

Comments:

At my place of work we have 2 Radio Mics that would be affected by these proposals however, due to the limited quantity that we have, I'm reliably informed that we aren't required to have a licence. It is only due to a meeting with another group who own a licence requiring number that I discovered about these proposals. What will happen with groups/institutions like ourselves who own 1 or 2 mics and have not been informed about this?

Question 1: Do you agree with our proposals for sufficient evidence that a rental company's operations are based on equipment hire as opposed to equipment use that requires a licence? If not, what would you suggest as alternative evidence?:

The ownership of a licence is surely all that is needed to entitle people to funding for re-setting the equipment - regardless of age!!

Question 2: Do you agree that users who have held a valid channel 69 licence at any time during the 12 months prior to 2 February 2009 and can justify why it lapsed should be eligible for funding, subject to the other conditions outlined above? If not, what other time period would you propose and why?:

What about the groups who don't require a licence due to owning only 1 or 2 mics....?

Question 3: Do you agree that equipment purchased by eligible PMSE users between 2 February and 30 June 2009 should be eligible for funding, subject to providing evidence of the compelling reasons for making the purchase? Is there other evidence we should consider acceptable?:

ALL channel 69 equipment should be eligible for funding it is not the fault of the purchaser that the bands are changing - so it is the responsibility to ensure that no owner of Channel 69 equipment is out-of-pocket due to this change of band...

Question 4: Do you agree with our proposal that channel 69 equipment purchased after 30 June 2009 should not be eligible for funding? If not, what are the circumstances in which you think such equipment should be eligible?:

ALL channel 69 equipment should be eligible for funding it is not the fault of the purchaser that the bands are changing - so it is the responsibility to ensure that no owner of Channel 69 equipment is out-of-pocket due to this change of band...

Question 5: Do you agree with our proposal to consider on a case by case basis representations from PMSE users of channels 31-37 and 61-68 who feel there are special circumstances that in their view may

entitle them to a different period of notice than others? If not, please state your reasons.:

ALL channel 69 equipment should be eligible for funding it is not the fault of the purchaser that the bands are changing - so it is the responsibility to ensure that no owner of Channel 69 equipment is out-of-pocket due to this change of band...

Question 6: Do you agree with our approach to calculating funding based on the residual value of the equipment for the period during which a PMSE user could reasonably have expected to have access to channel 69? If not, can you set out an alternative approach which meets the overall objective of promoting the efficient use of spectrum?:

NO. Not all equipment will experience the same use..... ALL channel 69 equipment should be eligible for funding it is not the fault of the purchaser that the bands are changing - so it is the responsibility to ensure that no owner of Channel 69 equipment is out-of-pocket due to this change of band...

Question 7: Do you agree with our assessment that PMSE users could reasonably have expected to have access to channel 69 until 2018, but not beyond this date? If not, what time period would you consider reasonable, and why? In this context, please note, the fact that some equipment may be expected to operate beyond 2018 is not, on its own, a sufficient reason to reconsider that date.:

Why change?? In the consultation document, which I've read several times, is there any strong argument presented for the change??

Question 8: Do you have receipts for your equipment? What else do you consider we should accept as evidence of the date and price of purchase and proof of ownership? :

The ownership of a licence is all that is required for funding! Even equipment without a licence should be eligible for funding. No owner should be out-of-pocket due to this action!

Question 9: Do you think we should make assumptions about the date of purchase of equipment for which there is no evidence? If so, what assumptions do you think we should make?:

No - it is not your right to make these decisions. If the equipment works, you fund the re-banding process.

Question 10: Do you agree with the factors we propose to consider when designing the methodology for determining the funding payable for each piece of eligible equipment? Are there any additional factors we should consider?:

No - it is not your right to make these decisions. If the equipment works, you fund the re-banding process.

Question 11: Do you agree with our proposal determine a set value and lifecycle for each equipment type, in the interests of simplifying the application and funding process? If not, what would you suggest? Do you think there is scope to group similar equipment into larger sub-groups to simplify the process?:

No - it is not your right to make these decisions. If the equipment works, you fund the re-banding process.

Question 12: Do you agree that a rate card approach would be a practical way of calculating the funding for each item of eligible equipment? If not, how do you consider the amount of funding for each item of equipment should be calculated?:

No - it is not your right to make these decisions. If the equipment works, you fund the re-banding process.

Question 13: Do you agree with our proposal not to distinguish between equipment by type of user? If not, what would be your preferred approach?:

No - it is not your right to make these decisions. If the equipment works, you fund the re-banding process.

Question 14: What type(s) of equipment do you own (e.g. wireless microphone, in-ear monitor) which uses channel 69? For each equipment type:(a)How many pieces of equipment do you own?(b) Can this equipment be modified (or re-tuned) to function in channel 38? If so, what would be the average cost of this modification? (c)What was the average purchase price (excluding VAT)? (d)on average, how many years would you normally keep this equipment in operation?(e)Does the useful life of equipment vary with the amount and method of use? If so, in what way?(f)What is the average age of the equipment?(g)Would you normally sell or dispose of the equipment at the end of its useful life? If sold, how much on average would you expect to receive for it? If disposed of, how would you normally dispose of it? How much does this disposal normally cost?:

I personally own an in-ear monitoring system - 2 channels - and work has 2 radio mics - who will pay to have this equipment, which is below the licence minimum, re-set??

Question 15: How would a decision to clear PMSE from channel 69 on 1 January 2012 affect you? What could we and the Government do to provide for an orderly migration in these circumstances?:

If funding was not provided I would either be several hundreds of pounds out-of-pocket, owning equipment that I could no longer use - or I'd be out-of-pocket since I'd have to pay to have them re-banded It should be OfCom's responsibility - not the equipment owner's - to pay for ALL channel change work.

Question 16: Do you believe we should facilitate early migration to channel 38 of those PMSE users for which this is convenient? If so, can you quantify the benefits? Would you take advantage of this option if it were available? :

No

Question 17: Do you agree with our proposal to allow each PMSE user to submit only one application for funding and to reserve the right to require the surrender of equipment for which funding has been received? If not, how do you suggest we ensure items are only claimed for on one occasion? :

No - the equipment is the property of the owner - the channel change MUST be funded - the owner should NOT be out-of-pocket - and it is up to the owner what is done with the equipment subsequently!

Question 18: What are your views on the three options for new licensing arrangements for channel 38 identified by JFMG? Do you prefer any different approaches?:

Appalling!

Question 19: Do you agree with our proposal to include frequencies from channels 39 and 40 in the shared licence arrangements for channel 38?:

if you must change, then I suppose so !