



COMMERCE COMMISSION

Please refer to:
13.1/J10943
741062_1.doc

Mobile Co-location Conference – Key issues

This document outlines a number of key issues that will be discussed at the Mobile Co-location conference and provides guidance on the types of questions that may be asked. The Commission would like parties to ensure that they have people with relevant expertise and/or technical knowledge at the conference to discuss the issues outlined in this letter, as well as the issues indicated in the agenda. This is a non-exclusive list and additional matters may be raised at the conference.

Unacceptable Performance Degradation

The submissions on the definition of Unacceptable Performance Degradation in the draft STD indicate a range of views on the appropriate total level of loss from the Access Provider's or Existing Co-locator's link budget, and how this loss is to be measured.

The Commission seeks clarification of the calculation of the loss in link budget, and in particular, whether internal interference (I_{int}) should be included in the formula.

The Commission invites further discussion/evidence on the likely impact of a 1.0dB loss in the link budget, as opposed to 0.5dB. Furthermore, the Commission wishes to discuss the significance of the impact of a 1.0dB loss in link budget in a network with overlapping coverage areas, and whether it is appropriate to set different interference thresholds for urban and non-urban areas.

In addition, the Commission would like to discuss submissions on the protection of emergency services and commercial co-locators¹.

Site Alterations

The Commission's preliminary view was that antenna minimisation and antenna rearrangement are valid methods for an Access Seeker to obtain a position on a mast that will result in the required level of coverage.

The Commission notes that some parties have suggested in their submissions that mast replacement, extension or revision should be the preferred solution. The Commission is concerned that this approach will introduce unnecessary delays to the co-location process, where antenna minimisation or rearrangement may prove to be a more efficient and cost-effective option.

¹ Commercial co-locators include those parties who are co-located on an Access Provider's site under separate agreements to this STD.

The Commission also notes submissions that antenna minimisation may prevent the independent configuration of different types of antenna, thereby limiting the optimisation of different network systems, and that the resulting coverage loss is not protected by the definition of Unacceptable Performance Degradation. The Commission would like to discuss this issue further at the conference.

Access Provider forecasting and use of reserved space

The Commission's preliminary view was that a two year forecast horizon for Access Providers combined with the ability for Access Seekers to co-locate during this period would strike an appropriate balance between certainty and flexibility while encouraging quick and efficient co-location.

In light of the submissions received on this issue, the Commission invites discussion at the conference as to whether a five year forecast horizon, when combined with the ability for Access Seekers to co-locate during this period, strikes a more appropriate balance between allowing Access Providers to reserve space for their future deployment plans, and the benefit to end users that will result from allowing a new entrant to co-locate where feasible.

Greenfields Co-location

The Commission's preliminary view was that greenfields sites are within the scope of the description of service in the Act, and that there are public policy justifications for the regulation of greenfields sites. The Commission considers that the service description provides for regulation to *enable* co-location on relevant facilities once those facilities are used for mobile transmission, which may require steps to be taken prior to those facilities 'going live'.

However, the Commission notes that a number of parties have submitted that there are significant practical difficulties associated with the regulation of greenfields sites. These practical difficulties may indicate that a mandatory greenfields process should not be included as part of the regulated service. The Commission seeks clarification on the practical difficulties associated with a mandatory greenfields process.

The Commission considers that if the greenfields process is to be voluntary, then it may be more appropriate to leave greenfields issues to commercial agreements between Access Seekers and Access Providers rather than include a voluntary process in the standard terms determination. The Commission invites discussion on this point at the conference.

Service levels and penalties

The submissions on service level capacity limits indicate a divergence of views. The Commission seeks further information at the conference on the benefits, costs and practicalities of a service level

capacity limit for each Access Provider of 10 applications per Access Seeker per week, compared to a limit of 15 applications.

A number of submissions were received on the dual penalty regime proposed by the Commission in the draft STD. The Commission is considering the retention of only the penalty for cumulative delay days, on the basis that this more flexible penalty regime better reflects the importance of the various steps required to deliver the mobile co-location service. The Commission invites further discussion on this issue at the conference.

Common Format Site Database

The Commission's preliminary view was that the Common Format Site Database should contain information on all of an Access Provider's Relevant Facilities, rather than only those that are reasonably and/or practicably capable of supporting the Mobile Co-location Service.

The Commission received a number of submissions on the Common Format Site Database. Some submissions expressed the view that the database should be maintained in a common format by each Access Provider, and include only those sites that are reasonably and/or practicably capable of supporting the co-location service. The Commission seeks further discussion at the conference on the scope of sites to be included in the database, including whether buildings and rooftops should be incorporated, and potential implications in terms of cost and time for delivery of the service. The Commission also wishes to discuss whether prioritisation of the inclusion of sites is required in order to ensure that the database is implemented in a timely manner.

The Commission considers that if the database only includes those sites that are reasonably and/or practicably capable of supporting co-location, Access Providers should be obliged to use best endeavours to ensure that database information is both current and accurate.

Implementation timeframes

Based on submissions on the draft STD, the Commission considers that there may be grounds to indicate that further time should be provided for development of the operational support systems and the common format site database.

The Commission's preliminary view that the soft launch should be linked to an initial tranche of applications was based on the length of the end-to-end process required to deliver the co-location service. However, the Commission understands that there may be some benefit in linking the soft launch to applications received over a specified timeframe rather than a number of orders, so as to enable time for changes to be made to processes and systems and to ensure separation of business as usual orders from soft launch orders.

The Commission seeks comment on a possible implementation plan that includes the following key steps:

Determination Date (Day Zero)

Day Zero +10WD	Database and enhancements to operational support systems (OSS) to be complete
Day Zero +15WD	Report on completion of database and OSS enhancements sent to Access Seekers and the Commission
Day Zero +15WD	Access Seekers to submit forecasts for the following 24 months
Day Zero +20WD	Access Seekers may begin submitting orders for Soft Launch. Performance penalties will not apply to these orders
1 st Order + 20WD	Performance penalties to apply to all new orders received after this date
Soft launch +10WD	Report on soft launch sent to the Commission and Access Seekers 10 working days after completion of the applications that are part of the soft launch.

Agreement on charges

The Commission received a number of submissions suggesting that agreement between an Access Provider and Access Seeker on charges should be a pre-requisite for co-location for practical reasons. The Commission considers that these practical considerations are likely to provide grounds to reinstate in the General Terms the requirement that charges be agreed as a pre-requisite to co-location. However, the Commission notes its preliminary view that if it transpires that the service is not being delivered because of a failure to agree on charges, then this would constitute grounds to review the status of Mobile Co-location as a specified service.

Other issues

The Commission may also raise other clarification issues that are not discussed in this paper.