

**Title:**

Mr

**Forename:**

Steve

**Surname:**

Mitchell

**Representing:**

Organisation

**Organisation (if applicable):**

NATS

**Email:**

steve.mitchell@nats.co.uk

**What do you want Ofcom to keep confidential?:**

Keep nothing confidential

**If you want part of your response kept confidential, which parts?:**

**Ofcom may publish a response summary:**

Yes

**I confirm that I have read the declaration:**

Yes

**Ofcom should only publish this response after the consultation has ended:**

You may publish my response on receipt

**Additional comments:**

**Question 1: Do you agree with our proposed core principles of setting AIP?  
Are there additional matters that it would be helpful to clarify? :**

As stated by NATS in previous Ofcom consultations, we do not agree with the principle of AIP being applied to spectrum used by aviation. NATS does however pay AIP fees for non-aeronautical mobile and fixed link systems and the proposed principles for setting AIP would appear to be appropriate for those types of service.

**Question 2: Do you agree that we should charge cost-based fees where AIP is not appropriate or AIP would not cover our costs? How do you think we should set cost-based fees in future fee reviews? Are there particular factors you think we should take into account, for specific licences fees or cost-based fees in general? :**

Yes cost-based fees should be used where AIP is not appropriate or AIP would not cover Ofcom's costs. The fees would need to take into account everything associated with a particular sector but should as a minimum consider the cost of assigning frequencies, the cost of spectrum management including international representation and cost of rectifying interference that might occur to that sector.

**Question 3: Do you agree with our proposed fee-setting methodology principles (set out below)? Are there additional matters that it would be helpful to clarify?:**

The proposed fee-setting methodology appears a sensible approach.

**Question 4: Do you agree with our proposal to move away from regular full-scale reviews to reviewing in response to evidence, as set out in Option 5?:**

Yes, regular full-scale reviews are very time consuming and will not achieve anything if the market values or Ofcom costs are fairly static. We would agree that Option 5 appears to set out a good balance of achieving the desired results and stakeholders stability in terms of costs and investment decisions by allowing a minimum term before any review takes place.

**Question 5: Do you agree with our process for assessing the priority of future fee reviews? Are there other sources of evidence of misalignment between fees and spectrum value or spectrum management costs that you can think of, and what weight should we give them?:**

The process outlined for assessing the priority of future fee reviews appears to be a valid approach.

**Question 6: Based on our proposed criteria, or other criteria you would propose we use, what do you think our priorities for future fee reviews should be? Please tell us your reasons for thinking these should be prioritised. Do you agree that we should prioritise a fixed link fee, as some stakeholders have suggested to us? :**

We have no views what Ofcom's priorities should be with regards to future fee reviews but given the information presented in the consultation document concerning lack of geographic variation for fixed links fees this sector would seem a candidate for review.

**Question 7: Do you agree with our proposed approach to post-review evaluations? :**

We fully concur with the statement in 5.31 of the consultation document that "When we make regulatory decisions we should, as a matter of good practice, evaluate their effects to assess whether they had the effect intended." The proposed approach to post review evaluations seems to be a sensible one.