

Title:

Forename:

Surname:

Withheld

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

Additional comments:

AIP in aeronautical terms stands for Aeronautical Information Publication. In the UK AIP you will see that it is a condition of flight in controlled airspace that aircraft are RT equipped. This is an international requirement, not just something dreamt up in the UK. The overriding reason for this need is one of safety. I do not see how you can think taxing in this way, or charging if that is what you prefer to call it, will do anything but compromise safety somewhere, somehow. To dress up such a tax proposal in these terms, is nothing short of scandalous.

There is no demonstrated excess spectrum demand. Neither is there any point in

retaining a frequency if it is not needed. In the event of a frequency no longer being required, the UK cannot simply reassign it itself. The frequency must be returned to Europe for reallocation to prevent interference between stations. How then does your proposal benefit UK society if a UK tax merely places a financial burden upon people who will see no tangible return?

Most significantly, I have seen nothing in your consultation that addresses the potential detrimental effect on safety. However, if you think it is possible to abdicate this in favour of the regulatory body for aviation picking up the pieces left by your ill conceived interference, I think you are mistaken. The powers you possess cannot allow you dabble in areas that affect the safety and well being of others and be absolved of any consequences.

This is simply a proposal to raise revenue dressed up in a lot of jargon that is without solid foundation and should be dismissed as such. I sincerely hope very many people object in the strongest terms. All too often a proposal such as this becomes reality because ordinary people feel it is inevitable that their opinion will be dismissed.

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

No

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?:

N/A

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

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

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?:

No

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.:

I do not have access to information that would enable me to provide a meaningful analysis.

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