

Sony Europe's response to Ofcom's second consultation on coexistence of new services in the 800 MHz band with digital terrestrial television.

Question 7.1: Do you agree that it is best to seek to establish MitCo in advance of the auction for later transferral to 800 MHz licensees?

Yes, Sony supports the setup of MitCo in advance of the auction (refer to additional comments under Question 7.9).

Question 7.2: Do you agree with our initial views on MitCo's constitution and governance?

No comment from Sony.

Question 7.3: Do you have any views on the proposed approach to the Supervisory Board.

Having reviewed the constitution of the Supervisory Board as shown in Table 7.1 we propose the PMSE industry should have a representative on the Board.

Question 7.4: We propose that the 50% gain share be split between 800 MHz licensees based on the volume of spectrum they hold in the 800 MHz band. Do you have any comments on this proposal?

No comment from Sony.

Question 7.5: Are the information parameters defined above and in Annex 5 sufficient to allow MitCo to accurately and reliably forecast the scale and scope of households affected by DTT interference?

No comment from Sony.

Question 7.6: Do you agree the KPIs related to MitCo's activities are appropriate and robust?

See answer to Question 7.8.

Question 7.7: Do you agree that the KPI for incentivising and measuring the proactive supply of DTT receiver filters to households affected by interference should be based on an assessment of the outcomes rather than the activities performed by MitCo?

See answer to Question 7.8.

Question 7.8: Do you agree with the approach we have outlined for incentivising KPI achievement and managing cases of non-compliance with KPIs?

We think the KPIs are too focussed on the process of supplying filters with no specific check to ensure the interference issue has been resolved and DTT coverage in the UK has been

maintained at an acceptable level close to 98.5%. We recommend a KPI is added to assess the impact on DTT coverage.

Question 7.9: Do you agree with our proposed approach for managing MitCo's performance against other elements of service delivery that are not captured by KPIs?

We note from the list of additional performance management areas in Table 7.4 that MitCo will be responsible for the filter specification. Since MitCo will be run by the mobile network operators, it is not clear how the consumer electronics industry (whose products will connect to the filters) will be able to contribute to the filter design.

We recommend Ofcom clarifies how the consumer electronics industry may contribute with their expertise of TV/STB RF reception performance to MitCo's filter specification.

Sony does not support the statement in clause 3.5 that "Only one filter will be provided per household" and "where interference is experienced on other sets in addition to the main TV set, the consumer will need to obtain an additional filter (or filters) themselves". Since the average number of TV sets per household is 2.3, we propose the number of free filters should match the number of TV sets in affected households, up to a maximum of 3. Consumers have purchased all their TVs with the assumption they are fit for purpose, its reasonable to expect that the new services pay for this mitigation technique where necessary.

We think a vital element is missing from Table 7.4. MitCo should create an accreditation scheme for third party filter providers to ensure they meet the specification requirements defined by MitCo to protect consumers who may need to purchase additional filters from retailers.

Question 7.10: Do you think a hard or soft limit should be set in relation to platform changes? Do you have any other comments in relation to the platform change cap?

No comment from Sony.

Question 7.11: Do you agree with the requirements we propose to place on licensees to address interference after MitCo closes?

No comment from Sony.

Question 8.1: Do you have any views on the nature or detail of the requirements we propose may be necessary as set out in this Section?

No comments from Sony.

Sony would like to make the following additional comments on the topics raised by the consultation document;

1. The results of the latest modelling are shown in Table 5.1. We would like to see a statement confirming these figures are supported by BBC and Arqiva.

2. Sony does not agree with the conclusions set out in clause 3.6. The comment, “research commissioned by Ofcom ... supports the view that most consumers should be able to fit receiver filters without assistance ...” does not address the scenario where a filter has to be fitted before an amplifier (that could be mounted on the aerial mast or in a loft) to prevent it being overloaded by the interfering signal. Many consumers, may not be able to make such a change to their installation without help and so we think MitCo should provide some financial assistance e.g. a voucher scheme with local installers.
3. Table 5.1 summarises the split of households between domestic and communal dwellings, however we think the consultation does not address the specific issues that will be faced by those living in communal dwellings. It is likely the TV reception systems installed in some communal dwellings will need filters connected just after the aerial to protect the subsequent signal distribution equipment. We think special guidance should be given to MitCo on how it should communicate to those living in communal dwellings with a specific performance criteria to measure its success in resolving such interference issues.
4. In clause 6.33 it states, “For any household that is unable to receive a satellite or cable service and for whom DTT filtering (or replacing DTT equipment with equipment less susceptible to interference) fails to restore DTT services, MitCo will be required to undertake special measures to try and restore digital TV services and will be required to spend up to £10k per household in doing so.” We think the consumer electronics industry could contribute to the "special measures" if the scope of these measures was improved. Please clarify the meaning and give examples for "special measures".