

Title:

Mr

Forename:

Adrian

Surname:

Parsons

Representing:

Self

Organisation (if applicable):

private

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?:

e-mail address

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. Aside from the fact that it is protected under international treaty, The proposed charges are merely an ignorance of the reason for their existence, and bowing down to commercial - i.e. profit making limited company bullying. Squeezing existing safety users out frequency use will, I repeat will create safety problems, leading perhaps to the loss of one or more lives. Reducing the profits of multinational broadcasters will not.

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?:

I am not an expert in this area.
I hope so.

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

Absolutely

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?:

I do not think that any fees are appropriate.

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 addition of cost will squeeze out smaller users, who simply cannot afford them and their profit business model just cannot stretch. The thought of safety margins being reduced worries me. I live near an airfield and the prospect of uncontrolled anarchy and possibly collision following the reduction in the service does bother me. We are not talking about charging the rich and the famous money they already have, or large corporations who have the profit capacity to spare, but small business communities and individuals working to provide a service to the aviation industry. The people who will benefit are the shareholders of the large communications firms, not the general public.

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 - as above. I am not a politician, nor a clever writer, merely a UK resident / taxpayer hoping that the independent regulator will be just that and not be bullied / persuaded by the wheels of commerce.

It might not be a very good example but would you like to pay for roads where there are traffic lights fitted, or worse not be allowed to see the traffic lights if you didn't pay an additional motoring tax, whilst still sharing the road with others who could.