

Your response

Question	Your response
<p>Question 1: Do you agree with the planning principles and methodologies that we will use in our work to refine the coverage area plan for small-scale DAB?</p>	<p>Yes. The chosen methodology provides a fair means to identify the target areas along with the associated adult populations.</p>
<p>Question 2: Do you agree with our proposed approach to the required technical licence conditions for small-scale radio multiplex services, and the proposed amendments to the Digital Radio Technical Code?</p>	<p>No, the proposal to exclude MPEG1 layer 2 will disadvantage listeners using older DAB radios from the small-scale service. Ultimately, it should be down to the service provider to use MPEG1 layer 2 or HE AAC v2 (or both) with a preference for migrating the audience to DAB+ only.</p>
<p>Question 3: Do you agree with Ofcom's proposed approach to setting the level of reserved capacity for C-DSP services on small-scale radio multiplex services?</p>	<p>No. As the community sector is of a different size in each polygon, it seems inappropriate to have a fixed number of slots. We believe that it would be better to be able to flex the number to meet the local requests.</p>
<p>Question 4: Do you agree with the factors we are proposing to take into account of in deciding the order and timescale in which Ofcom will advertise small-scale radio multiplex licences?</p>	<p>Yes, we welcome the fact that Ofcom has prioritised the licensing of small-scale DAB services ahead of further local multiplex licensing. We hope that this may be reasonably interpreted as early licensing in each of the 4 nations and particularly within Northern Ireland as it did not have the benefit of a trial multiplex.</p>
<p>Question 5: Do you agree with our proposed approach for assessing the technical plans submitted in small-scale radio multiplex licence applications?</p>	<p>Yes, this appears to be a logical method. We also would like to support the statement "is an extremely important part of the application". In addition, the use of local knowledge and experience is a valuable asset to the process.</p>
<p>Question 6: Do you agree with our proposed approach for assessing the ability of applicants to establish their proposed small-scale radio multiplex service?</p>	<p>Yes, but this should be "sector neutral" in that applications may or may not be associated with existing community services, thus opening the door to entrants with the necessary skills.</p>
<p>Question 7: Should Ofcom require that the studio of a C-DSP licensee be located within the coverage area of the small-scale radio</p>	<p>Yes, this is an important requirement, as the ethos of community radio is to provide social gain through access and service to a defined community.</p>

multiplex service it plans to broadcast on? Please explain the reasons for your view.	Equally, it should not be possible for a community licensee to become a large local or even regional service through carriage in a number of polygons.
Question 8: We propose that holders of corresponding analogue community radio and DSP licences apportion their income equally across their licences, unless there are compelling reasons why a different apportionment is reasonable. Do you agree with our suggested approach?	Yes. It is vital that the income model is transparent.
Question 9: Do you agree with our proposal that a prospective C-DSP service provider will be able to apply for a C-DSP licence once we have invited applications for the small-scale radio multiplex licence upon which their proposed C-DSP service is intended to be provided?	Yes, this is a perfectly logical approach.