

Your response

Question	Your response
<p>Question 1: (Section 2) Do you have any comments on our assessment of potential use cases, demand and deployment strategies for new uses of mmWave spectrum?</p>	<p><i>Is this response confidential? – No</i> You make no reference to harm to humans generally, or specifically address the needs of individuals who struggle with wifi and emf on a day to day basis. The mm wave spectrum has not been proven safe to humans and indeed in parts of the US, has been ceased by councils.</p>
<p>Question 2: (Section 2) Do you have any comments on our proposed overall approach to mmWave spectrum (including our aim to make the 26 GHz and 40 GHz bands available for new uses on the same or similar timeframe)?</p>	<p><i>Is this response confidential? – No</i> Please see above and in addition, as this technology is uninsurable, how will landowners, councils, etc be able to cover any claims made on them for personal damage?</p>
<p>Question 3: (Section 3) Do you agree with our approach of specifying high and low density areas in the UK, and authorising new uses differently in those areas?</p>	<p><i>Is this response confidential? – No</i> I don't agree with your approach at all, please provide me with a risk assessment for harm to humans (never mind biodiversity particularly pollinators).</p>
<p>Question 4: (Section 3) Do you agree with our overall authorisation approach in high density areas for the 26 GHz band (i.e. to grant Shared Access licences on a first come, first served basis for the bottom 850 MHz of the 26 GHz band, (24.25-25.1 GHz), and to auction citywide licences for the rest of the 26 GHz band (25.1-27.5 GHz))?</p>	<p><i>Is this response confidential? – No</i> The precautionary principle should be applied. Have you notified landowners and tech companies of their liabilities?</p>
<p>Question 5: (Section 3) Do you agree with our overall authorisation approach in low density areas for the 26 GHz band (i.e. to grant Shared Access licences on a first come, first served basis)?</p>	<p><i>Is this response confidential? – No</i> See above. But I should add of course it's going to be the biggest and wealthiest corporations that get anything of value!</p>
<p>Question 6: (Section 3) Do you agree with adopting a similar approach to authorising the 40 GHz band as our proposals for the 26 GHz band, if we were to decide to re-allocate the 40 GHz band?</p>	<p><i>Is this response confidential? –No</i> As above</p>

<p>Question 7: (Section 4) Do you agree with our proposed methodology for identifying and defining high density areas?</p>	<p>Sorry I can't be bothered to fill in any more. I know that if you deploy any of these near me I have to move house. Cheers</p>
<p>Question 8: (Section 4) Do you agree with our proposed cut-off point of 40 high density areas?</p>	
<p>Question 9: (Section 5) Do you agree with our proposal to clear the fixed links in and around high density areas from the 26 GHz band?</p>	
<p>Question 10: (Section 5, Annex 8) Do you agree with our estimates of the cost of migrating fixed links into alternative spectrum bands?</p>	
<p>Question 11: (Section 6) Do you agree with the proposed approaches we have outlined to manage coexistence between new 5G users and the different existing users in the 26 GHz band? In particular, do you have any views on our proposals to limit future satellite earth stations in this band to low density areas only, and to end access to this band for PMSE users with five years' notice?</p>	
<p>Question 12:(Section 7) Do you agree with our initial assessment on which option for enabling the 40 GHz band for new uses would best achieve our objectives?</p>	
<p>Question 13: (Section 7, Annex 8) Do you agree with our analysis of the impact on existing 40 GHz licensees, including our estimates of the cost of moving fixed links under the options involving revocation (options 2, 3 and 4)?</p>	

<p>Question 14: (Section 8) Do you have any comments on our high-level Shared Access proposals (including technical and non-technical licence conditions and proposed approach to setting fees)?</p>	
<p>Question 15: (Section 8) Do you agree with the overall approach we have set out to coordination and coexistence between new Shared Access users in the 26 GHz band and existing users?</p>	
<p>Question 16: (Section 9) Do you have any comments on our initial thinking in relation to auction design?</p>	
<p>Question 17: (Section 10) Do you have any comments on the licence duration options we have considered in this section for new licences for the 26 GHz and 40 GHz bands that we would auction?</p>	
<p>Question 18: (Section 11) Do you agree with our assessment of potential competition concerns and that it may be appropriate to impose a competition measure such as a 'precautionary cap'?</p>	

Please complete this form in full and return to mmwave.allocation@ofcom.org.uk