

**Organisation (if applicable):**

Airwave

**Additional comments:**

**Question 4.1: Do you agree with our approach to wholesale product market definition and our proposed wholesale product market definitions in relation to services provided using contemporary interfaces? In particular, do you agree with our proposal to define a single product market for Contemporary Interface Symmetric Broadband Origination (CISBO) services? If not, what alternative would you propose and why?:**

**Question 4.2: Do you agree with our assessment of competitive conditions for very high CISBO services? If not, what alternative would you propose and why?:**

**Question 4.3: Do you agree with our approach to geographic market definition and our proposed geographic market definitions? In particular do you agree with our proposals to define the Central London Area (CLA) and the London Periphery (LP) as separate geographic markets? If not, what alternative would you propose and why?:**

**Question 4.4: Do you agree with our approach to SMP assessment? In particular, do you agree with our proposals to find no CP to have SMP in the market for CISBO services in the Central London Area (CLA), and to find BT to have SMP in the markets for CISBO services in the London Periphery (LP) and the Rest of the UK (RoUK). If not, what alternative would you propose and why?:**

**Question 4.5: Do you agree with our approach to product and geographic market definition for wholesale CI core conveyance services and do you agree with our proposed market definitions for wholesale CI core? If not, what alternative would you propose and why?:**

**Question 4.6: Do you consider that our list of candidate competitive exchange and data centre locations is correct?:**

**Question 4.7: Do you agree with our assessment that connectivity between additional candidate nodes and data centres are competitive?:**

**Question 5.1: Do you agree with our proposal to identify a single product market for Traditional Interface Symmetric Broadband Origination (TISBO) services at low bandwidths with a single geographic market for the UK (excluding Hull)? If not, what alternative would you propose and why?:**

**Question 5.2: Do you agree with our proposal not to identify any other Traditional Interface Symmetric Broadband Origination (TISBO) services above 2Mbit/s? If not, what alternative would you propose and why?:**

**Question 5.3: Do you agree with our SMP assessment with respect to low bandwidth TISBO services? If not, what alternative would you propose and why?:**

**Question 5.4: Do you agree with our approach to, and proposed product and geographic market definition for, wholesale TI trunk, including our proposal to treat regional trunk segments as part of the TISBO market? If not, what alternative would you propose and why?:**

**Question 6.1: Do you agree with our approach to (wholesale and retail) market definition in the Hull Area? If not, what alternative would you propose and why?:**

**Question 6.2: Do you agree with our assessment of SMP to the markets for low bandwidth TISBO and CISBO services in the Hull Area? If not, what alternative would you propose and why?:**

**Question 6.3: Do you agree with our assessment of SMP for the markets for low bandwidth TI and CI services in the Hull Area? If not, what alternative would you propose and why?:**

**Question 6.4: Do you agree with our assessment of wholesale remedies not being sufficient to sustain effective competition in retail markets in the Hull Area? If not, what alternative would you propose and why?:**

**Question 6.5: Do you agree with our finding that the three criteria test is met when applied to the retail markets in the Hull Area?:**

**Question 7.1: Do you agree with our approach to assessing what remedies are appropriate to address the competition problems we have identified in the markets in which we propose to find that BT and KCOM have SMP? If not, please explain why, and what alternative approach you consider we should take.:**

**Question 7.2: Do you agree with our assessment of the benefits that a package of passive and active remedies can offer relative to a package of active remedies only? If not, please explain why, giving your views on our assessment of these benefits, and providing any relevant evidence in support.:**

**Question 7.3: Do you agree with our assessment of the risks associated with imposing passive remedies? If not, please explain why, giving your views on**

**our assessment of these risks, and providing any relevant evidence in support.:**

**Question 7.4: Do you agree that our proposal of a dark fibre remedy priced and designed in the way we have described in this consultation provides the best balance between the benefits and risks that we have identified? If not, please explain why, providing any relevant evidence in support, referencing specific aspects of our proposed remedy design where appropriate, and taking into account any comments you have made in response to questions 7.2 and 7.3.:**

**Question 7.5: Do you agree with our assessment of passive remedies, and our proposal to include dark fibre in the package of remedies we propose to impose on BT? If not, please explain why.:**

**Question 8.1: Do you agree with the general remedies that we propose for BT in the wholesale TISBO and CISBO markets? If not, what alternative remedies would you propose and why? :**

**Question 9.1: Do you agree with our proposals in relation to the dark fibre remedy? If not, what alternative dark fibre remedy would you propose and why?:**

**Question 9.2: Do you agree with our proposals in relation to the pricing of dark fibre? If not, please explain why, and what alternative approach you consider we should take.:**

**Question 10.1: Do you agree with the specific active remedies that we propose for BT in the wholesale CISBO markets? If not, what alternative active remedies would you propose and why?:**

**Question 11.1: Do you agree with the PPC Direction that we propose for BT in the wholesale TISBO market? If not, what alternative would you propose and why?:**

Airwave do not agree with the PPC Direction that is proposed for BT in the wholesale TISBO market. The wholesale TISBO market should remain regulated unless BT agrees to increase the notice period for withdrawing sub 2Mbit/s PPC from 1 year to 2 years (Sections 11.3, 11.21). This is how long it can take to replace a kilostream circuit in remote areas by a self provided microwave circuit; anything less than 2 years notice could impact the service Airwave provides to the emergency services.

