| Title: |
|---|
| Mr |
| Forename: |
| GW |
| Surname: |
| Watson |
| Representing: |
| Organisation |
| Organisation (if applicable): |
| Broadcasting company |
| Email: |
| gary@7-media.net |
| What do you want Ofcom to keep confidential?: |
| Keep nothing confidential |
| If you want part of your response kept confidential, which parts?: |
| Ofcom may publish a response summary: |
| Yes |
| I confirm that I have read the declaration: |
| Yes |
| Of com should only publish this response after the consultation has ended: |
| You may publish my response on receipt |
| Additional comments: |
| Question 1: do you agree that we should introduce RSA in the 3400 to 3600 MHz?: |

Are you crazy. This is an international satetllite allocated band. In Fiji they allocated this band for WIFI and it caused huge intertference problems to a level where people were murdered for interfering with TV receiption. This is a blatant miss management of the spectrum.

Question 2: do you agree that we should extend the relevant regulations to allow Crown bodies to be granted and to trade RSA in the 3400? 3480 MHz and 3500? 3580 MHz blocks? If not, which frequency ranges do you think the RSA regulations should cover and why?:

No it is to close to the international satteliet band

Question 3: do you agree that there should be no minimum trading unit for the RSA grant and the WT licences arising from trade in the band?:

Are you crazy. This is an international satetllite allocated band. In Fiji they allocated this band for WIFI and it caused huge intertference problems to a level where people were murdered for interfering with TV receiption. This is a blatant miss management of the spectrum.

Question 4: are there specific conditions that you consider should be included in RSA grants and WT licences arising from trading in the band?:

Are you crazy. This is an international satetllite allocated band. In Fiji they allocated this band for WIFI and it caused huge intertference problems to a level where people were murdered for interfering with TV receiption. This is a blatant miss management of the spectrum.

Question 5: do you agree with the proposed in block emissions limit for base stations in the 3500 ? 3580 MHz block?:

no

Question 6: do you agree with the proposed out of block emissions mask at the 3500 MHz and 3580 MHz boundaries for base stations?:

Question 7: do you agree that less stringent technical parameters should be permitted if agreed between neighbouring operators?:

Question 8: should we align UK Broadband licence conditions for base stations at 3500 MHz and 3580 MHz with those in the RSA grants if and when UK Broadband requests us to do so?:

Question 9: do you agree with the proposed in block emissions limits for terminal stations?:

Question 10: do you agree that the block edge mask should be based on the spectrum emissions mask from ETSI EN 302 623?:

Question 11: do you agree with our derivation of regulatory out of block limits for terminals and, if so, which of the proposed four alternative regulatory conditions do you think most appropriate?:

Question 12: should out of block limits for fixed, nomadic and mobile terminals be different?:

Question 13: should we align UK Broadband licence conditions for terminal stations at 3500 MHz and 3580 MHz with those in the RSA grants if and when UK Broadband requests us to do so?:

Question 14: do you agree that the technical limits at 3480 MHz should copy those at 3580 MHz when the use immediately below 3480 MHz is broadband wireless?:

Question 15: do you agree with the proposed technical limits at 3480 MHz for the scenario where the upper edge of the emergency services block does not change from the current allocation at 3475 MHz?:

Question 16: do you agree with the proposed technical limits at 3480 MHz for the scenario where the upper edge of the emergency services block is moved to 3480 MHz?:

Question 17: do you agree that the technical conditions of the RSA grant at the 3500 MHz and 3580 MHz boundaries are the best option for the boundaries that will appear inside the 3500 ? 3580 MHz block if the block is partitioned and traded into several smaller sub-blocks?:

Question 18: do you think that the out of block limits for broadband wireless base stations in Figure 8.2 are sufficient to protect air-to-ground videolink receivers in an adjacent block?:

Question 19: what are your views on the requirements for protection of air-to-ground videolink receivers from interference from broadband wireless terminals?:

Question 20: do you think that an out of block requirement for airborne videolink transmitters of -25 dBm/MHz EIRP is sufficient to protect broadband wireless receivers?: