

Name Withheld 1

Question 1: do you agree with the proposal to vary Vodafone's 900 MHz, 1800 MHz and 2100 MHz licences and H3G's 2100 MHz licence so as to permit those frequencies to be used to deploy 4G technologies?

Yes. It is vital for our economy, for extending fast broadband to rural areas and complying with EU law. As all licences would be liberalised under these plans, there should be no detrimental effect on competition.

Question 2: do you agree with the proposal to vary Telefónica's 900 MHz, 1800 MHz and 2100 MHz licences and EE's 2100 MHz licence so as to permit those frequencies to be used to deploy 4G technologies where we receive formal requests to do so?

Yes. Indeed Ofcom should actively encourage all spectrum licensees affected (if these changes are implemented) to regularly review their use of spectrum and ensure that it is being used in the most efficient and effective way, for the benefit of both operators and consumers.

Question 3: do you agree with the proposal to vary the 900 MHz licences to increase the maximum power limit for UMTS by 3dB from 62 dBm e.i.r.p. per carrier to 65 dBm e.i.r.p. per carrier?

Yes. I live next to a cellular transmitter, and although I was a little concerned at first, I have noticed absolutely zero negative affects. There are obvious benefits to allowing licensees to use sufficiently powerful signals (within agreed safety limits, of course), including better reception in buildings and at further distances.

The imagined health detriments of use of radio spectrum (in accordance with current regulations) by some have never been substantiated.

Personally, I value the boosted signal to my home that enabled me to call an ambulance in an emergency from my kitchen, which I could not have done before. I have anaphylaxis and so having quick, reliable access to 999/112 services wherever I am could literally save my life. Over the last year, I had four anaphylactic shocks and as I'm allergic to common ingredients, I can only do so much to limit my exposure if I am going to be able to leave the house for more than a few hours. I do get nervous when I can't get a signal and may have to delay eating as a result, which isn't much fun! I really hope that you publish at least this comment as those who campaign against the mobile infrastructure they themselves use for spurious health reasons could be putting those of us with real life-threatening illnesses at risk. Our voice should be heard, but is usually drowned out by unscientific nonsense. Boosted power means more chance of me getting a signal and enables me to be much safer going out into rural areas and inside buildings.

Question 4: do you agree with the changes proposed in section 5?

Yes, this is a sensible proposal that will lower costs. Of course, I would hope that as technology progresses, that Ofcom will consider raising the coverage requirement further (if

possible under EU law!). We are a small nation, and whilst a 100% requirement would not be economically feasible right now, further improvements as technology and funding permits should at least be encouraged, if not required. The performance of the existing companies is reassuring, but we should not be complacent, nor unambitious in our future plans.

Additional comments:

Whilst I strongly support consultation, it does worry me how much time and effort is put into these, and have to express my wonder at whether an 84 page report was really necessary for this one. Minor point and Ofocom's thoroughness is commendable, but I know that there is increasing public concern about the time and resources devoted to an ever-increasing volume of consultative processes by all public bodies.