

Your response

Question	Your response
<p>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.</p>	<p>I currently operate, install, configure and maintain numerous 802.11 based networks within the UK. Providing wireless networks for enterprise, smart buildings, public venues etc I use wireless everyday and am expecting to deploy wireless in more outdoor spaces, and more of the aforementioned spaces</p>
<p>Question 2: Are you interested in providing or developing AFC databases for use in the Lower 6 GHz band in the UK?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Question 3: Do you have any views on the operational considerations of setting up and running AFC databases?</p>	<p>This should be centralised to ensure that all parties cooperate properly. They should be redundant, resilient but not be prone to spoofing or incorrect data insertion.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>They should have security standards and upkeep and availability metrics to ensure that no client data is captured or used for any other purpose than intended. It should mirror and improve the FCC process to ensure unilateral support across vendors.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Any changes should be well documented and easily understandable and searchable. They should not be hidden within a document and should be clearly noted online. If accounts need to be set up for a connection, this should be easy to be done on behalf of a customer as a systems implementor.</p>
<p>Question 6: Do you have any comments on our proposal to use a “phased” approach, or on the alternative to wait for European harmonisation?</p>	<p>Ideally we should set the standard and let Europe follow but having harmonisation is important. We should not let delays in Europe stop the UK from benefiting from use of this extra spectrum</p>

Question	Your response
<p>Question 7: Do you have any comments on the above suggestion to manage any “legacy” Wi-Fi devices, or alternative suggestions?</p>	<p>Wireless is inherently backwards compatible so minimum works would be necessary. Client devices are largely compatible with the band anyway and would only require software patches. Networks would need to be backwards compatible with previous standards as normal. Without this, uptake would be low for a while whilst devices are naturally lifecycled.</p>
<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>As Wi-Fi has become critical infrastructure in many places, it should be prioritised over other uses of the spectrum.</p>
<p>Question 9: Do you have any comments on our plan for a “phase 1” when Wi-Fi will be introduced?</p>	<p>N/A</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>I think it has to be allowed or not allowed. Allowing only “some devices” for a large period of time would not allow smaller companies or devices to benefit.</p>
<p>Question 11: Do you have any comments on our plan for a “phase 2” when mobile will be introduced?</p>	<p>n/a</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>Equal spread?</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>No</p>

Question	Your response
<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>No</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>	<p>They should be allowed based on their power levels being so low they wouldn't disrupt other geographic locations?</p>
<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>I think it's a great idea.</p>
<p>Question 17: Do you have any comments on the proposed technical conditions?</p>	<p>Clear boundaries for power levels.</p>
<p>Question 18: Do you have any comments on the proposed VNS draft?</p>	<p>No</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>No</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>It should only be restricted in locations using said system in my opinion, but if used everywhere then avoid the spectrum would be my stance</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>Yes – Wi-Fi is resilient by nature.</p>

Question	Your response
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?	no
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?	no
Question 24: Do you have any other comments on our policy proposals or any of the issues raised in this document?	no