

Additional comments:

Question 4.1: Do you agree with our assessment of the competition concerns relating to national wholesale competition that could arise if the auction took place with no measures to promote competition? Please state your reasons for your views.:

No. I feel that 3 Mobile with a significantly poor customer retention rate has demonstrated an appalling level of bad service and is undeserving of any access to future bandwidth allowances until they have committed to entirely UK based call centres; improved service overall and are held to account for past practices.

Question 4.2: Do you agree that option 4 should be adopted to promote national wholesale competition? Please state the reasons for your views.:

Whilst I am in favour of increased competition 3 Mobile are not a viable or effective competitor due to their corporate planning and structure. Their share of the spectrum (including future bids) should be offered to tender to a company that would base itself in the UK and meet higher standards of basic service.

Question 4.3: Do you agree that the portfolios in group 2 (middle portfolios) of option 4 are likely to be most appropriate and proportionate implementation of this option?:

Please see prior objections.

Question 4.4: Do you believe that geographically split licences for a particular block of 2.6 GHz spectrum between standard power use and lower power use is likely to create significant additional benefits for consumers?:

Yes dependent on who is administering the service.

Question 4.5: Please provide your views including the reasons for them on which options you believe should be taken in relation to promoting low power shared use of 2.6 GHz spectrum. :

I have no informed opinion on this.

Question 5.1: Do you have any comments on the proposal to include a coverage obligation in at least one of the 800 MHz licences, and the proposed extent of such a coverage obligation?:

Coverage obligation should include increased accuracy for customers regarding signal strength and also increased rights of return due to poor signal.

Question 5.2: Do you have any comments on which of the two approaches proposed for the specification of such an obligation would be preferable:

Approach A, which would require the licensee to provide a 4G mobile data service to an area within which at least 98% of the UK population lives:

No comments.

Question 5.3: Do you have any comments on our assessment that it is unlikely to be proportionate to impose such a coverage obligation on more than one licensee?:

No comments

Question 5.4: Do you have any views on the costs and benefits of a wholesale access obligation on the licensee with the coverage obligation in respect to those areas beyond existing 2G mobile voice coverage?:

No comments

Question 5.5: Do you have any comments on the possibility that we may in certain limited circumstances consider granting concurrent licences as set out in paragraphs 5.88 to 5.93?:

No comments

Question 6.1: Do you agree with our revised proposals for the packaging of the 800 MHz band? Please state the reasons for your preference.:

No comments

Question 6.2: Do you agree with our revised proposals for the packaging of the 2.6 GHz band? Please state the reasons for your views.:

No comments

Question 7.1: Do you agree with our revised proposals for the number of eligibility points that should attach to each lot? Please state the reasons for your views.:

No comments

Question 7.2: Do you have any comments on the proposed auction rules as explained in section 7, Annex 11 and Annex 12? Please state the reasons for your views.:

No comments

Question 8.1: Do you have any comments on the Additional Spectrum Methodology as one of several sources of information for estimating the full market value of spectrum?:

No comments

Question 8.2: Do you have any comments on our updated thinking on estimating full market value for the purpose of revising ALF as set out in this section and Annex 13?:

No comments

Question A7.1: We would welcome comments on any aspect of the data, assumptions and modelling methodology we have used in our technical analysis, in particular our approach to serving users in a range of both easier and harder to serve locations.:

No comments

Question A7.2: We would welcome any additional information, in particular from current operators, on the choice of parameters making up our ?Min var and ?Max var? cases.:

No comments

Question A8.1: Do you agree with our assessment of when Everything Everywhere, Vodafone and Telefónica are likely to be able to refarm their existing 2G spectrum? In particular, do you agree with our views on the importance of user devices and the likely availability and take-up of devices that use different technologies and bands? Please state the reasons for your views, including if appropriate your views on handset roadmaps and the practical constraints which apply to those roadmaps.:

Yes I agree with this. It would be appropriate to request that the 2G spectrum be released to another network; other than 3 Mobile to enable and increase competition. Conditional on basic standards of service and UK based operations and administration.