

GM8ARV

**Question 1: Do stakeholders agree with the proposals for the award of licences in the 10 GHz, 28 GHz and 32 GHz bands in 2007?:**

No, the 10GHz allocation is in an internationally recognised satellite communications band, and any high-power transmissions even near that band will create intolerable interference to the reception of very weak satellite signals.

**Question 2: Do stakeholders agree with the proposal to include in the award of the 32 GHz band that portion of the band that has been open since 2003 for point-to-point applications?:**

No comment

**Question 3: Do stakeholders agree with the proposals to defer the release of the 40 GHz band and review the position in two years' time?:**

No comment

**Question 4: Do stakeholders have any other comments on the contents of this document?:**

**Additional comments:** We already have examples of the problems that this type of allocation can cause. For example, in the 137MHz satellite band, signals from weather satellites operating in the higher part of the band are completely unusable in many parts of the country because of interference from pages and other transmissions around 138.1MHz. The UK's action has caused international bodies in Europe and NOAA in America to find ways to minimise the problems and data loss. The present proposal would create even worse interference as the proposed frequencies are right on top of the satellite transmissions. It is vitally important that all the space band frequencies, and a guard-band on either side, are kept clear to allow the low-power, weak signal communications to continue.