

SKY'S RESPONSE TO SUPPORT FOR PMSE EQUIPMENT OWNERS

Question 1: Do you agree with our proposed criteria for who should be eligible for the grant scheme? Yes

Question 2: Do you agree with our assessment of the impact clearance will have on equipment which operates exclusively below 694 MHz? No, our response sets out knock-on effects to associated equipment which will add substantially to the costs many equipment users will have to bear under the proposals.

Question 3: Do you agree with our analysis of the impact clearance will have on equipment which straddles the 700 MHz band and the spectrum below 694 MHz? No, it will not be possible to re-use all partially affected equipment as Ofcom envisages.

Question 4: Do you have any evidence that an alternative boundary for the tuning range of equipment should be drawn? Yes, but it will depend on the specific spectrum available post the clearance (not currently available to Sky) and the equipment mix held by users.

Question 5: Do you agree with the proposed formula to estimate the level of funding? No, the costs will be much greater for reasons stated in our response.

Question 6: Do you agree with our approach to calculating asset life? Broadly yes.

Question 7: Are you aware of any developments which would mean data from the 2013 equipment survey or the 2010 Channel 69 statement are likely to misrepresent average asset life? No.

Question 8: Do you agree with the use of an average asset age for the estimation of funding entitlements? If not, do you have any suggestions for an alternative approach? No, we believe full compensation should be made available for PMSE equipment users in the same way that DTT network reconfiguration is being supported.

Question 9: Are we correct in our assumption that a large proportion of PMSE equipment owners will not have evidence of when they purchased their equipment? Probably yes, especially for older equipment.

Question 10: Do the data in the 2013 equipment survey provide a reasonable basis for calculating average equipment age? If not do you have an alternative approach for gathering relevant data for making this calculation? Broadly yes.

Question 11: Do you have any comments on our proposals for how the claims handling process should operate? As we state in our response, under the proposals, significant expenditure will be needed by PMSE equipment users well before the claims handling process begins and the compensation will leave many PMSE equipment owners substantially out of pocket.

Sky 6th July 2017