

Online Response: 24 May 2006

Title: Mr

Forename: Steve

Surname: Kennedy

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

Representing (self or organisations): Organisation

Organisation Name : NetTek Ltd

Email Address: steve@nettek.co.uk

Keep nothing confidential: on

Keep whole response confidential: No

Keep name/contact details/job title confidential: No

Keep organisation confidential: No

Keep part of the response confidential: No

Which parts?:

Publish response summary?: Yes

Read declaration: Yes

Publish after consultation?: No

Question 1: Do you agree that the Amateur and Amateur-Satellite allocations in the 75.5 - 76 GHz band should remain in the UK Frequency Allocation Table after 31st December 2006 on a secondary basis? If not, what would you suggest as an alternative approach? Also, what is your view on permitting the secondary Amateur and Amateur-Satellite allocation in the 81 ? 81.5GHz band within the UK Frequency Allocation Table?: Amateur use should be encouraged so as to stimulate amateur use. The existing 75.5-76GHz band should be retained for secondary use.

The 81 - 81.5 GHz band should be used solely for licensed use.

Question 2: Do you agree that a light licensed approach is appropriate to facilitate access to the 71-76 GHz and 81-86 GHz bands? What are your views on the need to provide a regulatory mechanism for interference protection of fixed links operating in the 71-76GHz and 81-86GHz bands? Do you agree that links

registered in the database require a date/ time priority rule for establishing interference protection of links?: Light licensing will encourage use without penalising users who would have to pay large license fees.

High speed wireless links will give broadband networks the ability to backhaul without having to rely on expensive fixed links (and the few networks that can supply them).

In the absence of any other proposed method, the date/time priority rule is probably the fairest for establishing interference protection, however without care it can be abused by a single entity who can "reserve" links without ever using them, just to stop others.

Question 3: Do you agree that a fee based on £50 per link per year provides the right balance between allowing access to spectrum and discouraging the hoarding of "paper" links within the registration Database. If not, what would you suggest as an appropriate fee to achieve these aims?: The fee is fair for the majority of users. However it is also open to "hoarding", especially in areas where many providers will want to offer services.

Maybe there should be a limit to the number of registrations a particular company can put in at any one time, or a timed entry where multiple entries cost substantially more if submitted at the same time. This would discourage a single entity putting in "paper links" just to stop the competition.

Question 4: Do you agree that the CEPT channel plan ECC/Rec(05)07 should not be mandated and that a flexible band structure comprising of two national spectrum blocks of 4.75GHz is appropriate for facilitating access to the 71-76GHz and 81-86GHz bands?: Yes it is appropriate.

Question 5: In addition to the date/time priority rule do you think it would be beneficial for Ofcom to set a maximum interference threshold policy for the 71-76GHz and 81-86GHz bands? If so, do you have suggestions for the criteria and how this could be assessed?: Yes (maximum interference threshold policy).
No re suggestions.

Question 6: Are there any regulatory impacts or other considerations not otherwise mentioned in this consultation that you believe are relevant to the 71-76GHz and 81-86GHz bands?: No.

Additional comments: NetTek welcomes the opportunity to respond to this consultation and is encouraged to see Ofcom potentially offer more spectrum under a license exempt or light licensed regime.