

Title:

Forename:

Surname:

Withheld

Representing:

Self

Organisation (if applicable):

Email:

What do you want Ofcom to keep confidential?:

Keep name 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 - as VHF Aeronautical Frequencies are covered by International Agreement, and administered by the Directorate of Airspace Policy, Civil Aviation, Authority as the recognised UK representative of ICAO, OFCOM has no right to charge or interfere in any way, shape or form with the current system. In fact, OFCOM's proposal's for charging for these frequencies is nothing more than an attempt to derive a fraudulent

revenue from an item over which they actually have no rights over. Disbandment of OFCOM would be a better solution!

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?:

See answer to Question 1 - the only approach should be the abandonment of this proposal.

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

See answer to Question 1 - The proposed fees for ALL frequencies are completely insane and the proposals should be scrapped. Instigation of these fees will mean a reduction in all ATC services of any kind, leading to a reduction in safety and a risk to Human Life.

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

If Ofcom are intent on charging I would suggest a charge of £75 MAXIMUM for ALL frequencies is a more reasonable figure than some of the outlandish charges quoted.

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?:

This is just daylight robbery! We are meant to be encouraging the use of such technology for ATC purposes, not pricing it out of existence!.

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 consultation is inappropriate, from the lead in period to the amounts projected for charging. Scrapping OFCOM would be a more cost-effective measure.

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.:

The Aviation industry is a major employer that is suffering in the current recession, and is likely to do so for some time to come. Putting more expense on an industry which is already highly regulated and where margins are slim may just be the straw that breaks the camels back.

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.:

This assessment has been dreamed up by someone sat in an office with no grip on reality whatsoever. It is nothing more than OFCOM trying to justify their own existence and fund themselves from what they see as a "Golden Egg Laying Goose". There is NO conceivable benefit to the Aviation Industry, nor any other user from these proposed charges - it is just another, thinly disguised tax proposed by an organisation who are desperately trying to justify their own existence at the expense of others.

The proposal is nothing more than an attempt to defraud the Aviation industry, and those that fly, by an organisation that has obviously lost its way and has got ideas above its station.