

Steve Cook, G4ANA

**Question 1**

*Do stakeholders agree with the proposals for the award of licences in the 10GHz, 28GHz and 32GHz bands in 2007?*

Answer 1.

I wish to question the proposals relating to the award of licences in the 10GHz band. I note that the terms of your proposed licences include an assurance that no change will be made for at least five, maybe fifteen, years, yet you appear not to be extending any such courtesy to those already using these frequencies. Though the band may be quiet at the moment, there are amateur satellites currently under construction intended to use the (current) 10GHz amateur allocation, and the Mars Orbiter, also under construction, is an outstanding example of an intelligent use of the band – albeit one intended to return knowledge and skill rather than cash. If commercial licenses are allocated at the power levels proposed, all these – non trivial – experiments will be wrecked. At the very least, sufficient notice should be given of such drastic proposals far enough ahead of time to allow the completion of current work.

**Question 2**

*Do stakeholders agree with the proposal to include in the award of the 32GHz band that portion of the band that has been open since 2003 for point-to-point applications?*

Answer 2.

(I have no comment on this question.)

**Question 3**

*Do stakeholders agree with the proposal to defer the release of the 40GHz band and review the position in two years' time?*

Answer 3.

(I have no comment on this question.)

**Question 4**

*Do stakeholders have any other comments on the contents of this document?*

Answer 4.

For most of the 3½ decades I have held my amateur licence, I have been reasonably confident that (a) the licensing authority was well-disposed towards the amateur fraternity, and (b) spectrum allocations, etc., were decided primarily on sound technical grounds – such as appreciating that weak-signal work is impossible in the vicinity of a very strong signal. The short time scale of this proposal, as much as its content, makes me doubt (a), and the frank declaration in the document that allocations are simply to be decided by auction, on pure market principles, sounds like a declaration of war on (b). We should all value the amateur allocations, even if only secondary, very highly. Providing both R&D and R&R for some of the most technically competent people in the country, their worth is beyond mere cash: they contribute directly to our knowledge and skill base. Please, gentlemen, leave the experimenters a few relatively quiet windows where they can experiment.