1) Do you agree with our assessment of the business models that might emerge?

Yes, I agree, as long as the quality of the service is not degraded, nor the cost of the service is very high.

a. Are there any other D2D business models that you think could benefit people and businesses in the UK?

I believe that they should exist so that they contribute to encouraging the penetration of D2D services and also be able to lower prices as D2D services spread.

b. Is there a business model that cannot work with the proposed approaches?

I believe that as long as the quality of the service is not degraded and the final prices are not raised for the user, any approach is viable.

2) Do you agree with our assessment of the benefits that could be obtained by authorizing D2D services?

Yes, because there is an attempt to promote D2D services in the United Kingdom before the WRC2027,

to extend the coverage, backup and access to the 999 service in areas where there is currently no coverage of mobile terrestrial operators, considering that whoever provides these services will have to submit not to interfere with anyone and equally if interfered not to complain (article 4.4 of the Radio Regulations)

a. Are there other benefits that could be obtained for UK citizens and businesses?

Yes, better service availability.

3) Do you have any feedback on how emerging D2D technology should support the delivery of the 999 service?

Offering the geographical coordinates of the place where the person who makes the call to 999 or sends an SMS to 999 is located.

4) Are there any mobile spectrum bands that are not within the scope of our proposals that you think we should consider?

Within the licensed bands below 3Ghz are contemplated the licensed bands of the MNO, therefore there would be no lack of frequency band of interest.

5) Does deployment in the Supplementary Downlink Spectrum (SDL) present any challenges compared to other bands? Is there interest in deploying in this spectrum?

There is no need to deploy this spectrum as SMS services will initially be offered in the other licensed bands of the MNOs.

6) Do you agree with our proposal to limit this authorisation to the inland and territorial waters of the United Kingdom? If not, please explain why.

Yes, I agree, because by proposing this limitation it means that the signals of the downlinks of D2D satellites can be received in the waters that are under the jurisdiction of the United Kingdom, in the case of inland waters it refers to bodies of fresh water: rivers, lakes, etc. and in the case of territorial waters it refers

to the waters of its seas from the coast to an extension of 12 nautical miles.

7) Do you agree that our proposed technical conditions for D2D satellite broadcasts will protect mobile services provided by other operators in adjacent areas and spectrums?

In theory I do agree, because the limits

(PR=-138 dBW/MHz)indicated in this query is equivalent to -126dBm in the EU(user equipment), i.e. they are 6 dB below the sensitivity (-120dBm) of the IMT UE receiver in each frequency band, meaning that this limit (-126dBm) would ensure that there will be no probability of adjacent channel interference in the receivers of the UEs of the bands indicated in this query, since we theoretically validate the results of tables A3.2 with equation 1, and we also validate equation 2 to find the PR= -138 dBW/MHz and we validate equation 3 to find the PRSRP in dBm, meaning that -138 dBW/MHz is equivalent to -126dBm in the EU (IMT user equipment)

8) Do you agree with our overall assessment of coexistence for other services in spectrums adjacent to D2D?

Yes, I agree.

9) Are there any other co-channel or adjacent spectrum services that you think we should consider when assessing coexistence? If so, provide evidence of the nature of the interference and the level of protection you feel is necessary.

As seen in this query, if there are other communications services in bands adjacent to the licensed bands of the MNOs where they were classified as Amber because it could show a probability of interference, such as:

1400MHz Band:

communications services of the Ministry of Defence and radio astronomy communications services.

2600MHz Band:

aeronautical, civil, and military radar services operate above 2.7GHz.

But, in order to provide evidence of the nature of the interference and the level of protection that should be considered necessary, more technical data of each service must be known (if you provide them to me, I will gladly do the respective studies).

10) Do you agree with our preferred authorization approach (option 2)? If not, state your reasoning.

If I agree with what this consultation proposes in numbers 5.38, 5.39, 5.40 and 5.41

11) ¿Are there alternative authorization options, not discussed here, that you think are worth considering?

Yes, they could exist, especially when D2D services are extended, for example: data, internet, voice.

12) ¿In general, do you agree with the proposed conditions set out in this section?

You could say yes, because they contemplate the most important factors.

13) Do you have any further comments on the proposals made in this document?

Although these proposals are being anticipated in anticipation of WRC 2027, but accepting that these proposals should be modified or changed according to the conclusions reached at WRC 2027, therefore, it could be said that they are very interesting because they are attractive to both D2D operators and MNOs and MNO users in the UK.

BR

CJPP