



**SUBMISSION TO THE RADIO SPECTRUM MANAGEMENT, POLICY AND PLANNING BRANCH OF  
THE MINISTRY OF BUSINESS, INNOVATION AND EMPLOYMENT ON THE FIXED SERVICES IN  
NEW ZEALAND DISCUSSION DOCUMENT**

15 MARCH 2015

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	3
Introduction	5
Contact	6
Background	7
Answers to Questions	9
2.1. Digitisation	9
2.2. Spectral efficiency	9
2.3. Metropolitan site congestion	9
2.4. Interference evaluation method for Digital Microwave Radio (DMR)	10
2.5. Adjacent channel interference criteria	10
2.6. Equipment standards	10
2.7. Necessary bandwidth and channel widths for digital services	10
2.8. Information on licence records	11
2.9. Transition of spectrum to the management rights regime	11
2.10. Channel widths	11
2.11. Band renaming	11
3.1. ISTL, JKSTL, KL and K STL bands	11
3.2. EE Band	12
3.3. I Band	12
3.4. J Band	12
3.5. JL band	13
3.6. KK Band	13
3.7. L Band	13
3.8. 5 GHz Band	13
3.9. P Band	13
3.10. R Band	13
3.11. T Band	14
3.12. V Band	14
3.13. U, W and Y bands	14
3.14. H band	15
3.15. Z band	15
3.16. G band	16
3.17. X band	16
3.18. 18 and 23 GHz bands	16
3.19. 38 GHz band	16
3.20. 70 – 80 GHz band	16



## INTRODUCTION

TeamTalk Ltd would like to thank the Radio Spectrum Management division of MBIE for the opportunity to submit on Fixed Services in NZ, our response is on behalf of the TeamTalk group of companies.

We would also like to acknowledge the work of the RFUANZ.

## CONTACT

Any enquiries regarding this review should be directed to:

Mr. Jamie Baddeley  
Group Chief Technology Officer  
TeamTalk Ltd.  
PO Box 9345  
Wellington

c:+64 21 448 309

d:+64 4 910 5632

e:jamie.baddeley@[citylink.co.nz](mailto:jamie.baddeley@citylink.co.nz)

e:jamie.baddeley@[teamtalk.co.nz](mailto:jamie.baddeley@teamtalk.co.nz)

## BACKGROUND

TeamTalk Ltd is a publically listed company on the New Zealand Stock Exchange. It comprises of the following businesses:

**TeamTalk Mobile Radio - NZ's leading national two-way mobile radio network provider.**

TeamTalk owns and operates a national digital microwave backbone as well as operating at more than 250 "high site" radio transmission facilities. It is the leading Mobile Radio Network Provider in NZ. It has a significant investment program using Fixed/Wireless Broadband technology focused on the Rural/Provincial markets of NZ.

**BayCity Communications Ltd (trading as Farmside) - NZ's leading Rural Broadband specialist.**

Farmside is NZ's leading Direct to Home (DTH) satellite Internet provider. Farmside is rural New Zealand's leading telecommunications company, providing fast broadband via Satellite, RBI Fixed Wireless and Fixed Line solutions.

**Citylink - The pioneering Wellington based fibre provider and operator of NZ's main Internet Exchange Points (IXP).**

Citylink has Metropolitan Fibre Network Assets in Wellington and Auckland and has led the way in terms of urban fibre networking since the 1990's. It plays a key role in the telecommunications sector by operating the Internet Exchange Points in Auckland, Wellington, Hamilton, Palmerston North and Christchurch.

**Araneo - An independent national wireless broadband and wireless wholesale network.**

Araneo focuses on providing rural and provincial wireless IP connectivity solutions from a customer's door to a retail service provider via TeamTalk Group transmission assets. It provides wholesale ethernet backhaul from remote and rural locations to over a dozen Retail Service Providers around the country.

Across the four companies, the TeamTalk group is the 7<sup>th</sup> highest contributor to the Telecommunications Development Levy for the period July 2012-June 2013.

TeamTalk Ltd would like to thank the Ministry for the opportunity to make this brief submission.



# ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

## 2.1. Digitisation

1. *Should all or some sub 1 GHz fixed service bands be digital only? If so, are there particular bands that should be given priority to change to digital only services?*

**Response:**

Only bands already designated as digital only should so designated. Other bands should remain analogue or digital provided suitable co-ordination is mandated. Digital links have inherent latency issues that prohibit their application in some circumstances. These cases, and others where critical performance or interfacing requirements dictate, make analogue links necessary.

