

**Question 1: Do you agree with our proposal to permit the licence-exempt use of BMA devices in specific spectrum bands using UWB technology?:**

**Question 2: Do you agree with our proposal to exempt users of HDFSS operating with e.i.r.p. no greater than 50 dBW in the 27.50-27.8185 GHz, 28.4585-28.8265 GHz and 29.4625-30 GHz bands from the need to possess a WT licence?:**

**Question 3: Do you agree with our proposal to allow an increase in power for Meter Reading & Asset Tracking licence-exempt devices in the 169.4 - 169.475 MHz band to 500mW?:**

**Question 4: Do you have any comments on our proposals to align with the draft Commission Decision relating to SRDs?:**

I have no issue with the removal of legislative constraints on any community, by its nature legislation is often unnecessarily oppressive, wasteful, and meaningless. In the case of this proposal to remove the SRD "restriction on airborne use" I have to note that this is just a political precursor to a planned compulsory requirement for FLARM (or similar collision alert) equipment to be installed in general aviation. This is armchair PC gone mad, aircraft collision avoidance is maintained by "looking out", not by managing another cockpit gadget bleeping/flashing to no useful purpose most of the time. Of course after 99 false alarms a real alarm will be meaningless, but the armchair bureaucrat can sleep easy knowing the alarm was given (or not, if they follow my point). Is it "pilot error" to not make a special reaction to 1 alarm after 99 false alarms?

**Question 5: Do you have any comments on our proposal to simplify the LMSS equipment listings in the Exemption Regulations and IR2016?:**

**Additional comments:**