

Title:

Mr

Forename:

Henri

Surname:

Reinbolt

Name and title under which you would like this response to appear:

Nomad Forum response

Representing:

Organisation

Organisation (if applicable):

Nomad Forum

Email:

henri.reinbolt@greenwich.gov.uk

What do you want Ofcom to keep confidential?:

Keep nothing confidential

If you want part of your response kept confidential, which parts?:

Ofcom may publish a response summary:

Yes

I confirm that I have read the declaration:

Yes

Ofcom should only publish this response after the consultation has ended:

You may publish my response on receipt

Question 1: Do you agree with these proposals for the awards of the three bands or have any other comments on the contents of this document?:

The Forum supports the principles and approach stated in Section 6. The Forum wishes nonetheless to reiterate the need for the design of the award to take into account the wider public outcomes, and thus the interests of citizens and of the non-defence public sector.

The authors of this response believe that the UK public sector, as a user, should endorse and take advantage of the opportunities open by the Regulator's strategy as defined in the Spectrum Framework Review (SFR). Availability of a national public sector license would free up unlicensed spectrum for community use across the country, while enabling large-scale growth in the use of the most recent wireless standards and technologies for critical services such as those carrying sensitive data. Spectrum would be made available through the process of auction, with the auction design acknowledging the value which can be quantified of a national public sector license for transformation, efficiency and social cohesion.

Question 2: Do you agree with the analysis in section 5 or have any comments on adjacent interference issues?:

Nomad has not carried out a detailed assessment of the analysis undertaken by Ofcom and their consultants, however the general approach seems valid.

Plots in Ofcom's technical assessment document are useful, however Nomad would like to see the results available in more detail, for example in a raster format, to help assess the impact on specific regions and local authorities or partners.

Question 3: Do you agree that Ofcom should authorise use of the spectrum bands 2500-2690 MHz, 2010-2025 MHz and 2290-2300 MHz?:

Yes, the Forum supports the objective of most effective use of spectrum for the benefits of citizens and consumers.

Question 4: Do you agree that awarding licences by auction would be the appropriate mechanism for authorising use of the spectrum bands 2500-2690 MHz, 2010-2025 MHz and 2290-2300 MHz?:

Yes, in principle. The auction design should ensure that:

?Small lots (say 10MHz) bidders are not excluded (in the context of UK-wide licensing)

?The long term public interest in TDD based services (and thus access to unpaired channels) are not ignored (subject to EU decisions)

?An important caveat is for the specific requirements of the London Olympic and Paralympic Games in 2012 to be fully taken into account in the award, inclusive of legacy considerations.

Question 5: Do you agree that it is likely to be in the interests of citizens and consumers to proceed with the award of the 2.6 GHz and 2010 MHz bands as soon as practicable, rather than to delay the award pending reduction in uncertainty relating to other bands?:

Yes in principle

Question 6: Do you agree Ofcom should aim to award the bands 2500-2690 MHz, 2010-2025 MHz and 2290-2302 MHz by the end of 2007, while keeping the position on the 2.6 GHz and 2010 MHz bands under review in the light of possible developments in

European regulatory fora?:

Yes, awards should proceed provided Ofcom judges the chances of a conflict with an RSC decision to be very small. Ofcom should publish its prediction of RSC's decision at the most appropriate time before the auction process begins.

Question 7: Do you agree with Ofcom's proposals for licence conditions (technology neutrality, tradability, conditions of tenure and absence of roll-out obligations)?:

In principle yes. The Forum wishes nonetheless to point out the risk to citizens' interest and public outcomes should the auction lead to a national license awarded over multiple lots to an aggregator or consortium unwilling to roll out in geographical areas of potential low commercial returns (rural areas or some economically disadvantaged urban communities) in the absence of real competition (see response to Q 8).

Question 8: Do you have views on whether or not there should be a 'safeguard' cap on the amount of spectrum that any one bidder could win in an award for the 2.6 GHz bands and, if so, do you have a view on whether 90 MHz would be an appropriate size for a safeguard cap?:

Yes, a cap is required to promote competition and innovation [see para 2.12]
90 MHz is however too high a cap; we suggest 30 MHz (over the 2.6 GHz band) as this would result in more competition and innovation

Question 9: Do you agree with Ofcom's proposal to package spectrum as lots of 2 x 5 MHz for paired use and 5 MHz lots for unpaired spectrum and to allow the aggregation of lots by bidders? :

Yes

Question 10: Do you agree with Ofcom's proposed approach to allowing the respective amounts of paired to unpaired spectrum for the band 2500-2690 MHz to be varied (maintaining the 120 MHz duplex spacing and allowing additional unpaired spectrum, if needed, at the top end of the band)? :

Yes

Question 11: Do you agree with Ofcom's proposals for a 5 MHz restricted block between FDD and TDD neighbours and between TDD and TDD neighbours and with a modified out-of-band base station mask for second adjacent 5 MHz blocks? :

Yes

Question 12: Do you agree with Ofcom's proposals to award the 2010 MHz band as a single 15 MHz lot?:

Yes

Question 13: Do you agree with Ofcom's proposals to award the 2290 MHz band as a single 10 MHz lot?:

Yes [noted the consideration of a future award in 2300-2310 MHz at paragraph 7.88]

Question 14: Do you agree with Ofcom's proposals to combine the award of the 2.6 GHz and 2010 MHz bands and to hold the award of the 2290 MHz band separately and in advance?:

No, 2.6 and 2010 bands are not similar enough to be awarded together; awarding them together would reduce the ability for new operators to bid for the less valuable 2010 spectrum; we suggest that the 2.6 band should be awarded first, followed by the 2010 band

?Nomad agrees that the 2290 band should be awarded separately, however awarding it before the 2.6 band makes it very difficult for new operators to bid for the 2290 band; the 2290 band should therefore be awarded after the 2.6 and 2010 awards

Question 15: Do you agree with Ofcom's proposals for a two-stage auction design for the 2.6 GHz and 2010 MHz bands?:

Yes but see answer to Q 14

Question 16: Do you agree with Ofcom proposals to award the 2290 MHz band through a second price sealed bid auction?:

Yes

Question 17: Do you have a preference for either of the two approaches to specifying technical licence conditions? :

We would prefer masks as these are easier for operators to implement

Question 18: Do you have any comments on the transmitter spectrum masks defined below? :

Nomad seeks confirmation from Ofcom that the proposed masks are appropriate for WiMAX usage of the bands

Question 19: Do you have any comments on the SUR parameters defined below? :

No

Question 20: Do you have any comments on the SUR methodology and assumptions detailed in this annex? :

No

Question 21: Do you have any comments on the use of the Visualyse tool as described, on the assumptions or the propagation model proposed in this annex? :

No

Question 22: Do you have any comments on the assumptions detailed in this annex?:

No

Comments:

The Nomad Forum is a collaborative group of local authorities across the UK that has grown out of one of the original national e-government projects. Nomad is owned by Cambridgeshire County Council, and has over 3000 registered users across the public sector.

Nomad is a centre of excellence and information on all aspects of mobile and flexible working in the public sector. Over the last year, in response to local authorities' demand, it has developed a Wireless Special Interest group sharing ideas and experience of using wireless technologies to provide connectivity. From this work has come significant interest in looking to ensure that public sector access to the newest technologies and their natural spectra is available in a sustainable, affordable and useable way.