

Your response

Question	Your response
<p>Question 1: Do you have comments on the overall approach to the review?</p>	<p>Yes. Your review appears only to consider the interests of the industry and it ignores important matters of public concern.</p>
<p>Question 2: Have we captured the major trends that are likely to impact spectrum management over the next ten years?</p>	<p>No. You have ignored all environmental, public safety, or civil liberties issues. You appear only to promote the interests of investors at the public expense.</p>
<p>Question 3: Could any of the future technologies we have identified in Annex 6, or any others, have disruptive implications for how spectrum is managed in the future? When might those implications emerge?</p>	<p>Yes. Implications are emerging already, as OfCom is well aware. Opposition to 5G and indeed to all mobile data technology is growing, and unless these genuine concerns are actually addressed openly and publicly, OfCom will lose any credibility as a public regulator.</p>
<p>Question 4: Do you agree that there is likely to be greater demand for local access to spectrum in the future? Do you agree with our proposal to consider further options for localised spectrum access when authorising new access to spectrum?</p>	<p>Not known. We need properly conducted independent research on safety. Otherwise public support or demand for all these services will simply evaporate.</p>
<p>Question 5: Do you agree with the actual and perceived barriers identified for innovation in new wireless technologies, and our proposed ways of tackling those?</p>	<p>No. The barriers in reality are those of public support and confidence. Dismissing concerns as 'conspiracy theories' or whatever will prove counter-productive. New technologies have to be sold to the public by reference to benefits. Selling through fear cannot succeed in the long term. Companies that use this technology to automate jobs and services, impoverish the public and destroy the economy will find they very soon have no customers.</p>
<p>Question 6: Do you agree with Ofcom's proposals to improve our outreach and</p>	<p>Communication is unsatisfactory. The public need far better and more complete information</p>

<p>reporting activities, and spectrum information tools?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there additional ways that Ofcom could better engage with existing and future users and providers of wireless communications? • Please explain any specific areas where you believe more or better provision of information could provide value to stakeholders 	<p>, presented by means of the mainstream media including social media. The public are all 'stakeholders'. As is the environment. Public concerns about health risks, safety, implications for civil liberties, and a complete lack of any environmental assessment must be properly addressed if OfCom is to retain any confidence as a regulator. OfCom must be seen to act in the public interest, not solely on behalf of investors.</p>
<p>Question 7: Do you agree that it is important to make more spectrum available for innovation before its long-term use is certain? Do you have any comments about our proposed approach to doing this?</p>	<p>No I fundamentally disagree. The precautionary principle is essential. Many technologies have been recklessly misused, causing immense suffering and environmental destruction. A proper risk assessment is required.</p>
<p>Question 8: Do you agree that it is important to encourage spectrum users to be 'good neighbours' to ensure more efficient use of the spectrum? Do you agree with our proposals to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> increase realism in coexistence analysis at a national and international level? encourage spectrum users to be more resilient to interference? ensure an efficient balance between the level of interference protection given to one service and the flexibility for others to transmit? <p>Do you have any comments on which of these will be the most important?</p>	<p>'good neighbours' applies not only to other spectrum users but to the wider public. The erection of masts without due planning process, the refusal to address legitimate public safety and / or environmental concerns, pushing ahead regardless and shutting down any critical voice by means of silly 'conspiracy theories' is utterly unacceptable. The public must have a right to have no spectrum at all if they so wish.</p> <p>In terms of commercial competition, as with the railways, competing networks are inefficient and wasteful. OfCom should create a single national network, in public ownership and then licence providers to compete in offering services.</p>
<p>Question 9: Are there any other issues or potential future challenges that should be considered as part of this strategy?</p>	<p>I remain extremely concerned at OfCom's complete refusal to address any environmental or public safety concerns at any stage. This is utterly unacceptable. There is also growing public concern over the growing threat to civil liberties posed by this technology.</p> <p>The ICNIRP does not command the confidence of the wider public and it does not address any environmental concerns.</p> <p>OfCom must address these issues as a matter of urgency..</p>

Question 10: Do you agree that continued use of our existing spectrum management tools (as set out in sections 4-7) will be relevant and important for promoting our objectives in the future, in light of future trends?	I cannot comment on this.
Question 11: Is there anything else we should be considering doing, or doing differently, to promote our objectives?	You need to change your objectives and work for the public interest rather than private investors.