



Digicel Response to the Public Consultation

By

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

On

Satellite Spectrum and Licensing Framework, Including NGSO Broadband, Direct to-Device Services and Satellite Earth Stations

Publication Date: July 6, 2026

Closing Date: August 14, 2026

We thank the Public Utilities Commission of Anguilla for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Satellite Licensing framework in Anguilla. Wireless (Ventures) Anguilla Limited and Caribbean Cable Communications Anguilla Limited ('Digicel') respectfully submit its comments and responses on the public consultation "Satellite Spectrum and Licensing Framework, Including NGSO Broadband, Direct to-Device Services and Satellite Earth Stations", published on July 6, 2026.

The views submitted herein are not exhaustive and Digicel's decision not to respond to any particular issue(s) raised in this consultation paper or any particular issue(s) raised by any party relating to the subject matter does not generally represent agreement in whole or in part, nor does any position taken by Digicel in this document represent a waiver or concession of any sort of Digicel's rights in any way.

Please do not hesitate to refer any questions or remarks that may arise as a result of the subsequent overview to: -

Name: Ms. Sharo-Ann Chisholm

Designation: Legal & Regulatory Director

Organization: Wireless Ventures (Anguilla) Limited, Caribbean Cable Communications Anguilla Limited

Email: sharo-ann.chisholm@digicelgroup.com

Q.1. Do respondents agree with the Commission's proposed objectives and principles for satellite regulation in Anguilla?

Digicel supports the Commission's intention to establish a forward-looking regime for the provision of new technologies such as satellite-based services. We also acknowledge the relevance of principles of adaptability, transparency, sustainability and enabling environment conducive to co-existence with extant terrestrial services in relevant jurisdictions.

As new technologies emerge, all players, including satellite operators should operate under an equitable and balanced regulatory regime with a significant degree of regulatory certainty.

Terrestrial mobile network operators have collectively invested billions in terrestrial infrastructure, spectrum acquisition, skilled workers and compliance with service obligations premised on the understanding that all providers would be subject to comparable legal and regulatory frameworks. Establishing a parallel licensing framework tailored to a specific technology segment, particularly one predominantly operated by foreign-based entities, is tantamount to devaluing those sunk investments, disincentivizes future investment and destabilizes regulatory parity.

Q.2. Should the Commission prioritize particular satellite use cases? If so, please rank them and provide reasons.

Digicel submits that the Commission should prioritize satellite use cases in the following order: Case 1, followed by Case 3 and then Case 2, as described by the consultation paper.

- *Use Case 1: NGSO satellite public internet access using stationary user terminals (ie User Terminals classed as Fixed Satellite Service (FSS)) using the Ku and Ka bands¹.*
- *Use case 1 should be prioritized first because the FSS terminals will operate in dedicated ku/ka bands of spectrum with no interaction with spectrum assigned to terrestrial operators in the IMT/mobile assignments. Therefore, the Satellite operators would not need to compete with Terrestrial MNOs for spectrum.*
- *Case 3: NGSO satellite public voice and lower data rate access using smartphones and other mobile devices ie devices in MSS bands identified by 3GPP for non-terrestrial networks but outside bands identified for IMT².*

Case 3 uses MSS spectrum outside the IMT band plan, it does not raise the same concerns that arise when a satellite operator seeks to use spectrum for which an MNO already holds exclusive rights.

¹ Public Utilities Commission, Satellite Spectrum and Licensing Framework, Including NGSO Broadband, Direct to-Device Services and Satellite Earth Stations, (Consultation Paper PN 02/2026, 2026)

² Public Utilities Commission, Satellite Spectrum and Licensing Framework, Including NGSO Broadband, Direct to-Device Services and Satellite Earth Stations, (Consultation Paper PN 02/2026, 2026)

- *Case 2: NGSO satellite public voice and lower data rate access using smartphones and other mobile devices ie devices in the Mobile Satellite Service (MSS) using the licence and frequency authorization of an existing Mobile Network Operator. In other words, satellite operators would provide services to the MNO under a commercial contract³.*

Digicel does not oppose Case 2 but is of the view that it should be the lowest ranked since it is contingent on a commercial arrangement with the Mobile Network Operator (MNO). Case 2 may not require the Commission to prioritize or actively facilitate this as opposed to Cases 1 and 3.

Q.3. Do respondents believe that there is any significant risk from interference between the satellite bands proposed and terrestrial services or any other interference. If so, what mitigating measures are necessary beyond what is already stipulated in the Radio Regulations and 3GPP NTN standards?

Digicel does not anticipate any significant interference between the proposed satellite bands proposed and terrestrial services. Expected risks are as outlined in table 3 in PN2026. Provided that all operators are compliant with ITU regulations, no interference is expected.

It is cautioned however that the risk of interference is incumbent on the practical implementation and monitoring of satellite bands by the PUC.

Q.4 Do you agree with these Ku-Band and Ka Band proposals? If not, please provide alternative proposals with justifications.

Digicel has no objections to the Ku-Band and Ka Band proposals.

Q.5. Do you agree with the proposed V, E and W band allocations and the terms on which they can be used, or are there other uses to which some of this spectrum should be put such as terrestrial microwave to the exclusion of satellite services? Provide justifications for your answers.

Digicel has no objections to the proposed V, E and W band allocations and the terms on which they can be used.

The proposed use aligns with the international best practice for Satellite band allocations.

Q.6. Are there existing terrestrial fixed links, mobile networks, broadcasting systems, government systems, aviation/maritime systems or other services in Anguilla that may be affected by use of the proposed satellite bands? Please identify the frequencies, locations, technical characteristics and likely interference mechanisms.

³ Public Utilities Commission, Satellite Spectrum and Licensing Framework, Including NGSO Broadband, Direct to-Device Services and Satellite Earth Stations, (Consultation Paper PN 02/2026, 2026)

Our exposure falls into two categories:

- 1) Registered point-to-point microwave backhaul links; and
- 2) Our IMT mobile network, including any spectrum made available for D2D.

For microwave links, the risk is out-of-band or sidelobe emissions from high-power earth stations, particularly E-band and W-band gateways, illuminating a registered receive antenna near the earth station's line of sight and degrading fade margin.

In terms of our mobile network, the more significant risk arises where D2D shares our own licensed IMT spectrum, creating co-channel or adjacent-channel interference through near-far effects on the uplink and aggregate downlink PFD on the downlink. Because this second exposure applies across our network footprint rather than at fixed locations, we do not think site-specific detail is the right tool for it.

Q.7. Should the Commission require satellite applicants to submit an Anguilla-specific interference assessment before authorization? If so, what should that assessment include?

Yes, the commission should require satellite applicants to submit an Anguilla-specific interference assessment prior to authorization and we consider this the most important issue in this consultation.

The draft framework makes the MNO responsible for ensuring no harmful interference occurs from D2D services in its own spectrum but gives the MNO no practical way to verify compliance: base stations report interference as degraded performance, not by source, and MNOs do not have calibrated PFD measurement equipment or access to satellite pass data.

We therefore ask that the assessment require satellite operators to submit pre-launch, site-representative PFD/EPFD compliance data for Anguilla, and to provide ongoing access to satellite pass-schedule and beam-activation data so that any reported interference event can be time-correlated to a satellite pass.

A defined attribution and escalation protocol should be agreed before commercial launch, covering investigation responsibility, evidence standards and response timeframes. Absent these elements, we ask that the MNO's obligation under Annex 2 be limited to acting on a determination of interference made by the Commission or supported by satellite-operator telemetry, rather than requiring the MNO to independently detect and prove it.

Q.8. Should gateway earth stations (larger stations that aggregate traffic rather than being user specific) be subject to site-specific coordination zones, exclusion zones, registration, public notice, or neighbour-jurisdiction coordination before deployment?

Gateway earth stations should be subject to site-specific coordination zones, registration, public notice or neighbour-jurisdiction coordination before deployment. Consistent with the Commission's

own recognition that gateway and large earth stations carry materially greater interference potential than user terminals. Coordination and exclusion zones should be calculated against the Commission's actual current terrestrial link and mobile site register rather than generic distances, and we support a minimum 30-day public notice period before commissioning, mirroring the notice period the Commission has proposed for itself.

A registration system accessible to affected licensees would let us check proposed builds against existing and pending earth stations, and vice versa for satellite operators against our registered links. We also ask that coordination data be treated as living rather than one-off: any material change to a commissioned station, such as a power increase or new beam pattern, should trigger re-notification and reassessment.

Q.9. Do you agree with this framework for satellite licensing and authorization? If you have alternative proposals, please provide explanations and justifications.

Digicel agrees with the framework in principle but propose certain modifications to ensure parity between satellite and terrestrial operators, consistent with the licensing-parity principle applied elsewhere in this submission.

Satellite operators providing services to Anguillan consumers or business whether directly or via D2D arrangement with a licensed MNO, should be subject to a local legal presence requirement, or, at minimum a locally registered agent with authority to accept service and respond to regulatory requests. Absent such a requirement, satellite operators would gain the benefit of access to the Anguillan market without the corresponding compliance and investment burden borne by terrestrial licensees, contrary to the object of the PUC to level the playing field.

Q.10 Do you agree with the information requirements for applications for large and high-power earth stations?

Digicel has no difficulty with the proposed information requirements for applications for large and high-power earth stations.

