

## **Comments:**

The government will make billions from this so users and owners of equipment should be compensated fully.

**Question 1: Do you agree with our proposals for sufficient evidence that a rental company's operations are based on equipment hire as opposed to equipment use that requires a licence? If not, what would you suggest as alternative evidence?:**

yes

**Question 2: Do you agree that users who have held a valid channel 69 licence at any time during the 12 months prior to 2 February 2009 and can justify why it lapsed should be eligible for funding, subject to the other conditions outlined above? If not, what other time period would you propose and why?:**

no - other people who joined the industry and bought equipment may have got licenced in June 2009 - why can't they be compensated too... period should be people licenced after publication of this report... NO NEW USERS WILL NOW LICENCE TO USE CHANNEL 69 EVER AGAIN...

**Question 3: Do you agree that equipment purchased by eligible PMSE users between 2 February and 30 June 2009 should be eligible for funding, subject to providing evidence of the compelling reasons for making the purchase? Is there other evidence we should consider acceptable?:**

No - still only channel 69 equipment available at the moment in this country - what happens if mine becomes faulty and i have to buy new.

**Question 4: Do you agree with our proposal that channel 69 equipment purchased after 30 June 2009 should not be eligible for funding? If not, what are the circumstances in which you think such equipment should be eligible?:**

no - faulty equipment needs replaced... still need to buy channel 69 until 2012

**Question 5: Do you agree with our proposal to consider on a case by case basis representations from PMSE users of channels 31-37 and 61-68 who feel there are special circumstances that in their view may entitle them to a different period of notice than others? If not, please state your reasons.:**

yes

**Question 6: Do you agree with our approach to calculating funding based on the residual value of the equipment for the period during which a PMSE user could reasonably have expected to have access to channel 69? If not, can you**

**set out an alternative approach which meets the overall objective of promoting the efficient use of spectrum?:**

no... this stinks... replacement cost for full value is essential otherwise people will be forced to get bank loans... my equipment was part of a redundancy package and is ten years old but works perfectly - it is insured for its full value - new for old replacement and that is what i would expect in 2012

**Question 7: Do you agree with our assessment that PMSE users could reasonably have expected to have access to channel 69 until 2018, but not beyond this date? If not, what time period would you consider reasonable, and why? In this context, please note, the fact that some equipment may be expected to operate beyond 2018 is not, on its own, a sufficient reason to reconsider that date.:**

no - channel 69 should be available for ever - has been for years so should not change - we all expected it to be channel 69 for many more years

**Question 8: Do you have receipts for your equipment? What else do you consider we should accept as evidence of the date and price of purchase and proof of ownership? :**

no receipts - my equipment came as part of a redundancy package from the company i once worked for.

**Question 9: Do you think we should make assumptions about the date of purchase of equipment for which where there is no evidence? If so, what assumptions do you think we should make?:**

no - should be direct equipment replacement... the government are going to generate billions so we user need compensated

**Question 10: Do you agree with the factors we propose to consider when designing the methodology for determining the funding payable for each piece of eligible equipment? Are there any additional factors we should consider?:**

no - direct replacement is essential or people will be forced into debt... televisiona nd film industry is hard enough without this happening

**Question 11: Do you agree with our proposal determine a set value and lifecycle for each equipment type, in the interests of simplifying the application and funding process? If not, what would you suggest? Do you think there is scope to group similar equipment into larger sub-groups to simplify the process?:**

no

**Question 12: Do you agree that a rate card approach would be a practical way of calculating the funding for each item of eligible equipment? If not, how do you consider the amount of funding for each item of equipment should be calculated?:**

no

**Question 13: Do you agree with our proposal not to distinguish between equipment by type of user? If not, what would be your preferred approach?:**

no - licenced and non licenced should be recompensed - many people are unaware they even need a licence

**Question 14: What type(s) of equipment do you own (e.g. wireless microphone, in-ear monitor) which uses channel 69? For each equipment type:(a)How many pieces of equipment do you own?(b) Can this equipment be modified (or re-tuned) to function in channel 38? If so, what would be the average cost of this modification? (c)What was the average purchase price (excluding VAT)? (d)on average, how many years would you normally keep this equipment in operation?(e)Does the useful life of equipment vary with the amount and method of use? If so, in what way?(f)What is the average age of the equipment?(g)Would you normally sell or dispose of the equipment at the end of its useful life? If sold, how much on average would you expect to receive for it? If disposed of, how would you normally dispose of it? How much does this disposal normally cost?:**

5 radio mic receivers. 5 radio mic transmitters - replacement value £10,000.. age 10 years but working as good as new as have had them serviced every second year... equipment lasts forever until new technology comes around... there is no end of useful life - it works 100% perfectly till it breaks and is then fixed - these never have no value...

**Question 15: How would a decision to clear PMSE from channel 69 on 1 January 2012 affect you? What could we and the Government do to provide for an orderly migration in these circumstances?:**

would put me out of business - 100% fact - on the dole... there is hardly any work in tv and film for sound recordists as it is, so hitting me with a £10,000 bill to replace my kit would mean i would join the dole queue

**Question 16: Do you believe we should facilitate early migration to channel 38 of those PMSE users for which this is convenient? If so, can you quantify the benefits? Would you take advantage of this option if it were available? :**

there are no benefits, no channel 38 equipment is available so this is nonsense

**Question 17: Do you agree with our proposal to allow each PMSE user to submit only one application for funding and to reserve the right to require the**

**surrender of equipment for which funding has been received? If not, how do you suggest we ensure items are only claimed for on one occasion? :**

channel 69 will still be useable with the equipment... all we do as users is increase the power of the unit from 10mw to a 100mw and the equipment will be strong enough to work on channel 69...

non licenced users need recompense too

**Question 18: What are your views on the three options for new licensing arrangements for channel 38 identified by JFMG? Do you prefer any different approaches?:**

people will not licence new equipment on channel 38.

**Question 19: Do you agree with our proposal to include frequencies from channels 39 and 40 in the shared licence arrangements for channel 38?:**

don't care