

Additional comments:

Question 1: Do you agree that clearing DTT from channels 61 and 62 and PMSE from channel 69 to align the upper band of cleared spectrum in the UK with the emerging digital dividend in other European countries is likely to further the interests of citizens and consumers to the greatest extent?:

Question 2: Do you agree that the proposed DTT migration criteria are proportionate and appropriate? If not, please explain why and clearly identify any other criteria you believe should be adopted and why.:

Question 3: Do you have views on the options identified and our assessment of them? Do you believe there are other, superior options, and, if so, why? Do you agree that the hybrid option is most consistent with the DTT migration criteria?:

Question 4: Do you have views on the implementation-timing options identified and our assessment of them? Do you agree that DSO-integrated implementation is most consistent with the DTT migration criteria? If not, why not?:

Question 5: Do you agree that a programme-control and -governance arrangement such as that outlined above is appropriate?:

Question 6: Do you agree that the four cost categories adequately capture the costs associated with clearing DTT from channels 61 and 62? Are there any costs that do not appear to have been accounted for in any of these categories?:

Question 7: Do you agree that our cost profile is a reasonable basis for planning the capital expenditure for clearing DTT from channels 61 and 62?:

Question 8: Do you agree that these are the most appropriate criteria to assess which spectrum is the best alternative to channel 69 for PMSE?:

Question 9: Do you agree with our technical and coverage analysis of the possible alternatives to channel 69 for PMSE?:

Question 10: Do you agree with our economic assessment of the realistic alternatives to channel 69 for PMSE?:

The assumption that all radio microphones have the 'typical' 10-year life-expectancy is fundamentally flawed. It is simplistic in the extreme. This may be realistic for 'heavy', professional users of such equipment but is totally unrealistic for 'light'

users. I have a set of VHF radio-transmitters and receivers (fortunately, not subject to change) which are 20 years old, perfectly functional, extremely useful and, I hope, fit for at least another 20 years. I have a set of UHF, channel 69 transmitters, which cost around £6,000 which are now 6 years old and would, therefore be subject to minimal compensation at the likely switch-over time. Like my VHF units, they are used only 2 or 3 times a year and are still worth their purchase price to me.

The full cost of modification of all existing, functional transmitters and receivers affected by the channel change, must be borne by OFCOM. Any other solution is unjust. Alternatively, for equipment that cannot be modified, the 'residual equivalent value of existing equipment' needs to be assessed by a completely independent panel and paid in full.

The environmental impact of the mass disposal of perfectly serviceable equipment to land-fill sites should be considered.

Question 11: Do you agree that channel 38 is the best alternative to channel 69 for PMSE?:

Question 12: Do you agree that we should award channel 38 to the band manager on the same terms as would have applied to channel 69?:

Question 13: Do you agree with our proposal to maintain PMSE access to channel 36 on 12 months' notice to cease and to the rest of the cleared spectrum (channels 31-35, 37 and 61-69) until DSO is completed in the UK in late 2012?:

Question 14: Do you agree with our approach to determining eligibility for, and our assessment of the level of, funding to move PMSE from channel 69?:

Question 15: Do you agree that three years is long enough for PMSE to move from channel 69?:

Question 16: Do you agree that with our analysis of the key impacts of our policy options? Are there any other key impacts we should assess?:

The assumption that all radio microphones have the 'typical' 10-year life-expectancy is fundamentally flawed. It is simplistic in the extreme. This may be realistic for 'heavy', professional users of such equipment but is totally unrealistic for 'light' users. I have a set of VHF radio-transmitters and receivers (fortunately, not subject to change) which are 20 years old, perfectly functional, extremely useful and, I hope, fit for at least another 20 years. I have a set of UHF, channel 69 transmitters, which cost around £6,000 which are now 6 years old and would, therefore be subject to minimal compensation at the likely switch-over time. Like my VHF units, they are used only 2 or 3 times a year and are still worth their purchase price to me.

The full cost of modification of all existing, functional transmitters and receivers

affected by the channel change, must be borne by OFCOM. Any other solution is unjust. Alternatively, for equipment that cannot be modified, the 'residual equivalent value of existing equipment' needs to be assessed by a completely independent panel and paid in full.

The environmental impact of the mass disposal of perfectly serviceable equipment to land-fill sites should be considered.