

Title:

Mr

Forename:

Christopher

Surname:

Holt

Representing:

Self

Organisation (if applicable):

Email:

What do you want Ofcom to keep confidential?:

Keep nothing confidential

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

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:

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

No. You state there are not enough frequencies to go round and therefore want to charge or in other words tax them. This premise is wrong as shown by IAOPA-Europe who have demonstrated there would be more than enough frequencies

available if the 27 frequency allocation offices in Europe were centralised. NATO has done this with its frequencies and solved the problem at a stroke.

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?:

You have totally ignored the fact that your proposals will reduce safety and markedly increase the risk of flying

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

YES

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?:

NO

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.:

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.:

Putting a charge in for something which is free now and which could lead to a potential reduction in safety is just daft and seems typical of Government and quangos in general. We are virtually still in a recession and taking money out of the economy to pay for something when it can be solved within europe at no additional cost is ridiculous.