

**Title:**

Mr

**Forename:**

Gregory

**Surname:**

Moor

**Representing:**

Self

**Organisation (if applicable):**

**Email:**

**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:**

Ofcom was originally tasked with responsibilities to preside over the transition from a monopoly communications marketplace (BT) to one of competition.

While this may have been entirely appropriate in order to enable smaller communications companies to gain a foothold, Ofcom's attempt to apply similar principles to the Aviation VHF spectrum demonstrates a profound misunderstanding of the primary requirement for this band of frequencies.

What is being attempted is to open a Pandora's box which will lay Ofcom open to substantial claims in the event of accidents which are directly attributable to the changes that come about.

To allow market forces to play a part in the management of the aviation spectrum is completely illogical.

Furthermore the proposal turns the spectrum into a marketplace which will be presided over by a monopoly - Ofcom itself. Who is going to regulate the regulator?

This is an ill disguised proposal to raise tax revenue with lots of use of 'smoke and mirrors' to persuade people that safety has been properly considered. It hasn't - safety cannot be put in the hands of market forces and must be controlled by the organisation with the most relevant experience in the field of UK Aviation.

**Question 1: Do you consider that our proposed fee rates for licences in the aeronautical VHF frequencies are appropriate?:**

Absolutely not.

**Question 2: In devising our revised proposals, have we identified all of the aeronautical uses of VHF communications frequencies which require a distinct approach to fee setting, as set out in tables 5 and 6?:**

No aviation frequencies in use to aid the maintainance of the safety of aircraft, passengers and others should have fees (taxes) applied to them.

**Question 3: Do you agree with our proposal not to charge any fees for Fire assignments?:**

Yes

**Question 4: Do you agree with our proposal to set a £75 fee for licences in any of the sporting frequencies?:**

No.

Aviation for sporting purposes is still aviation and those involved still carry the same responsibilities for maintenance of the highest safety standards.

**Question 5: Do you agree with our proposal to set an annual fee of £19,800 per ACARS or VDL assignment, with no variation related to the number of transmitters?:**

No - see answer to 2. above.

**Question 6: Do you consider that our proposed approach to phasing in fees for use of the aeronautical VHF communications channels are appropriate? If there are particular reasons why you consider that any user or group of users would need longer phasing-in periods, please provide any supporting evidence for us to consider. Specifically, do you have any evidence for us to consider that would support either of Options 1 and 2 for the highest proposed fee in this sector?:**

Taxes/fees should not be applied at all.

**Question 7: Do you have any further quantified information to contribute to the analysis of financial impacts of the proposed fees on particular spectrum users, as set out in Annex 5? We would like to publish all responses, but will respect the confidentiality of any material which is clearly marked as such.:**

The proposals will add further financial challenges to small airfields and training schools. In some cases the extra financial burden will be significant. These schools are the start for many who later progress to fly in the airline industry. The proposal may well, over time, reduce the number of schools operating in this country, forcing a higher proportion of future generations of UK airline pilots to seek their training abroad.

Furthermore additional costs imposed for those who fly privately will reduce the numbers of those who take part. This in turn will reduce the income to the UK light aircraft industry. The outcome of that is a reduction in the tax revenue currently paid by that industry.

**Question 8: Do you consider that our assessment of the impacts of our proposals has taken full account of relevant factors? If you consider that there is additional evidence that would indicate particular impacts we should take into account, we would be grateful if you could provide this.:**

No - the suggestion that market forces can be used in this way shows a lack of understanding of how the management of the aviation radio spectrum has to be handled. It also indicates that little weight has been given to the implications that the imposition of these taxes carry.

This proposal is an attempt by Ofcom to actively increase its area of responsibility by creating a marketplace which effectively forces the trading of VHF frequencies.

Practically speaking it means that Ofcom will become a monopoly in a UK VHF marketplace that it created. As such it will have turned against the basic principles on which it (Ofcom) was founded.