

Your response

Question	Your response
Question 1: What interest do you have in deploying outdoor or standard power Wi-Fi or other licence exempt RLANs in the Lower 6 GHz band? Please provide details of the types of expected deployments.	
Question 2: Are you interested in providing or developing AFC databases for use in the Lower 6 GHz band in the UK?	
Question 3: Do you have any views on the operational considerations of setting up and running AFC databases?	
Question 4: Do you have any views on how we should manage the approval process for AFC databases and, in particular, whether we should rely on parts of the FCC process rather than requiring the whole process to be re-run in the UK?	
Question 5: Please provide any other comments on our proposals for extending access to standard power Wi-Fi and outdoor use, including the overall approach, any details on technical parameters and the running of the AFC databases in this band.	
Question 6: Do you have any comments on our proposal to use a “phased” approach, or on the alternative to wait for European harmonisation?	Unless there is significant credible evidence confirming very low risk of interference to incumbents based upon actual use in relevant North American deployments or similar, Tampnet believes the implementation should wait for a harmonised European approach.
Question 7: Do you have any comments on the above suggestion to manage any “legacy” Wi-Fi devices, or alternative suggestions?	

Question	Your response
<p>Question 8: Do you have a view on the amount of spectrum that should be prioritised for Wi-Fi under the prioritised spectrum split option? Please provide evidence for your view.</p>	
<p>Question 9: Do you have any comments on our plan for a “phase 1” when Wi-Fi will be introduced?</p>	
<p>Question 10: One variation on “phase 1” would be to only authorise Wi-Fi in client devices to “seed” the market. Would you have any views on this, or suggestions for other variations?</p>	
<p>Question 11: Do you have any comments on our plan for a “phase 2” when mobile will be introduced?</p>	
<p>Question 12: Do you have a view on the amount of spectrum that should be prioritised for mobile under the prioritised spectrum split option? Please provide evidence for your view.</p>	
<p>Question 13: Do you have any evidence or views about the geographical extent of mobile networks’ likely deployment in Upper 6 GHz?</p>	<p>Tampnet endorses the approach that high power mobile use should be restricted to “high density” areas as defined in previous consultations.</p>
<p>Question 14: Do you have any comments on our proposed phased approach to authorisation of both Wi-Fi and mobile in the Upper 6 GHz band?</p>	
<p>Question 15: Do you have any comments on our proposal to not include very low power portable devices in the Upper 6 GHz band at this stage, but to keep this under review?</p>	

Question	Your response
<p>Question 16: Do you have any comments on our proposal to authorise the use of low-power indoor Wi-Fi access points and client devices to use 6425–7125 MHz?</p>	
<p>Question 17: Do you have any comments on the proposed technical conditions?</p>	
<p>Question 18: Do you have any comments on the proposed VNS draft?</p>	
<p>Question 19: Do you have any suggestions for an appropriate mechanism for enhanced sensing, or comments on the proposed solution above?</p>	
<p>Question 20: Do you agree with our proposal to restrict Wi-Fi from transmitting in the 6650-6675.2 MHz band to protect the radio astronomy service? Please provide any technical evidence to support your view.</p>	
<p>Question 21: Do you agree with our assessment of Wi-Fi coexistence with existing users of the band? If not, please provide details.</p>	
<p>Question 22: Do you have any evidence about the costs to operators of moving fixed links in and around “high density” areas (such as urban centres) to other bands?</p>	<p>Although Tampnet only operates a few fixed link stations on land, and these are mostly located in industrial zones or on hilltops rather than urban centres; if required to physically move an end station, this would imply significant costs which are difficult to quantify on a general basis because large structures are usually required to support the antennas to give the necessary path clearance on the long hops to offshore infrastructure, and alternatives may not be available, requiring a new site to be built. Alternatively, swapping radios and antennas from</p>

Question	Your response
	<p>the 6 GHz band to suitable alternative spectra, if available, typically incurs costs ranging from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] per link.</p>
<p>Question 23: Do you have any comments on our initial assessment of our likely approach to coexistence between future mobile use and current users in the Upper 6 GHz band?</p>	
<p>Question 24: Do you have any other comments on our policy proposals or any of the issues raised in this document?</p>	