

Title:

Mr

Forename:

Alan

Surname:

McIvor

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:

Cutting through the Chaff, the proposals are totally at odds of with the principal of the ITU treaty and its obligation. Ofcom being an agency of the government clearly is seeking to raise revenue for a service already funded."Cost opportunity" equals an avenue to raise funds.The CAA position would be totally undermined by these proposals.Interesting that in (1:31) it is put forward that a "beneficial impact on the economy as this value of this spectrum is recognised by decision makers"who might

they be?and how will it be of benefit to the nation when the AAIB investigations increase.

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

Not in the least

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, you have identified a sure route to encourage current users to switch off and compromise safety.

The current licence fee is appropriate and fair.

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

Rightly so, the residents of this part of our planet already fund this

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?:

As above 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.:

I would put it to you that the financial impact of fees proposed will be dwarfed by the burden on the other agency providers clearing up the mid air collisions.

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