

Your response

Question	Your response
<p>Question 1: Do you have any comments on our proposals to gather additional antenna parameters, and would you prefer Ofcom to specify a small number of antenna pattern ‘envelopes’ or for users to provide details of the specific antenna parameters in use for Ofcom to assess? Please provide reasons for your views.</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>Meta is mostly interested in indoor deployment and expects that this additional requirement would not apply to indoor deployment.</p>
<p>Question 2: Do you have comments on the suggested approach to enable user-led coordination in certain circumstances?</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>Meta is mostly concerned with indoor deployment and expects little to no coordination requirements between indoor users.</p> <p>Irrespective of the exact spectrum coordination mechanism, Meta hopes that spectrum will remain available for indoor users, even as outdoor deployment’s coverage expands.</p>
<p>Question 3: Do you have any comments on our proposal to increase the power level of our Low Power product by 3dBm in the 3.8-4.2 GHz band?</p>	
<p>Question 4 Do you have any comments on our proposal to remove the requirement for licensees holding a Low Power 3.8-4.2 GHz licence to keep a record of the address at which mobile terminals connected to an indoor base station will be used?</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>Meta fully supports Ofcom’s proposal to remove the requirement for licensees holding a Low Power 3.8-4.2 GHz licence to keep a record of the address at which mobile terminals connected to an indoor base station will be used.</p> <p>Low Power indoor networks offer the benefit to support a variety of services from a single indoor infrastructure. Delivering both neutral host and private networks services from a single infrastructure strongly improves the investment rationale for local indoor networks. Ofcom’s proposal will enable building owners and tenants to deploy infrastructure that will significantly improve UK’s indoor coverage.</p>

<p>Question 5: Do you agree with our proposals to assume synchronisation between users, and coordinate base station to terminal instead of base station to base station in the 3.8-4.2GHz band? If no, please explain how other measures could increase sharing of the band.</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>Meta understands that such coordination is primarily intended between outdoor users. Meta does not expect Low Power indoor deployments to trigger significant interference to other users.</p> <p>Mandating synchronisation of Low Power indoor deployments, either overall or as a remedy in case of interference, would have a significant negative effect on such deployments. Synchronisation triggers associated deployment costs and removes the flexibility for users to leverage the frame best suited for their own local use – which may even vary in time.</p> <p>Meta does not oppose Ofcom’s proposals but recommends Ofcom to take into account the low interference potential of low power indoor deployments before considering local synchronisation of such networks.</p>
<p>Question 6. Please indicate whether you support our preferred option of coordination at -88 dBm/20 MHz (based on I/N of + 3dB, at 1.5m) or a more conservative alternative of -91 dBm/20 MHz (based on I/N of 0dB at 3m), with reasons for your view.</p>	
<p>Question 7: Do you agree with our proposals for an increase in BEL in 3.8-4.2GHz? If no, are there alternatives which you consider could better achieve similar results?</p>	
<p>Question 8: Do you agree with our proposal that adjacent band protection for Shared Access users is in future limited to considering only the first 5 MHz above and below UK Broadband assignments?</p>	
<p>Question 9: Do you agree with our assessment that, in circumstances where localised shortages of spectrum have occurred, pricing can be used to influence requested spectrum amounts?</p>	
<p>Question 10: Do you agree that we should take measures to reflect the impact of bandwidth, power levels and urban/rural location in our pricing approach for the 3.8-4.2</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>Meta believes that indoor deployment significantly lowers the risk of interference to</p>

<p>GHz band? Do you think there are other factors we should be taking into account?</p>	<p>other users and therefore maximises the sharing opportunity. Therefore, Meta argues that it would be logical for Ofcom to adopt differentiated prices between indoor and outdoor licences, should Ofcom decide to leverage pricing to influence requested spectrum amounts.</p>
<p>Question 11: How do you consider the illustrative prices would impact your spectrum requirements and future deployment plans in the 3.8-4.2 GHz band? Please provide evidence in support of your view.</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>Meta does not expect the illustrative prices would significantly impact our spectrum requirements or future development plans.</p>
<p>Question 12: Do you have any comments on our proposals to clarify the circumstances in which exceptions are available, the tests we will apply, and how this supports user flexibility outside our overarching rules?</p>	
<p>Question 13: Do you agree with our overall approach based around refining our existing coordination framework for Shared Access, whilst monitoring future opportunities for more user led and outcomes led coordination where evidence suggests it would be of benefit?</p>	
<p>Question 14: Do you agree with our assessment of the potential impact on specific groups of persons?</p>	
<p>Question 15: Do you agree with our assessment of the potential impact of our proposal on the Welsh language? Do you think our proposal could be formulated or revised to ensure, or increase, positive effects, or reduce/eliminate any negative effects, on opportunities to use the Welsh language and treating the Welsh language no less favourably than English?</p>	
<p>Question 16: Do you have any other comments on the proposals set out in this document?</p>	

Please complete this form in full and return to sharedaccessresponses@ofcom.org.uk.