## Individual – Anonymous submission

## **Representing:**

Self

What additional details do you want to keep confidential?:

Keep name 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

## **Additional comments:**

I see from your Annex 11 document that in Table 1 you specifically list Rowridge HP (Horizontally Polarised), but no mention is made of Rowridge VP (Vertically Polarised). Since DSO, I have spent money on having my aerial changed for a VP aerial to ensure I get the best possible reception. Is it the intention that, in order to receive the new muxes, I would then need to spend more money on having my aerial turned back to a horizontal position, and lose the signal strength on other muxes that I gained when I switched to VP? If I was to switch to HP then at what point should I switch back to VP, and who will pay for all this switching? It's not a trivial task to go on the roof and rotate a chimney-mounted aerial. Please confirm that you will be broadcasting these new muxes on VP. Might I suggest that if you can only broadcast on either HP or VP then it should be VP only. That way, you would be incentivising people to switch to VP at the same time as DVB-T2. Perhaps you could then switch off HP altogether after 2018.

Question 1: Do you agree with our proposal not to include Channel 36 in the spectrum to be awarded?:

Yes

Question 2: Do you agree that the 600 MHz band should be awarded as a single ?lot??:

Yes

Question 3: Do you agree that the licence should have an end date of 2026, with a minimum term until 31 December 2018 and a clause enabling it to be

revoked after that date, subject to at least 12 months notice having been given?:

Yes

Question 4: Do you agree with the proposed service obligations for the licence, including roll-out and coverage obligations to ensure 50% UK coverage (and a minimum 25% in each UK Nation)?:

Yes

Question 5: Do you agree with our proposals to apply a cost-based fee instead of AIP?:

Yes

Question 6: Do you have any other comments on the non-technical licence conditions that are being proposed?:

No

Question 7: Do you agree with the technical licence conditions we propose to include in the licence?:

Yes

Question 8: Do you agree with our proposal not to restrict any party from participating this award process?:

No - it should be closed to any party that intends to use it for subscription-based content or for home shopping channels. There is a shortage of spectrum for PSB HD content, so it needs to be protected. At the present time, the TV licence fee is being used to make content in HD that can only be broadcast in SD.

Question 9: Do you have any comments on the proposed award process in the case of a single compliant Notice of Intention to Apply?:

No

Question 10: Do you have any comments on the proposed award process in the case of more than one compliant Notice of Intention to Apply?:

Yes - please ensure that it is not delayed by any more than a few weeks, not months or years.