

Title:

Mr

Forename:

Keith

Surname:

Jillings

Representing:

Self

Organisation (if applicable):

Email:

keithj@spamcop.net

What do you want Ofcom to keep confidential?:

Keep nothing 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:

Yes

Additional comments:

The way OFCOM has floated again these absurd proposals - which were proven to be inappropriate the last time they were raised - reminds me of the worst excesses of the "democratic process" of Soviet Russia: "Just keep putting it up for approval again and again until the opposition tires and we can get it through."

There should have been a 25-year moratorium imposed when it was thrown out last time. Or did OFCOM just "withdraw" it when they saw it was about to be thrown out.

If you have conveniently lost my long, carefully analysed critique of the previous proposal, let me know and I will send you a copy.

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

No. They are totally and utterly inappropriate, and a cynical abuse of Government authority to "tax" essential safety.

OFCOM made an abortive attempt to introduce these entirely inappropriate charges some time ago, and was rebuffed. That should have been sufficient to indicate the mind of the electorate and those who "own" this country.

The proposal entirely disregards international spectrum allocations and safety principles. It makes the UK a laughing stock.

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?:

You jest, surely?

Question 3: Do you agree with our proposal not to charge any fees for Fire assignments?:

I agree with the proposal not to charge any fees AT ALL.

Question 4: Do you agree with our proposal to set a £75 fee for licences in any of the sporting frequencies?:

No. The fee should be ZERO.

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. The fee should be ZERO.

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. There should be no fees. End of discussion.

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.:

The fees will mean that essential Air/Ground, Flight Information and other services will cease to operate. This will result in deaths.

It is not possible to "quantify" deaths that have not yet happened, but I trust that the names of those OFCOM officials who support these ludicrous charges will be made available so that they can be named and shamed when individuals are killed through the absence of the necessary air safety radio communications.

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. You have ignored the objections that were raised the last time this absurd proposal was raised.

If you have "lost" your copy of my analysis and objections from that "consultation", let me know and I will send you a copy.