

Title:

Mr

Forename:

John

Surname:

Bowen

Representing:

Self

What additional details do you want to keep confidential?:

No

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

Additional comments:

Question 1: Do you agree with our assessment of the number of viewers that will need to retune?:

No idea but usually most people underestimate a potential problem when they want to change anything.

Question 2: Do you any comments on how viewers will find the retuning process and whether there are particular groups of viewers which will require greater consideration/assistance with the process? What help might they need?:

Depends on how radical the Retune is.

Question 3: Do you have any information to suggest that our estimate for the number of households that will need to replace their aerials should be different?:

No idea - more than likely "Infill Customers".

Question 4: Do you have any information relevant to our assessment of the average cost of an aerial replacement?:

I would have thought that was about right.

Question 5: Do you have any evidence as to what proportion of viewers may struggle to bear the cost of an aerial replacement?:

Most old Aerials will be designed and built for a given Band. The "gain" an Aerial of this style will be greater than the more modern "Wide Band Aerials". This loss of signal may well be made up for the increased power when the local TX went Digital.

Question 6: Do you have any information to suggest that our estimate of the number of viewers that may need to repoint their aerials should be different?:

No idea.

Question 7: Do you have any information relevant to our estimate of the cost of aerial repoints or platform changes?:

No idea.

Question 8: Do you have any evidence as to what proportion of viewers may struggle to bear the cost of an aerial repoint or platform change? :

It will be the disadvantaged and older Viewer who may have most problems.

Question 9: Are there any other matters the viewer support scheme should cover?:

One thing I thought of while tuning the TV Stations recently.

To give more "space" between the Cel-Net TXs and the new TV Bands why not get rid of the "Radio" component which is transmitted by the TV?

Unfortunately I cannot remember when the "Radio Stations" on the TV were introduced but I have an idea it was when TV went from VHF to UHF. UHF gave vast areas of spectrum and it was added as a fringe benefit.

To run a TV set to listen to Radio is plainly daft.

A Plasma Set will end up with "burn" on the display - any TV will use much more power than a radio even the latest DAB Set which is known to be power hungry.

In my mind a TV set displays TV programmes and a domestic Radio provides as it says.

I am getting more and more TV interference which I think could be from Cell-Net splatter without your latest ideas of upsetting the viewing public.

Question 10: Are there any other elements a viewer information campaign would need to include? Do you have any comments on or further evidence to inform the above estimates of the cost of providing information and advice to viewers? Please provide supporting evidence for any adjustments that you think may be relevant.:

No comment.

Question 11: Do you have any comments on information which is relevant to our assessment of the potential costs of administering a help scheme?:

No comment

Question 12: Do you have any evidence to further inform our assessment of the likelihood of viewers that suffer from un-related pre-existing reception problems erroneously making claims against a 700 MHz help scheme?:

No comment

Question 13: Do you have any additional information to further inform our cost estimates and assumptions of the effectiveness for the different triage methods? Are there any other triage methods which should be considered? Please provide supporting evidence for any adjustments you think may be relevant to our current estimates. :

No comment

Question 14: Have there been any developments since 2014 which would affect our estimate of the amount of equipment that PMSE users will need to replace as a result of 700 MHz clearance?:

No comment.

Question 15: Are you aware of any developments since the 2014 Statement that would affect our cost estimates?:

No comment

Question 16: Do you have any information or evidence of the likely unit cost of new equipment which operates in the 960-1164 MHz band?:

No comment

Question 17: Have we correctly identified the main categories of PMSE user that 700 MHz clearance will affect? If not, please provide examples of stakeholders which do not fit broadly into any of the groups mentioned.:

Nocomment

Question 18: Do you have any comments on our assessment of the proportion of equipment the different users types account for?:

No comment

Question 19: In addition to any information provided in response to the survey, do you have any other evidence as to how clearance may financially affect each of the different categories of PMSE equipment owner identified above?:

Possibly the Single Channel Radio Microphone user may be more at risk than a Multi-Channel user who could switch Channels to try and find a clear space in his location.