2. *Should any requirement for digital services apply to new licences only or should existing analogue services be required to transition to digital? If all licences are required to transition to digital services, over what time period should analogue licences be phased out?*

**Response:**

Digital should not become mandatory. Many analogue systems provide robust, resilient, rugged and economical systems. For some applications they are a preferred technical solution over digital systems. An example is sites without mains power. Digital systems invariably consume more power than analogue ones and are usually required to be active continuously. They are often not suitable for use on solar or wind powered sites.

## 2.2. Spectral efficiency

3. *Should the Ministry increase the minimum spectral efficiency of digital services from one bit to four bits per second per Hertz? If so, should this apply to some (please identify which ones) or all bands?*

**Response:**

No, below 1GHz, possibly above 5GHz in specific bands and bandwidth. In planning links, ARE's need to consider fade margins and the length of a path as well as spectral efficiency. In some cases it is just not possible to obtain the suggested spectral efficiency over long paths while ensuring operation during fading conditions. The high modulation rates required for four bits per second per Hertz are not achievable by much equipment and some are limited to low spectral efficiency to achieve reliable operation over difficult paths E.g. Aviat Edge equipment has QPSK modulation only.

4. *Should any requirement for increased spectral efficiency apply to new licences only or should existing licences be required to transition to this standard? If so, over what time period should the lower standard be phased out?*

**Response:**

No.

Whilst analogue mobile radio services remain in service analogue linking must also be retained. Increased spectral efficiency should be required for new licences only, and only for wide bandwidth channels (e.g.56 MHz)

## 2.3. Metropolitan site congestion

5. *Should further areas be added to the designated DMAs and if so which areas?*

**Response:**

No.

6. *Should further DMA rules be introduced? If so, what should the rules specify? Should these be tailored to each particular DMA?*



**Response:**

No. The rules for Metropolitan Auckland could possibly be strengthened, but others should be left as is.

*7. Should any DMA specific rules be applied to new licences only or also apply to existing licences? If existing licences become subject to the new rules, how should the transition be managed?*

**Response:**

New licences only.

## 2.4. Interference evaluation method for Digital Microwave Radio (DMR)

*8. Should the current '1 dB interference threshold degradation' method prescribed in Section 4.3 'Co-channel interference threshold' of PIB 38 be retained or replaced with a carrier to interference method? Please provide information on why the method should be changed and the increased spectral efficiency over the current 1 dB threshold degradation method expected to result from the change.*

**Response:**

Retain the 1dB interference threshold method.

*9. If the method is changed to a carrier to interference method, how should this be implemented?*

**Response:**

No. There is little information regarding carrier to interference methods for different models of radio available. It is different for different modulation and error correction schemes.

## 2.5. Adjacent channel interference criteria

*10. Are the Frequency Dependent Rejection values in PIB 38 appropriate? If not, what should these values be? Should there be different values for different bands?*

**Response:**

From our experience, the values mentioned PIB 38 are appropriate.

## 2.6. Equipment standards

*11. Should the Ministry implement equipment standards for fixed services above 1 GHz? If so, what standard should be specified?*

**Response:**

Yes, quality standards for equipment should be introduced so as to allow appropriate co-ordination between services. The suggested European standard EN 302 217-2 is probably suitable

## 2.7. Necessary bandwidth and channel widths for digital services

*12. Should the Ministry adjust the general licencing conditions for digital services to ensure licences better reflect occupied bandwidth in the microwave bands?*

**Response:**

Yes, adopt a standard, compliance with ITU-R F.1191 should be suitable as suggested.

## 2.8. Information on licence records

13. *Is inaccurate information on licences a significant issue for AREs and ARCs and licensees? If so, how should the Ministry respond to the issue?*

### Response:

Inaccurate information can be an issue. ARE/ARCs can only design with the information that is in the RSM database. They cannot be held liable for any adverse effects resulting from inaccurate information. ARE/ARC's should be required to complete critical information. Audits should be carried out to ensure this occurs. Before certifying a new licence ARE/ARC's must assemble all the relevant information and ensure all relevant fields are filled.

## 2.9. Transition of spectrum to the management rights regime

14. *Should the Crown consider creating management rights for bands where there is predominantly a single licensee? If so, are there other criteria that should be met before a management right is created for fixed service bands?*

### Response:

No, they should remain in the Radio Licensing Regime. Over time technology changes and the fortunes and structures of companies change. In the example of the 5GHz band, Kordia, being an SOE, could have a change of structure or ownership. There should also be a policy of "use it or lose it" to licences where equipment has been decommissioned but licences retained to safeguard future requirements. This disadvantages new operators who are not able to access unused spectrum.

15. *If spectrum is transferred into the management rights regime, should it be managed by the Crown or allocated to a private manager? If allocated to a private manager, should the allocation be by contestable means or to the predominant user?*

### Response:

It should not be transferred to a management Right, either Crown or privately managed.

## 2.10. Channel widths

16. *Should the Ministry apply consistent channel sizes across specified frequency ranges in fixed service bands? If so, what should be the basis for these channel sizes? Should channel sizes be based on the preferred channel width shown in Table 3?*

### Response:

Yes and Yes

## 2.11. Band renaming

17. *Should the Ministry rename bands that are currently prefixed with letters, by numbers representing their approximate frequency of operation?*

### Response:

Renaming bands could cause confusion between existing allocations and new ones. Unless there is a compelling reason to change they should remain as is.

## 3.1. ISTL, JKSTL, KL and K STL bands

18. *Should digital services be permitted in STL bands? If so, should digital and analogue services be permitted or should all existing analogue services be required to transition to digital?*

### Response:

We suggest both digital and analogue services should be permitted in the same STL band, but the views of Broadcasters should be sought.

19. *Should a minimum link distance be specified for STLs in some bands for current and / or future links? If so, which bands should have the minimum link distance specified?*

**Response:**

Bands below 1GHz should not be used for distances less than 5km

20. *Should no new dual mono STL services be allowed? If not, should the Ministry transition users from dual mono services to digital links?*

**Response:**

Yes, no new services. Existing users should remain until they require any change to their licence.

21. *If the Ministry allows digital licences in the STL bands, should any broadcaster that transmits more than 3 programmes between a studio and broadcasting site be required to use a 500 kHz channel digital STL and those broadcasting a single programme be required to use a 250 kHz channel digital STL?*

**Response:**

Yes.

22. *Should a limit of three STL licences (via a combination of analogue and digital transmissions) at any single location be introduced for any single licensee? If so, should this be limited to congested sites only? If so, which ones? Should these limits apply retrospectively to current licences or should they only apply for new licences. Should the limits apply once any licence holder applies to make a change to any one licence at a site?*

**Response:**

Yes, apply to congested sites only, the ones already identified, i.e. Skytower etc.  
Only new licences and those wanting to make a change.

23. *How should the Ministry manage the timing and introduction of any changes to STL services? How should each of the five proposals above be managed?*

**Response:**

This is outside our field of experience. There should be consultation with broadcasting associations.

### 3.2. EE Band

24. *Are there any issues with the current band plan, use of, or future demands for the EE band?*

**Response:**

We would recommend that fixed services be removed from this band to ensure additional capacity for landmobile services.

### 3.3. I Band

25. *Should the Ministry offer 100 kHz channels in the I band (Group G) which interleave with the current 50 kHz channel plan? If not, how should the channel plan be amended, if at all?*

**Response:**

We recommend option 2, i.e. introduce 100 kHz channels overlaid onto the 50 kHz 'G' group, but also retain the 50 kHz channelling.

### 3.4. J Band

26. *Should the Ministry offer 100 kHz channels in the J band (Group D) which interleave with the current 50 kHz channel plan? If not, how should the channel plan be amended, if at all?*

**Response:**

We recommend option 2, i.e. introduce 100 kHz channels overlaid onto the 50 kHz 'G' group, but also retain the 50 kHz channelling.

### 3.5. JL band

27. *Are there any issues with the current band plan, use of, or future demands for the JL band?*

**Response:**

We are not aware of particular issues. We expect more uptake with the introduction of more spectrally efficient narrow band digital equipment reaching the market.

### 3.6. KK Band

28. *Are there any issues with the current band plan, use of, or future demands for the KK band?*

**Response:**

We are not aware of any issues and would recommend that the band remain as it is, including keeping the spectral efficiency as it is.

### 3.7. L Band

29. *What services should L band be used for in the future? Why?*

**Response:**

We consider this band to be ideal for long distance, point to point linking for landmobile. We would expect that spectrum should become available as multi-access radio systems are decommissioned with expanding broadband services.

### 3.8. 5 GHz Band

30. *Are there any issues with the current band plan, use of, or future demands for the 5 GHz band?*

**Response:**

There are no issues that we are aware of, but the band should be kept in the Radio Licensing Regime to ensure flexibility with technology changes, company operations etc. If services are discontinued, then licences should be cancelled. As with the T band, the N+1 designation should be reviewed.

### 3.9. P Band

31. *Do you have comments on the current coordination process or possible future demands for services in the P band?*

**Response:**

No.

### 3.10. R Band

32. *Should the Ministry adopt 28 MHz channelling for the R band?*

**Response:**

Yes. There should also be rationalisation of the Rx and RAX interleaved channels when licences are changed to 28 MHz.

33. *If the Ministry is to adopt 28 MHz channelling, should this be applied to new licences only or should all existing licences be required to transition to the new channelling? How long a timeframe should be allowed for the transition?*

**Response:**

Initially new licences only, but with existing licences to change over a gazetted period of time. At the same time the interleaved channels could be discontinued.

### 3.11. T Band

34. *Is the N+1 designation still required for efficient use of T band?*

**Response:**

No, it limits availability to large telcos.

35. *Should the redundant TA channels be removed from the channel plan for the T band?*

**Response:**

Yes.

36. *Should the Ministry consider rechanneling the T band to 14 MHz channel widths? If not, why not?*

**Response:**

This should be investigated

### 3.12. V Band

37. *Should new 56 MHz channels V23A (7110.5 MHz) and V23A# (7341.5 MHz) be created? If so, could the new 56 MHz channels coexist with the TVOB channels currently in place? What would be an acceptable coordination policy if this were to occur? Should the new 56 MHz channels be available only on a non-interference basis?*

**Response:**

Yes, it should be considered.

It should be on a non-interference basis and only licensed on areas outside the main centres. While we understand TVOB sometimes operates in the rural areas, they could use alternate channels at those few locations

38. *Can existing demand for the TVOB channels in V band be accommodated on other TVOB channels?*

**Response:**

No comment.

### 3.13. U, W and Y bands

39. *Do you have comments on the current coordination process or possible future demands for services in the U band?*

**Response:**

No, it seems satisfactory as is.

40. Should W band be rechanneled to enable either 28 MHz, 40 MHz, or 56 MHz channelling to enable new services? Which channel size is preferred? Why?

**Response:**

28MHz and 56MHz. Having 40 MHz channels would make co-ordination with 28MHz channels difficult and should not be implemented.

41. Should the Yx channels be disestablished from the Y band channel plan, enabling the current dominant channel plan (YxA) to become the single channel plan for Y band?

**Response:**

Yes

42. Should the Y band have an additional 56 MHz allocation added to the current YxA 28 MHz channel plan?

**Response:**

Yes, if possible.

43. Should the band boundaries be realigned to match ITU-R F.386, by adjusting the U / W boundary at 7.730 GHz down to 7.725 GHz, and by adjusting the W / Y boundary from 8.290 GHz to 8.275 GHz?

**Response:**

Yes.

### 3.14. H band

44. Should the Ministry offer a 14 MHz channel plan for H band and migrate users away from 21 MHz channelling?

**Response:**

Yes

45. Should the band be reallocated to a different service or use? If so, what other services or uses should be allocated to the H band?

**Response:**

We are not aware of any alternative service that would readily use this band.

### 3.15. Z band

46. Should the Z band channel plan be changed to 28 MHz channels? If not, why not?

**Response:**

Yes but 56 MHz channels must also be made available to allow existing users to transition 40 MHz channels to 56 MHz over a designated time. No new 40 MHz channels should be allocated.

47. If a 28 MHz channel is adopted, should the Ministry also adopt a 56 MHz channel plan?

**Response:**

Yes. See above

48. *If the band is rechanneled, should incumbent licensees be required to transition to the new band plan?*

**Response:**

We are very mindful of the impact on existing users who require the wider bandwidth to achieve required throughput. See 46 above. Any required transition should be over a period of at least 5 years.

### 3.16. G band

49. *Are there any issues with the current band plan, use of, or future demands for the G band?*

**Response:**

Not that we are aware of.

### 3.17. X band

50. *Should the Ministry introduce an additional 56 MHz channel to the X band, or should it remain unavailable for assignment?*

**Response:**

It should be introduced if at all possible, but it may need to have some geographic limitations.

### 3.18. 18 and 23 GHz bands

51. *Should the Ministry facilitate in any specific way the development of satellite services in the Ka band? For example, should the Ministry consider early clearances of some fixed services in either the 18 or 23 GHz bands?*

**Response:**

No, we don't think there should be any significant changes until usage and requirements for satellite services is clearer. It is already difficult to get assignments in this band.

52. *Should the Ministry remove the underutilised 3.5 and 7 MHz channels from the 23 GHz channel plan?*

**Response:**

Close the band to new 3.5 and 7 MHz licences but allow existing incumbents to remain.

### 3.19. 38 GHz band

53. *Are there any issues with the current band plan, use of, or future demands for the 38 GHz band?*

**Response:**

There are no issues that we are aware of.

### 3.20. 70 – 80 GHz band

54. *Should the Ministry move the licensing regime for the 70 – 80 GHz band from administrative licencing to a New Zealand general user radio licence?*

**Response:**

Not at this point in time. Watch should be kept on OFCOM developments to assess which of their two options deliver the best economic return and creates the least administrative overhead and issues for all parties involved. Once there is a better understanding of the effects of the OFCOM changes, the question should be reconsidered.