

Title:

Mr

Forename:

richard

Surname:

knight

Representing:

Self

Organisation (if applicable):

member of Chilbolton Flying Club

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. I consider that the proposed increases are punitive and are designed only to raise revenue. They will result in a marked decline in the safe operation of both private and

commercial air traffic as many present operators will be unable to afford them and will cease to operate a radio service.

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, the proposal has many flaws. End users have not been identified.

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

Not applicable to light aviation?

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

No. Overpricing will result in users going underground.

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 comment

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?:

Phasing-in of fees which will eventually reach an unaffordable level is no more than a 'fudge' or 'smokescreen' and doesn't answer the problem of fees set too high.

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.:

Airfield revenues are in decline due to the present financial situation. Safety is paramount. Airfields WILL reduce the service they offer to survive. Overpricing reduces capacity and therefore safety.

The rest of Europe isn't suggesting such a stupid proposal.

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.:

Not at all. Such a stupid proposal really requires the resignation of the perpetrator and changes of management at the highest levels.