

## Your response

Question	Your response
<p><b>Question 1: Do you agree that Ofcom should consider working with relevant industry partners to develop a voluntary testing standard, and publishing a list on our website of static indoor mobile phone repeaters that comply with our licence exemption requirements?</b></p>	<p>Confidential? – Y / <b>N</b></p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Our experience suggests that the 3<sup>rd</sup> party test process works. Providing a resource that allows consumers to research approved broadband repeaters that meet Ofcom network standards will help mitigate the influx of unapproved low-quality repeaters.</p> <p>We recommend that an approval number (grant) be tied to a single product model and be brand specific. The purpose being to limit the scenario where one approval number is shared and reused to market unapproved repeaters under multiple brands.</p>
<p><b>Question 2: Do you agree that we should modify IR 2102.1 to allow for 'provider specific' mobile phone repeaters? If you do not agree, please explain your reasons.</b></p>	<p>Confidential? – Y / <b>N</b></p> <p>We believe broadband repeaters are more consumer friendly for the majority of applications, but understand there could be scenarios where provider specific may make sense.</p> <p>The provider specific repeaters are single source and not always cost competitive. The higher cost drives some customers to purchase low-cost unapproved repeaters, which could cause excessive noise on the providers' networks.</p> <p>It would be thoughtful if under emergency calling situations the provider specific repeater would convert to work for all providers to ensure a call can be made.</p>
<p><b>Question 3: Do you agree that we should make 'multi-operator' mobile phone repeaters complying with the technical requirements outlined above (and set out in the draft UK Radio Interface Requirement IR 2102.3 at Annex A3) licence exempt? If you do not agree, please explain your reasons.</b></p>	<p>Confidential? – Y / <b>N</b></p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>We agree there should be a process in place that gives consumers easy access to multi-operator licence exempt repeaters. With an approval process, competitive market forces will drive retail prices for approved &amp; network friendly broadband repeaters to a nominal</p>

	<p>premium over the non-approved repeaters. Consumers will most likely choose the minimally higher priced approved broadband repeater thus limiting the spread unapproved, and potentially un-network friendly, repeaters.</p>
<p><b>Question 4: Do you agree with our provisional view as set out in paragraph 3.48 above? If you do not agree, please explain why you think the requirement is not necessary.</b></p>	<p>Confidential? – Y / <b>N</b></p> <p>We agree that the broadband repeater should repeat the 2G and 3G frequencies used by each MNO to give the user the best chance at making an emergency call.</p>
<p><b>Question 5: Do you agree that it would not be appropriate to allow the use of licence-exempt repeaters in the 2.6 GHz band? If you do not agree, please explain your reasons.</b></p>	<p>Confidential? – Y / <b>N</b></p> <p>In North America, we have seen instances where carrier preferences are strong for 2.6 GHz frequency (Band 7) and phones can be hung on a weak unamplified 2.6 GHz carrier frequency. The impact can be missed inbound calls.</p>
<p><b>Question 6: Do you agree that we should allow the use of static indoor mobile phone repeaters (on a licence-exempt basis) in the paired 700 MHz mobile band?</b></p>	<p>Confidential? – Y / <b>N</b></p> <p>In North America, low bands are deployed almost everywhere, especially at the edge of the network because of its better propagation. If that is the same in the UK, we encourage the inclusion of 700 MHz in any approved repeater spec.</p>