## **Cover sheet for response to an Ofcom consultation**

BASIC DETAILS
Consultation title: Spectrum Pricing
To (Ofcom contact): Michael Richardson
Name of respondent: David Reid
Representing (self or organisation/s): Self
Address (if not received by email):
CONFIDENTIALITY
Please tick below what part of your response you consider is confidential, giving your reasons why  Nothing  Name/contact details/job title
Whole response Organisation
Part of the response
If you want part of your response, your name or your organisation not to be published, can Ofcom still publish a reference to the contents of your response (including, for any confidential parts, a general summary that does not disclose the specific information or enable you to be identified)?
DECLARATION
I confirm that the correspondence supplied with this cover sheet is a formal consultation response that Ofcom can publish. However, in supplying this response, I understand that Ofcom may need to publish all responses, including those which are marked as confidential, in order to meet legal obligations. If I have sent my response by email, Ofcom can disregard any standard e-mail text about not disclosing email contents and attachments.
Ofcom seeks to publish responses on receipt. If your response is non-confidential (in whole or in part), and you would prefer us to publish your response only once the consultation has ended, please tick here.
Name Signed (if hard copy)

11<sup>th</sup> March 2010

Sir.

I have recently read about the spectrum pricing proposals in the General Aviation (GA) press with considerable disguiet.

It appears that an initial consultation was carried out last year, about which I was completely unaware. As a significant stakeholder in the consultation process – holding both professional (ATPL(H)) and private (PPL(A)) licenses – I believe I should have received a notification of this consultation by Ofcom.

This could quite simply have been coordinated with the Civil Aviation Authority.

Both I, and all my fellow airspace users (including the general public on the ground) will face a very significant and inevitable threat to Flight Safety if spectrum pricing at this level is approved. There is no impact assessment on GA airfields, glider and microlight sites documented in the Helios report – why not? How can the report be considered complete without a common-sense approach which would include such operations?

Had the GA press not written about the forthcoming proposal, I could well have gone flying one day and found that the majority of GA radio-equipped airfields were either closed, or not answering their radio. I am quite sure that many, many GA airfield operators will be scrapping their radios for economic reasons, should this outrageous proposal be implemented.

I have read all 54 responses to consultation that are available on the consultation website to date. I suspect that the majority of respondents are as angry as I am about the 'consultation' and its Orwellian proposals for more stealth taxation of the Nation. A fully considered response would take me a very long time to write.

I therefore wish to add my name to the responses given by Denham and by Wellesbourne Mountford airfields, both of which present cogent argument, and both of which I fully support.

Yours faithfully, D Reid