

**Title:**

Mr

**Forename:**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Surname:**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Representing:**

Self

**Organisation (if applicable):**

**Email:**

**What do you want Ofcom 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

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

You may publish my response on receipt

**Your comments:**

May I ask that capture to an electronic store and regular analysis of interference investigations be put in place?

Determining if the device producing interference is \*faulty\* would be useful to aid analysis of further cases. Repairing 'non-faulty' interfering devices could then fall under closer security in terms of their CE marking and the testing conducted for their CE mark.

This would certainly help drive down costs by:-

1. Allowing the investigation team to spot trends in repeat offenders - in terms of manufacturers or notified bodies repeatedly involved in placing interfering devices in the public domain.
2. Spotting repeat offenders also allows the escalation to BIS or those responsible for the CE mark to take action.
3. Any Notified Body that fails to properly recognise \*multiple\* devices as interfering in their testing can be investigated by the relevant department.

This extra data efficiently gathered and analysed and reacted to will allow faulty devices to be stopped at point of entry rather than after they are widely distributed; forcing the manufacturers to incur the cost rather than repeatedly generating cost of investigations to be incurred by Ofcom.