, SE1 9AX. Any reference to a partner in relation to Lewis Silkin LLP is to a member of Lewis Silkin LLP, or to an employee or consultant with equivalent qualifications and standing. This email is confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, do not copy or disclose its content, but please contact the sender immediately.