

Annex B

List of non-confidential respondents and tabulated summary of responses

1. ACSP
2. BT
3. DotEcon
4. Energis
5. Hutchison 3G
6. MGOA
7. NCC
8. Orange
9. O2
10. SACOT
11. SPC (on behalf of fixed access network operators)
12. T-Mobile
13. Vodafone

Party	Market definition	SMP and remedies for O2, Orange, T-Mobile and Vodafone	SMP and remedies for Inquam and '3'
ACSP	Agree, subject to inclusion of non-voice. A further market for multiple SIMs exists.	Agree, but SMP should include non-voice. Agree with remedies	Agree, but SMP should include non-voice. Agree with remedies
BT	Agree	Agree with SMP. Remedies should include 3G. Externality mark-up should be excluded from charge control.	Agree with SMP. H3G and Inquam should have charge control.
DotEcon	No comment	Erroneous definition of social welfare. Oftel misunderstands gross externality factor and observed cross elasticities of demand. Oftel's supporting arguments biased in favour of regulation.	No comment.
Energis	Agree.	Agree with SMP. Non-discrimination should cover supply by MNOs to their own businesses. Accounting separation required in order to monitor this undue discrimination.	Agree with SMP. Non-discrimination should cover supply by MNOs to their own businesses. Accounting separation required in order to monitor this undue discrimination.

H3G	Disagree: 2G and 3G are in the same market.	No comment.	Disagree with SMP - OfTel has not taken account of H3G's specific position. Remedies are disproportionate, inconsistent and discriminate against H3G.
MGOA	Should include non-voice such as GPRS and SMS.	Agree with both. Suggest that gateways could act as an additional control.	Agree with both. Suggest that gateways could act as an additional control.
NCC	Agree.	Agree with both, but charge control should be extended to 3G.	Agree with both, but charge control should be extended to 3G.
Orange	Market definition is transitory.	Disagree with SMP. Access remedy unnecessary. Undue discrimination remedy unclear / unnecessary. Charge control has errors. 2003/04 reduction is disproportionate. Reference offer is unnecessary / over-prescriptive. Notification should only apply to fixed-to-mobile.	Remedies for H3G discriminate against other MNOs and are not objectively justified. H3G should be subject to the charge control. Inquam should be subject to a LRIC+ control.
O2	Should be widened to include all mobile services.	Reference offer unnecessary. Access remedy unnecessary / definition too open. Non-discrimination remedy not required. Charge control contains errors.	H3G: agree. Inquam should face same regulation as that faced by other MNOs.
SACOT	Agree.	Agree with both.	No comment.
SPC	Agree.	Agree with SMP. Price notification should be 90 days. MNOs should be required to publish an 'internal' reference offer. Non-discrimination remedy should be supported by margin-squeeze test. Accounting separation remedy should be included.	Agree with both.
T-Mobile	Disagree - should consider cluster markets.	Disagree - does not have SMP. 28-day notice requirement unjustified. Reference offer disproportionate. RO and requirement to meet reasonable requests 'equally pointless'. Charge control unjustified. Glidepath of charge control too steep. Charge control has errors. Undue discrimination unclear. Alternative remedies (e.g. technical solutions) suggested instead of charge control.	No specific comments.
Vodafone	Disagree - wider market	Disagree - does not have SMP. Disagree with proposed	Agrees with remedies.

	required.	remedies. Suggests enforced bi-lateral agreements to address mobile-to-mobile charges. Errors in charge control. Transparency / non-discrimination remedies unnecessary.	
--	-----------	--	--
