

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>In principle. However, the current rapid expansion within Cambridge, with the potential of surrounding villages becoming absorbed as the city expands, points to the need to be flexible when considering the coverage area and the 40% commercial mux restriction.</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>We continue to welcome the opportunity to assess the effect of implementing a horizontal component to the signal.</p> <p>We would also ask that consideration be given to remove the need for a critical mask filter, reviewed on a site by site basis.</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>We welcome the requirement to reserve capacity for C-DSP services. Referring to our response to Question 7, we would ask that C-DSP provision is reviewed on a case by case basis against the need for carriage of station located outside the small scale multiplex's area.</p> <p>We accept the need for small-scale multiplex operators to publish their rate card. Will the same requirement be made of the commercial multiplex operators?</p> <p>Similarly, whilst we understand the reasoning to declare our carriage fees for existing services to Ofcom, we would ask that these are kept confidential. Again, will a same requirement be made of the commercial multiplex operators?</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.</p>
<p>Question 5: Do you agree with our proposed approach for assessing the technical plans</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

<p>submitted in small-scale radio multiplex licence applications?</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.</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 multiplex service it plans to broadcast on? Please explain the reasons for your view.</p>	<p>The studio of the C-DSP licensee should be within the coverage area of a small-scale multiplex it broadcasts on. It should also be possible, at Ofcom's discretion, for the C-DSP licensee to utilize spare (or request additional) C-DSP capacity on other small-scale multiplexes (under a single C-DSP licence).</p> <p>In the case of Cambridge 105 Radio, we have recently been granted an FM coverage extension in Cambourne. This falls within the proposed polygon of another small-scale multiplex. It would be reasonable to also provide DAB service within this additional FM coverage area, utilizing C-DSP capacity on the appropriate small-scale multiplex.</p> <p>Furthermore, the city only coverage of the proposed Cambridge polygon means we would need to arrange carriage on the adjacent small-scale multiplexes in order to achieve coverage in the surrounding villages which is comparable to that of our existing FM reach.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>