

Title:

Mr

Forename:

Benjamin

Surname:

Ayalon

Representing:

Self

Organisation (if applicable):

Email:

What do you want Ofcom to keep confidential?:

Keep part of the response confidential

If you want part of your response kept confidential, which parts?:

My email address please.

Ofcom may publish a response summary:

Yes

I confirm that I have read the declaration:

Yes

Ofcom should only publish this response after the consultation has ended:

You may publish my response on receipt

Additional comments:

"Why we are making these proposals

1.4 Spectrum is a finite resource, in that the use of spectrum for one purpose denies its availability to other users. Demand can sometimes exceed supply. AIP is intended to

apply market disciplines to the holding and use of spectrum rights, by prompting users to consider their spectrum needs in light of the AIP fees payable. AIP is already paid by most private sector users of spectrum, except where upfront payments have been set at auction. Many public sector users, including the emergency services and the Ministry of Defence, also pay AIP"

Rubbish!. All you want is to introduce another tax. The aviation spectrum is guarded and protected by international treaties, you can't offer it to any other user other than an aviation user. As all commercial airports have their own frequencies they are unlikely to apply for new/more frequencies, after all why should they pay more? I also can't see any new airports being built by the government, therefore the end result will be with you having many unused frequencies as many small General Aviation airfields will not be able to pay while we, the general aviation hobby pilots will have to suffer reduced safety and increased level of accidents because of your greediness.

"Safety regulation

1.25 We recognise the critical importance of safety in the aeronautical sector and, in that context"

No, you don't. All you want is MONEY! If you have cared about our safety you would not come up with this idea.

The spectrum is already managed by CAA and they already perform the balancing act that is required to minimise interference and to ensure frequencies are allocated to those who NEED them rather than to the highest bidder which is what you are going to do.

Question 1: Do you consider that our proposed fee rates for licences in the aeronautical VHF frequencies are appropriate?:

No, not at all. Radio is for safety and you will put people lives at risk.

Question 2: In devising our revised proposals, have we identified all of the aeronautical uses of VHF communications frequencies which require a distinct approach to fee setting, as set out in tables 5 and 6?:

No fee should be paid for safety.

Question 3: Do you agree with our proposal not to charge any fees for Fire assignments?:

Yes, but is it because you can't justify to the public tax on safety but think that you will manage to do it via the back door because people do not understand aviation?

Question 4: Do you agree with our proposal to set a £75 fee for licences in any of the sporting frequencies?:

No.

Question 5: Do you agree with our proposal to set an annual fee of £19,800 per ACARS or VDL assignment, with no variation related to the number of transmitters?:

No.

Question 6: Do you consider that our proposed approach to phasing in fees for use of the aeronautical VHF communications channels are appropriate? If there are particular reasons why you consider that any user or group of users would need longer phasing-in periods, please provide any supporting evidence for us to consider. Specifically, do you have any evidence for us to consider that would support either of Options 1 and 2 for the highest proposed fee in this sector?:

The whole idea should be dropped. You put people life at risk.

Question 7: Do you have any further quantified information to contribute to the analysis of financial impacts of the proposed fees on particular spectrum users, as set out in Annex 5? We would like to publish all responses, but will respect the confidentiality of any material which is clearly marked as such.:

Airfields will not be able to cover this charges and will drop the use of radio, as a result our safety will be harmed.

Question 8: Do you consider that our assessment of the impacts of our proposals has taken full account of relevant factors? If you consider that there is additional evidence that would indicate particular impacts we should take into account, we would be grateful if you could provide this.:

No. You are just looking to charge more money to the tax payer, you don't care about anything else.