

Your response

Question	Your response
<p>Question 1: (section 3) Do you have any further comments on the approach we are minded to take to authorising the 40 GHz band?</p>	<p><i>No Comments</i> <i>CBNG is not working on 40GHz solutions</i></p>
<p>Question 2: (section 5) Do you agree with the method that we have outlined in annex 16 for identifying which licences authorising the use of fixed links around high density areas will be subject to revocation on the basis that the authorised links would be likely to suffer interference from new users in the high density areas? If not, please give reasons.</p>	<p><i>Is this response confidential? – N</i> Agree</p>
<p>Question 3: (section 7) Do you agree that the licence fee for fixed links that we allow to remain in the 40 GHz band should be the same as the fee in place for the 26 GHz band? If not, please give reasons.</p>	<p><i>Is this response confidential? – N</i> No Comments</p>
<p>Question 4: (section 9) Do you have any comments on the proposed rules of our auction?</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p>Question 5: (section 9) Do you have an interest in bidding for specific high density areas in this award? If so, please provide evidence that you have a credible intention to do so.</p>	<p><i>Is this response confidential? – N</i> CBNG has no interest in bidding</p>
<p>Question 6: (section 9) Do you consider it appropriate to have one or two 26 GHz lot categories?</p>	<p><i>Is this response confidential? – N</i> No comments.</p>
<p>Question 7: (section 10) Do you agree with our proposed approach to coordinating Shared Access users in the 26 GHz band? If not, please give reasons.</p>	<p><i>Is this response confidential? – N</i> No comments</p>
<p>Question 8: (section 10) Do you agree it would be appropriate to coordinate Shared Access users in the 40 GHz band in a similar way to the 26 GHz band if we make it available in 5 years time (noting we would consult on the detail of this coordination). If not, please give reasons.</p>	<p>No Comments <i>CBNG is not working on 40GHz solutions</i></p>

<p>Question 9: (section 10) Which of the proposed options for coordinating award winners and existing licensees during the (5-year) revocation period do you think would be most appropriate? Do you think alternative approaches to coordination would be more appropriate?</p>	<p>No Comments</p>
<p>Question 10: (section 10) Do you agree with our proposal to protect the radio astronomy site at Cambridge (42.5-43.5 GHz) from new mobile users using the 40.5-43.5 GHz band using technical assignment coordination? If not, please give reasons.</p>	<p>No Comments <i>CBNG is not working on 40GHz solutions</i></p>
<p>Question 11: (section 10) Do you agree with our proposed approach to coordinating at the boundary of high and low density areas? If not, please give reasons.</p>	<p>No Comments</p>
<p>Question 12: (section 10) Do you agree with our proposed approach to international coordination? If not, please give reasons.</p>	<p><i>Is this response confidential? – N</i> Yes agree the approach to international coordination</p>
<p>Question 13: (section 11) Do you agree with the non-technical conditions that we propose to include in the award licences to be issued following the award of the 26 GHz and 40 GHz bands? If not, please give reasons.</p>	<p><i>Is this response confidential? – N</i> No comments</p>
<p>Question 14: (section 12) Do you have any comments on our proposal to award fixed term licences with a 15 year term?</p>	<p><i>Is this response confidential? – N</i> No comments</p>
<p>Question 15: (section 13) Do you agree with the proposed technical licence conditions for award licences and local access licences in the 26 GHz and 40 GHz bands? If not, please give reasons.</p>	<p><i>Is this response confidential? – N</i> We agree</p>
<p>Question 16: (section 13) Do you have any comments on our proposed licence conditions relating to antenna elevation?</p>	<p><i>Is this response confidential? – N</i> No comments</p>
<p>Question 17: (section 14) Do you agree with our proposal to make available channel sizes of 50 MHz, 100 MHz, 200 MHz, 400 MHz and 800 MHz? If not, please give reasons.</p>	<p><i>Is this response confidential? – N</i> We agree on the proposal for channel sizes.</p>

<p>Question 18: (section 14) Do you have any further comments on the proposal to limit low power outdoor deployments in 24.45-25.05 GHz to three base stations in any 300km² area in order to comply with the EESS protection requirements?</p>	<p><i>Is this response confidential? –N</i></p> <p>This seems to be a sensible approach</p>
<p>Question 19: (section 14) Do you have any further comments on the proposed level of fees for the Shared Access licences in the 26 GHz and 40 GHz bands?</p>	<p><i>Is this response confidential? – N</i></p> <p>No Comments</p>
<p>Question 20: (section 14) Do you have any further comments on the proposed extension of the Shared Access licensing framework (including its standard non-technical licence conditions) to the 26 GHz and 40 GHz bands?</p>	<p><i>Is this response confidential? –N</i></p> <p>No Comments</p>

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