**Question 12.1: Do you agree with the interconnection and accommodation remedies that we propose for BT in the wholesale TISBO and CISBO markets? If not, what alternative remedies would you propose and why?:**

**Question 13.1: Do you agree with our assessment of Openreach's Ethernet provisioning process, how it has been working in practice, the root causes of performance deterioration and process developments? Does our assessment reflect your experiences and understanding of Openreach's wholesale Ethernet provisioning performance? If not, please explain why and provide us with any supporting evidence.:**

**Question 13.2: Do you agree with our provisional conclusions on Openreach's performance? If not, please explain why, and provide us with any further supporting evidence.:**

**Question 13.3: Have we accurately captured the reported impact of poor performance? If not, please explain why and provide us with any further supporting evidence.:**

**Question 13.4: Do you agree with our assessment of Openreach's incentives to deliver acceptable Ethernet provisioning quality of service? If not, please explain why and provide us with any further supporting evidence.:**

**Question 13.5: Do you agree that it is appropriate to exclude customer caused delays from the minimum standard performance measures for provision activities? If not, please explain why.:**

**Question 13.6: Do you agree that it is appropriate to include the 'non-customer' delays (also including Third Party delay in Openreach data) in the minimum standard performance measures for provision activities? If not, please explain why.:**

**Question 13.7: Do you agree that it is appropriate to include delays due to events covered by MBORC declarations in the minimum standard performance measures for provision and repair activities? If not, please explain why.:**

**Question 13.8: Do you agree that it is appropriate to apply the minimum standards nationally? If not, please explain why.:**

**Question 13.9: Do you agree with our proposals regarding the application of minimum standards over the three year period of this review? If not, please set out your reasons and alternative proposals.:**

**Question 13.10: Do you agree that it is appropriate to use a combination of initial CDD and TTP as the basis around which to set the new delivery date certainty minimum standards? Please provide reasoning for your answer. If you do not agree, please also give your proposed alternative including reasoning.:**

**Question 13.11: Do you agree that it is appropriate to set the metrics for the delivery time certainty minimum standard to the initial value of 80% and final value of 90%? Please provide reasoning for your answer. If you do not agree, please also give your proposed alternative.:**

**Question 13.12: Do you agree that it is appropriate to apply limits to mean TTP and upper (97%) and lower (40%) percentiles as the basis for the lead time minimum standard? Please provide reasoning for your answer. If you do not agree, please also give your proposed alternative.:**

**Question 13.13: Do you agree that it is appropriate to set the upper percentile initial and final values to 159 and 118 working days and the lower percentile initial and final values to 30 and 29 working days for the lead time minimum standard to the values? Please provide reasoning for your answer. If you do not agree, please also give your proposed alternative.:**

**Question 13.14: Do you agree that it is appropriate to set the repair time minimum standard to 94%? Please provide reasoning for your answer. If you do not agree, please also give your proposed alternative.:**

**Question 13.15: Do you agree with our proposal to set a new SMP services condition which provides for Ofcom to direct BT to comply with all such quality of service requirements in relation to network access provided by BT pursuant to our proposed general and specific network access requirements? If not, please explain why.:**

**Question 13.16: Do you agree that it is appropriate to assess compliance with the proposed minimum standards on an annual basis? If not, please explain why.:**

**Question 13.17: Do you agree with our proposals to direct BT to comply with minimum performance standards for setting initial contractual delivery dates, delivery against initial contractual delivery dates, fault repair performance and overall mean time to provide? If not, please explain why, and set out your proposed alternative.:**

**Question 13.18: Do you agree with our proposals to direct BT to provide the KPIs we have specified? If not, please explain why, and set out your proposed alternative.:**

**Question 13.19: Do you agree with our proposals to maintain the existing SLG Direction? If not, please explain why, and set out your proposed alternative.:**

**Question 13.20: Do you agree with our proposals regarding the conduct of, and principles and criteria to be applied from now on, to contractual**

**negotiations concerning SLAs/SLGs for the provision of Ethernet services? If not, please explain why, and set out your proposed alternative:**

**Question 14.1: Do you agree with the remedies that we propose for KCOM in the retail TI and AI markets? If not, what alternative remedies would you propose and why?:**

**Question 14.2: Do you agree with the remedies that we propose for KCOM in the wholesale TISBO and CISBO markets? If not, what alternative remedies would you propose and why?:**