

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.</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 Should allow for DAB & DAB+ as is the case with large multiplex operators until 99% of listening is DAB+</p> <p>It is discriminatory that we should be subject to this restriction when the large Mux operators are not.</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</p> <p>It should be 3 C-DSP licences in addition to the number of FM Community Operators in the Mux area.</p> <p>Existing Community Radio Stations must be absolutely guaranteed carriage on the local Mux and at a guaranteed minimal fee not to exceed £600 per annum carriage fee whether they opt for DSP or C-DSP licenses.</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>No.</p> <p>We think that areas that were excluded entirely from the trials (and subsequent extensions) such as Northern Ireland should be a priority.</p> <p>We absolutely oppose not prioritising areas where there is capacity on the existing large DAB multiplex. This excess capacity is because of the exorbitant costs of carriage and profiteering by Mux Operators which have actively excluded potential participation by Community Radio stations and small commercial operators. To deprioritise these areas would be to reward the profiteers of the nations spectrum.</p>

Question 5: Do you agree with our proposed approach for assessing the technical plans submitted in small-scale radio multiplex licence applications?

Yes, we agree with Ofcom's proposed approach.

Question 6: Do you agree with our proposed approach for assessing the ability of applicants to establish their proposed small-scale radio multiplex service?

No
Clear emphasis needs to be given to applicants whose participants include the local FM community radio service who already have demonstrable experience of delivering a successful radio service in the locality proposed. This indicates real-world experience of implementing or commissioning transmission services and of negotiating site access arrangements with relevant local site owners. This criterion should also take into additional account the opportunities for co-locating with existing FM services.

In making an award decision Ofcom must also balance responses on this criterion and the technical plan (Criterion 1) with responses to the 3 other criteria listed. In particular, the third criterion (ownership or participation in the applicant by a potential or actual C-DSP licensee) should carry equal weighting in an award decision alongside each of the other criteria.

We believe that Ofcom should establish a minimum threshold at which Criterion 1 and 2 are deemed met.

Once met, the emphasis should be exclusively on the other 3.

We feel that Ofcom must place particular emphasis and preference upon applications which adopt a not-for-profit model and where possible that applications involving FM Community Radio stations should be favoured or Community/Local Commercial FM partnerships.

We also believe that there absolutely needs to be price controls when it comes to Community Radio Stations accessing a Mux. Simply requiring operators to publish prices will have zero impact given that the Mux operator will likely have a monopoly in that area. Also, applicants should be bound by any price indications given in their application for the whole term of their Mux licence so that they

	<p>cannot suggest one thing in an application but once a licence is awarded then hike the prices up.</p> <p>In terms of price controls, a Community Radio Station currently pays £600 per annum for a Broadcasting Act licence, we believe that access to the Mux for licenced community radio stations should be capped at £300 (half the BA act fee). It is clear that the cost of operating a Mux is likely to be less than £10k so to allow higher fees would be to grant licenses “to print money”.</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>No.</p> <p>The holder of a C-DSP licence may wish to broadcast on more than 1 multiplex. For example, a community service in Portadown may want to also broadcast on the multiplex covering Belfast on the basis of the large number of residents in Portadown (many 000’s) who commute each day to work in Belfast so almost half their potential listening-time availability is in Belfast rather than Newry. Such a condition could lead to the Newry station having to have studios in multiple locations.</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>No.</p> <p>It should be a matter for licence holders to determine as is currently the case in apportioning the value of income to be applied to analogue output, webstream output and production fees.</p> <p>If Ofcom does proceed with applying the 50:50 apportionment then the £15,000 current exemption which applies to analogue Community Radio Licences should be replicated so that if a station is on both FM and SSDAB then the combined exemption would rise to £30,000.</p> <p>Will C-DSP licence holders be eligible for the Community Radio Fund. If so will this be distinct from any application that was made by the FM Community Radio Licence holder. Has this been considered???</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</p>	<p>Yes & No</p> <p>There needs to be protections that commercial operators would not apply for and be granted multiple C-DSP licences (disguised as other</p>

radio multiplex licence upon which their proposed C-DSP service is intended to be provided?

corporate entities) which they could then use to fill the reserved C-DSP channels as a blocking mechanism to prevent valid existing community radio stations who obtain a C-DSP licence from accessing the multiplex.

We believe that Ofcom need to give further consideration to this whole area to ensure that existing analogue community radio stations are not priced out of SSDAB or blocked by channels being filled to prevent community radio stations participating. We believe that Ofcom needs to discuss this extensively with representative organisations such as the Community Media Association and Media Ireland to ensure safeguards are put in place to prevent such an occurrence and we further believe that Ofcom needs to have some method of appeal or arbitration process to address this and guarantee access for existing FM Community Radio operators.

Finally, we congratulate Ofcom on the positive and constructive approach that Ofcom has adopted in recognising that SSDAB is there to facilitate Community Radio and very small Local Commercial Stations to gain access to the DAB medium. We hope that their approach will continue to focus on this and not be a money-making exercise for others. We believe that we and Ofcom share this objective, it is a matter for how we work together to achieve this within the confines of the legislation.