

Your response

| Question | Your response |
|--|--|
| <p>Question 1: (Section 2) Do you have any comments on our assessment of potential use cases, demand and deployment strategies for new uses of mmWave spectrum?</p> | <p><i>Is this response confidential? –No</i></p> <p><i>As a Rural/suburban WISP we would like greater access to mmWave Frequencies to increase subscriber speed for PTP and PTMP applications</i></p> |
| <p>Question 2: (Section 2) Do you have any comments on our proposed overall approach to mmWave spectrum (including our aim to make the 26 GHz and 40 GHz bands available for new uses on the same or similar timeframe)?</p> | <p><i>Is this response confidential? –No</i></p> |
| <p>Question 3: (Section 3) Do you agree with our approach of specifying high and low density areas in the UK, and authorising new uses differently in those areas?</p> | <p><i>Is this response confidential? –No</i></p> <p><i>Yes, lighter rules/costs for rural areas will help companies such as ours bring gigabit service to underserved areas quickly and cheaply</i></p> |
| <p>Question 4: (Section 3) Do you agree with our overall authorisation approach in high density areas for the 26 GHz band (i.e. to grant Shared Access licences on a first come, first served basis for the bottom 850 MHz of the 26 GHz band, (24.25-25.1 GHz), and to auction citywide licences for the rest of the 26 GHz band (25.1-27.5 GHz))?</p> | <p><i>Is this response confidential? –No</i></p> <p><i>No strong opinion one way or the other</i></p> |
| <p>Question 5: (Section 3) Do you agree with our overall authorisation approach in low density areas for the 26 GHz band (i.e. to grant Shared Access licences on a first come, first served basis)?</p> | <p><i>Is this response confidential? –No</i></p> <p><i>Yes, small operators need a fair crack at the whip for access to these bands. Simply auctioning off to MNOs significantly harms the WISP industry</i></p> |
| <p>Question 6: (Section 3) Do you agree with adopting a similar approach to authorising the 40 GHz band as our proposals for the 26 GHz band, if we were to decide to re-allocate the 40 GHz band?</p> | <p><i>Is this response confidential? –No</i></p> <p><i>Yes</i></p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Question 7: (Section 4) Do you agree with our proposed methodology for identifying and defining high density areas?</p> | <p><i>Is this response confidential? –No</i></p> <p>No opinion at this stage</p> |
| <p>Question 8: (Section 4) Do you agree with our proposed cut-off point of 40 high density areas?</p> | <p><i>Is this response confidential? –No</i></p> <p>No opinion at this stage</p> |
| <p>Question 9: (Section 5) Do you agree with our proposal to clear the fixed links in and around high density areas from the 26 GHz band?</p> | <p><i>Is this response confidential? –No</i></p> <p><i>Not entirely</i></p> |
| <p>Question 10: (Section 5, Annex 8) Do you agree with our estimates of the cost of migrating fixed links into alternative spectrum bands?</p> | <p><i>Is this response confidential? –No</i></p> <p>No opinion at this stage</p> |
| <p>Question 11: (Section 6) Do you agree with the proposed approaches we have outlined to manage coexistence between new 5G users and the different existing users in the 26 GHz band? In particular, do you have any views on our proposals to limit future satellite earth stations in this band to low density areas only, and to end access to this band for PMSE users with five years’ notice?</p> | <p><i>Is this response confidential? –No</i></p> <p>No opinion at this stage – does not impact my industry</p> |
| <p>Question 12:(Section 7) Do you agree with our initial assessment on which option for enabling the 40 GHz band for new uses would best achieve our objectives?</p> | <p><i>Is this response confidential? –No</i></p> <p><i>Yes, if managed correctly and not simply auctioned at a national level reducing the ability for smaller operators to compete</i></p> |
| <p>Question 13: (Section 7, Annex 8) Do you agree with our analysis of the impact on existing 40 GHz licensees, including our estimates of the cost of moving fixed links under the options involving revocation (options 2, 3 and 4)?</p> | <p><i>Is this response confidential? –No</i></p> <p>No opinion at this stage</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Question 14: (Section 8) Do you have any comments on our high-level Shared Access proposals (including technical and non-technical licence conditions and proposed approach to setting fees)?</p> | <p><i>Is this response confidential? –No</i></p> <p><i>I'd like to see provision put in place for higher power PTP links in the 26 and 40GHz bands providing the links are registered and the antenna beam pattern is known to avoid potential interference.</i></p> |
| <p>Question 15: (Section 8) Do you agree with the overall approach we have set out to coordination and coexistence between new Shared Access users in the 26 GHz band and existing users?</p> | <p><i>Is this response confidential? –No</i></p> <p><i>Overall, yes but some tweak to help small rural operators would be welcomed</i></p> |
| <p>Question 16: (Section 9) Do you have any comments on our initial thinking in relation to auction design?</p> | <p><i>Is this response confidential? –No</i></p> <p>No opinion at this stage</p> |
| <p>Question 17: (Section 10) Do you have any comments on the licence duration options we have considered in this section for new licences for the 26 GHz and 40 GHz bands that we would auction?</p> | <p><i>Is this response confidential? –No</i></p> <p>No opinion at this stage</p> |
| <p>Question 18: (Section 11) Do you agree with our assessment of potential competition concerns and that it may be appropriate to impose a competition measure such as a 'precautionary cap'?</p> | <p><i>Is this response confidential? –No</i></p> <p>No opinion at this stage</p> |

Please complete this form in full and return to mmwave.allocation@ofcom.org.uk