

| Question | Your response |
|---|------------------------|
| Question 1: Do you agree with our proposal that 'Phase 1' protections would be required to avoid the potential for significant disruption at ports and airports? | Confidential? – N - |
| Question 2: Do you agree with the list of airports we propose to protect, in Annex A8? | Confidential? – N - |
| Question 3: Do you have any comments on the two options we have proposed for the ports which would require protection, noting the further detail (and requests for specific evidence) in Annex A7? | Confidential? – N - |
| Question 4: Do you agree with our preference to reduce these restrictions to 'Phase 2' levels over a shorter timeline than the natural lifecycle of the terminals? | Confidential? – N - |
| Question 5: Taking into account the further detail in Annexes A7 and A8, please provide any evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that a shorter period, around five years, for the relevant receivers to be replaced or upgraded is not technically or practically feasible; or • of the impact that a longer period of up to 20 years may have on the ability of MNOs to use the spectrum and the | Confidential? – N - |

| Question | Your response |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| <p>benefits to consumers and citizens that would be foregone.</p> | |
| <p>Question 6: Do you agree with our proposal not to put in place restrictions on IMT use of this spectrum to protect: (a) land terminals; (b) potential future uses of the 1.5 GHz spectrum; or (c) PMSE users.</p> <p>In this regard, we particularly welcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • any evidence that Inmarsat’s land terminals are used for the operation of critical national infrastructure or safety purposes; • any evidence that it is not technically or practically feasible to replace Inmarsat land terminals, including through alternative solutions or upgrades; and • any evidence on the impact of protecting land terminals on the ability of mobile network operators (“MNOs”) to use the spectrum and the benefits to consumers and citizens that may be foregone. | <p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>-</p> |
| <p>Question 7: Are you able to provide any evidence on the likelihood of audio links suffering interference from IMT use of 1492-1517 MHz?</p> | <p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>-</p> |
| <p>Question 8: Do you agree with our proposed approach to coordination?</p> | <p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>-</p> |

| Question | Your response |
|--|---|
| <p>Question 9: Do you agree with our proposal to define PFD limited zones as complex polygons? Would defining them as a set of points, rather than an entire boundary, make coordination calculations easier for licensees?</p> | <p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>-</p> |
| <p>Question 10: Do you agree with our provisional view that not defining coordination zones around ports may be simpler for licensees than complying with multiple different coordination zones, particularly while Phase 1 PFD limits are in place?</p> | <p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>-</p> |
| <p>Question 11: Do you have any feedback on the coordination procedures (as set out in Annex A10) or the specific parameters proposed?</p> | <p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>-</p> |
| <p>Question 12: How difficult would you find it to comply with our proposed coordination requirements? In particular, we are interested in information from potential licensees on how the proposed coordination zones would affect their deployment processes and decisions.</p> | <p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>-</p> |
| <p>Question 13: Do you have any comments on our proposal that licensees should carry out their own coordination, on the basis of coordination parameters set by Ofcom?</p> | <p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>-</p> |
| <p>Question 14: Do you have any comments on our proposed technical licence conditions?</p> | <p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>We fully support Ofcom’s proposal to align the ‘out-of-block power limits’ (as referenced in clause 6.27 and detailed in Table 6.3) with those set out in ECC Decision (17)06 and Commission Implementing Decision (EU) 2018/661.</p> |

| Question | Your response |
|---|--|
| | <p>Accordingly, we understand that these limits refer to the <i>'maximum mean out-of-block EIRP per antenna'</i>, rather than the <i>'maximum out-of-block EIRP per cell'</i>.</p> <p>Any deviation from this interpretation would result in a misalignment with the ECC/EC Decisions and could necessitate bespoke equipment, differing from that currently available across the EU market.</p> |
| Question 15: Do you have any comments on the non-technical licence conditions that we propose to include in the award licences? | <p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>-</p> |
| Question 16: Do you have any comments on the proposed format for the auction? | <p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>-</p> |
| Question 17: Do you have any comments on the proposed bidding options for the auction? Do you believe we have excluded any bidding options which would be worth identifying? | <p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>-</p> |
| Question 18: Do you have any comments on our proposed information policy or reserve price? | <p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>-</p> |
| Question 19: Do you have any other comments on the proposals or analysis set out in this consultation document? | <p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>We fully support Ofcom's proposal to align the out-of-block power limits, as outlined in this consultation, with ECC Decision (17)06 and Commission Implementing Decision (EU) 2018/661.</p> <p>We also support reflecting this alignment in the draft Licence Schedule and the draft Interface Requirement 2068. To ensure consistency, we suggest editorial changes to the current drafts, as detailed in our response to Question 14.</p> |

Please complete this form in full and return to 1.4GHz.authorisation@ofcom.org.uk.