

Question 1: This executive summary sets out Ofcom's proposals for the release of the digital dividend. Do you agree with these proposals?:

We do not agree. We feel it is an irresponsible plan of action based on profit.

Question 2: Do you have any comments on our analysis of the essential constraints that will apply to the available UHF spectrum?:

I feel that there is an attempt to cloud the issue of not preserving the frequency bands used for wireless microphones, instruments links and in ear monitoring systems. My response for the above band is one relating to the use of expensive equipment which the proposals may render useless.

Question 3: Do you agree with the more detailed analysis and proposals regarding these technical constraints as set out in Annex 10?:

There should be no change to the present access to those frequencies detailed in the last answer.

Question 4:Do you have any comments on Ofcom?s assessment of the potential uses of this spectrum? Are there any potential uses which should be considered that are not mentioned in this document?..

These questions like all consultation questions nowadays are constructed to provide answers that the consultation provider wishes to hear. OFCOM should assess the present users and damage to them should the frequency bands be altered in accessibility in any way.

Question 5:Do you have any comments on our analysis of the choice between a market-led and an interventionist approach to the release of this spectrum? Do you agree with the analysis of different mechanisms for intervening to remedy potential market failures?..

Answers regarding the analysis to not confront the issue to which we are presenting our views. When thousands of people throughout the United Kingdom spend millions of pounds purchasing equipment for use in their occupations and hobbies, the impact of not continuing to provide the same waveband service for the use of this equipment would be catastrophic. The analogy would be like selling cars with diesel engines and then for the petrol industry to withdraw diesel sales at the pumps.

Question 6:Do you agree with our proposals to continue making available channel 69 for use by low power PMSE devices? Do you agree with our proposal to make some or all of the spectrum available for use on a licence-exempt basis?..

Part of the cost of the above mentioned equipment was to ensure that there was a licence for its use on those frequencies. To deregulate some of that spectrum is irresponsible.

Question 7:Do you agree that there should be transitional protection for professional PMSE users to ensure that they can continue to access interleaved capacity until at least the end of 2012? Do you have any views on the mechanism for providing future access to this spectrum?..

If this consultation is just a paper exercise and will not be considered in the decision making,(as are most consultations) then all present users should be protected to ensure that they can continue to use their own equipment without any modification.

Question 8:Do you consider that additional spectrum from the digital dividend should be reserved for low power applications? If so, please provide as much evidence as possible about the nature of the application and its potential value to society..

This implies having to purchase new equipment to replace existing fully functional systems. This is not acceptable.

Question 9:Do you consider that it would be desirable to hold back some spectrum from award with a view to its potential use for future innovation? If so, please provide comments on how much spectrum should be held back, and for how long.:

If there are parts of the spectrum not being used for a purpose now, then it would make sense to hold some back for future innovation.

Question 10:Do you agree with our proposal that we should package the interleaved spectrum in a way that would be suitable for use by local television services, but not reserve spectrum solely for this use?..:

From my other answers, the preservation of the continued use by existing equipment owners on all the frequencies used is of paramount importance.

Question 11:Do you agree with our proposal to package the spectrum in a way which does not preclude mobile broadband use, but to take no further action in relation to this use?..:

AS above.

Question 12:Do you agree with our proposal that we should not intervene in the award of this spectrum to reserve spectrum for DTT? Do you agree that we should package the spectrum in a way which is suitable for DTT use?..:

as above

Question 13:Do you consider that we have included in our analysis the most material risks in relation to market failure?..:

as above

Question 14:Do you agree with our proposal to auction licences for the use of the available UHF spectrum?..:

Strongly disagree

Question 15:Do you agree with Ofcom's proposals as to the timing of any auction? If not, what alternative proposal would you make and why, and what evidence and analysis can you provide in support of your alternative proposal?..:

If present equipment has a working life then at least ten years before the interference of UHF spectrum should be strongly advised.

Question 16:Do you have any views on which of the packaging options identified for the cleared spectrum would be most suitable?..:

See answer to question 4

Question 17:Do you have any views on which of the packaging options identified for the interleaved spectrum would be most suitable?..:

see above

Question 18:Do you have any views on which of the auction design options would be most suitable?..:

Disagree with action for at least ten years

Question 19:Do you agree with Ofcom?s proposals for the non-technical terms of the licences to be awarded for use of the UHF spectrum?..:

see above

Question 20:Do you agree with the analysis of the options as set out in this Impact Assessment?..:

I think this consultation document should have had a section where one could read all the matters, for which these questions have been constructed, thus making it a fair and unbiased one.

Additional comments:

Consider the thousands of people who have spent millions of pounds to use equipment who will now have that right jeopardised. Is it morally right to create that situation?