

ITN response to Clearing the 700 MHz band – Support for PMSE equipment owners
Consultation

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

Answer: Broadly yes

Question 2: Do you agree with our assessment of the impact clearance will have on equipment which operates exclusively below 694 MHz?

Answer: Some large installations will probably run out of spectrum in areas where DTT is re-planned below 694 MHz, requiring the purchase of new equipment. The existing equipment should be compensated as though it is unuseable; PMSE users should not have to attempt to sell their equipment on the secondhand market themselves to recoup some of their losses .

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?

Answer: Yes as long as the 694 MHz boundary is not changed to 703 MHz if the guard band is made available for PMSE use. The useability of the guard band will only become apparent after the mobile devices are in general use,

Question 4: Do you have any evidence that an alternative boundary for the tuning range of equipment should be drawn?

Answer: No

Question 5: Do you agree with the proposed formula to estimate the level of funding?

Answer: The level of funding does not take into account the project management costs of investigating replacement equipment, finding receipts, removal of existing equipment, installation of replacement equipment and frequency planning. Whilst these may not be great for small installations, they are very significant for large installations such as ours. The funding also does not take into account situations where an existing complete installation may consist of many identical units having the same frequency range, however post changeover part of the installation may require some of these units to be in a different range/ type, hence requiring an increase in the spares holding.

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

Answer: 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?

Answer: 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?

Answer: Yes

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?

Answer: This assumption is probably correct.

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?

Answer: Broadly agree

Question 11: Do you have any comments on our proposals for how the claims handling process should operate?

Answer: No