

The recent notion that radio bandwidth is a tradable resource has yielded great short term benefits to the treasury but will only be reflected in the longer term costs as the competing companies seek to recover the "windfall tax".

Explicit claims of higher quality pictures are always made for digital communications which leads to periods of disappointment when heavily compressed digital signals fall way below the presentation standards of a good analogue system. I have had to complain to our local cable supplier

(NTL) on many occasions when the compression ratio is set so high that you could well believe a football or rugby match was being played on a lake of pea soup. With larger screens the demands to reduce 'artefacts' increase.

Explicit in the governments push towards digital television is the reward of better picture quality (even though the fact and effect of the doubling of the digital transmitter power on analogue switch off is rarely referenced).

Implicit should be that we are moving towards a new and improved level of broadcasting i.e. a system capable of providing a wide choice of the highest quality HDTV channels (1080p) with low compression. I believe the public will feel betrayed should the cost and inconvenience of this upgrade were to result in nothing more than convention digital standards.

Further it is vital that the gateways to high performance television are not left to be dominated by one dominant supplier i.e. Sky.