

Online Response: 1 June 2006

Title: Mr

Forename: Andy

Surname: Singer

Name and title under which you would like this response to appear: Mr. Andy Singer - President

Representing (self or organisations): Organisation

Organisation Name : Radio Waves

Email Address: andy_singer@radiowavesinc.com

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?: I agree that amateur radio allocations are important to keep as amateur radio provides an excellent basis to develop young engineers for the industry and emergency communications services that are useful.

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?: Yes we agree with the light licensing approach.

This approach is very attractive to the end users and due to the nature of propagation in these bands, the potential for interference is limited. This approach provides for rapid and simple deployment of these high capacity links.

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?: Yes I agree that a fee in the range of 50 to 100 would be appropriate and balance both needs.

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, this should provide for high capacity links that are one of the key advantages of these bands.

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?: No comments

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. We do think that Ofcom should move forward quickly with the licensing of these bands.

Additional comments: