**Building Communication Networks**
**Fibre - Wireless for Data - Internet – Subdivisions**

Response to

Managed Spectrum Park

Review and Regional / Non - National Allocation

# Discussion document June 2021

**Prepared by**

**Trevor Fulton** | Manager

**M**: 0274-322-125 **D**: +64 3 218-4489    **E**: trevor@velocitynet.co.nz
**P**: 03-215-4026 **W**: velocitynet.co.nz
**Postal** Box 5153  **A:**18 Bond Street Invercargill                    13.07.2021

# Discussion document  June 2021

To be submitted by 17:00 13.07.2021

As discussed by telephone I Trevor Fulton / We Velocitynet make this submission in response to the dilemma that the MSP has become through what I suspect amounts to greed.

We are an end user and not Radio Engineers and to further compound our experiences we are largely underpopulated and I have no experience to date of the competitive nature of the processes that have led to the necessity of what appears to be a great opportunity to maximise the spectrum commodity.

We are a WISP and for clarity I am also a member of our governing committee.

Having spoken to David (RSM) on the odd occasion I have expressed a willingness for WISPA to explore any opportunity that might become available to self-govern any allocation that might ever be made to regional operators.
To date our discussions have been very favourable, and we see an opportunity to ensure any allocation is used to the fullest extent.

Within my response I have endeavoured to be pragmatic and consider the implications for all parties.
I feel the intent was well founded, and we have only a fleeting knowledge of what's around the corner that will need radio communication. If we can work collaboratively on the MSP it may well be the basis of further allocations across the Spectrum which we hope will repair the previous hording and underutilisation of this finite resource.

---

> **Question 1:**
> **Do you think that co-operation is feasible in the Managed Spectrum Park?**

Should any entity be allocated spectrum be required to publish the location and deployment details into a Central repository. This detail might include Antenna details and propagation modelling.
   a) The Governing body (RSM) will gain an accurate overview of any deployment
   b) Another potential user could then ascertain the possible utilisation of any spectrum underutilised.

Currently I see the allocation is done on LTA boundaries which considering the unruly behaviour of a radio transmission I find this rather amusing. "Thou shall not travel past here"

I have no experience within the MSP of a competing allocation but I would hope we have enough resolve to work it out.
Would it be feasible to allocate the $1^{st}$ ½  for a predetermined time and only then the $2^{nd}$ ½ could be applied for by the incumbent. This allocation would once again need to be published proving the use as in the initial application. This would hopefully ensure full use of the spectrum.

Any further application with another operator would be over the $2^{nd}$ ½ only allowing the governing body to make a decision.
Under the current allocation this would always ensure the incumbent's reduction was not below 20MHz for any deployment.

> **Question 2: When considering MSP spectrum allocations, what allocation method(s) would be preferable to you?**

a) As above First in seems appropriate, in my situation the full 40 MHz obviously allows for a greater opportunities however your necessity for this review shows there are issues.

Accordingly referring to my Q1 response if there is no competing application made within the predetermined time.

b) Should any allocation holder become an associate party to another holder then the combined allocation should be considered as one. In this way another Non associated party may then make application for the 2$^{nd}$ ½ of the allocated bandwidth. This would assist in ensuring monopolistic or predatory actions do not prevent a fair distribution.

c) Defining associated parties would need a some thought and a concise repertoire of possibilities may need to be detailed.

> **Question 3: What are your thoughts on the level of technical requirements/rules in relation to MSP licences?**

I'm not an A.R.E. so my comments are not technical in any way

Radio Transmitter
- Make and Model
- Height above Ground if antenna is integral
- Power Level
- Antenna Type
- Radiation Pattern
- Height above ground
- Azimuth
- Proof of Non-interference by TDD synchronisation

Perhaps even The **Purpose of Connection** *this may become an important element in any frequency rebalancing that may be required*

> **Question 4: What are your thoughts on the best method(s) for future regional/non-national spectrum allocations?**

The MSP Model seems to be fair and provides an equivalence that seems remote in many other facets of Spectrum allocation.

To ensure that regional operators are not disadvantaged by the larger corporate operators is a double edged sword for the Crown.
We have been discussing the possibility of entering the mix for spectrum allocations that are impending that suit the business models of WISP's.
This would require the support of the Crown in entering into a long term financial agreement with the applicant to facilitate a loan / repayment.
The benefit is a thorough use of the spectrum allocated, and the moderating effect on the overall allocation that an additional operator in the market would facilitate.

> **Question 5:  Should priority be given to incumbents over new entrants?**

Yes that should be the case, with reservations.
Only ½ is up for reallocation.
The new applicant must present the business case that shows ineffective or inefficient use of that 2$^{nd}$ ½ by the incumbent.
If successful the new applicant has a finite time to meet the obligations under Q2 & Q3. Should the applicant not meet those obligations the reallocated portion can be returned to the incumbent. Whilst this ½ might possibly see / saw , it is returning a fee, and hopefully being reutilised.

> **Question 6: Is the market big enough to support sub-regional competition?**

In some areas of the Country I should say absolutely
In other such as ours ( Southland) possibly not.
But geographic and population based models arbitrarily enforced might prove problematic and be deemed unfair.

From my position we have no experience but I would expect that whilst not welcoming a cut in an allocation we would facilitate the intrusion provided the equipment met the non-interference rules applied.

> **Question 7: Should spectrum allocation rules be used to limit consolidation (mergers or take-overs) of regional players?**

Absolutely as per previous any amalgamation would result in ½ the spectrum becoming immediately available for a competing applicant.
A concise register of the allocations could perhaps be created within the governing body's documentation would allow for ease of a new applicant gaining the details of the existing licence holders details.
In this way preliminary discussions may be able to satisfy both parties needs and assist in the distribution.

> **Question 8: What are your thoughts on how to protect regional rights for regional use?**

I believe the existing Model is if structured as intended a desirable means of Spectrum allocation.
It does encourage full utilisation of a particular resource.
National allocations have proven to be in many cases poorly utilised in many districts, the MSP model addresses this in the best way I can envisage. National Players have an allocation and the regional players have theirs.
Only say 15 years ago the thought of regional telecommunication operators was in infancy.
The formation of WISPA NZ has dramatically changed that landscape, and at this point the regional operators operating within the spectrum are well entrenched.
A continuance of a Regional non-transferable allocation seems sensible.
Little change is required other than documentation of the existing rights Q3 and the availability of those details  as per Q7.