Q.11 Do respondents agree that MNOs should be permitted to provide satellite services using spectrum already assigned to them? If not please explain why not with justifications.

Digicel agrees that Mobile Network Operators (MNOs) should be permitted to provide satellite services, including D2D services, using spectrum already assigned to them, subject to appropriate technical co-ordination safeguards.

Where an MNO holds a valid terrestrial spectrum assignment, the right to deploy that spectrum for satellite to device or D2D applications should be treated as a derivative use for the existing licence rather than requiring a separate authorization.

Permitting MNOs to use their own assigned spectrum for satellite services ensures regulatory parity between MNOs and independent satellite D2D operators, who may otherwise be seeking access to the same or adjacent bands without the same existing regulatory obligations such as coverage and consumer protection.

Technical co-ordination is critical, considering that the typical cell radius for D2D cells ranges from 30 to 50km, a single cell would cover the entire island of Anguilla (which is less than 30km end to end)⁴. This raises a material risk of spillover unto the neighbouring island to the south of Anguilla.

To completely rule out interference, coordination efforts would be required between the regulator of Anguilla and the regulators of the neighbouring islands, where spectrum broadcast from the D2D service provider could not be utilized for terrestrial transmission by the Mobile Network Operators (MNOs) of either island that is likely to fall in the path of the D2D's cells.

Digicel accordingly urges the PUC to adopt the position by their fellow regulator in the Caribbean, Turks and Caicos Islands Telecommunications Commission (TCIC) regarding the partnership by terrestrial and satellite operators in the provisioning of Satellite D2D services.

See the quote below extracted from the final decision of the TCIC:

“Accordingly, the Commission determines the following.

- 1. Satellite operators providing direct-to-device services utilizing terrestrial mobile spectrum (IMT bands) must operate in partnership with a licensed Mobile Network Operator within the Turks and Caicos Islands.*
- 2. Such partnerships shall ensure that the use of terrestrial mobile spectrum remains consistent with national spectrum authorization frameworks and that satellite-based services are integrated with the domestic mobile telecommunications network.*
- 3. The Commission emphasizes that independent direct-to-device services under MSS spectrum are not authorized at this time. The Commission reserves the right, in its sole discretion, to determine, establish, review, and revise the regulatory conditions, licensing requirements, and fee structures applicable to such services as part of its broader spectrum management and licensing framework, taking into account international*

⁴ (Anguilla | Caribbean Island paradise & British overseas territory | Britannica)
<<https://www.britannica.com/place/Anguilla-island-West-Indies>> accessed 14 August 2026

regulatory developments, technological advancements, and the potential impact of such services on the telecommunications market in the Turks and Caicos Islands. Should such services be authorized in the future, they will be subject to licensing conditions, regulatory obligations, and fee structures distinct from those applicable to Fixed Satellite Service (FSS) operations.

The Commission considers that this approach provides a balanced and proportionate framework that supports technological innovation while ensuring fair competition and effective spectrum management⁵”.

The PUC should also undertake the requisite market competition analysis and assessments (i.e., market definition/dominance) to address any observed anti-competitive behaviour.

Q.12 Do respondents agree that these power limits are appropriate and if not what is the alternative bearing in mind the impact on service quality? Please provide justifications for your answers.

Digicel agrees that power limits are necessary to prevent harmful interference between satellite and terrestrial services but submits that the PUC should not impose power limits independent of or more restrictive than the framework already established under the ITU Radio Regulations.

Q.13 Do respondents agree that a minimum elevation angle of 10° is appropriate and if not what is the alternative bearing in mind the constraints on coverage that would result if the angle were to be made larger. Please provide justifications for your answers.

Digicel agrees that an elevation angle of 10° will work in some instances, consistent with international best practice. However, the framework should have regard to angular differences between neighboring sites at different altitudes and structural heights.

The ITU-R terrestrial propagation methodologies⁶ recognize the importance of antenna height, terrain, clutter and terrain clearance angles in assessing radio propagation and coverage.

It is Digicel’s position that the appropriate approach would therefore be to establish 10 degrees as the general planning criterion, which permits variation to the elevation angle where a licensee can demonstrate that this is necessary to maintain coverage and does not result in unacceptable interference.

⁵ Telecommunications Commission (Turks and Caicos Islands), ‘Decision Notice 2026-02: Final Decision on the Regulatory Framework for Satellite Network/Service Licensing, Spectrum Licensing and Fee Structure’ (20 March 2026) 7

⁶ International Telecommunication Union, *Guide to the application of the propagation methods of Radiocommunication Study Group 3*, Recommendation ITU-R P.1144-8 (June 2017) https://www.itu.int/dms_pubrec/itu-r/rec/p/R-REC-P.1144-8-201706-S!!PDF-E.pdf

Q.14 Should D2D services in shared 3GPP NTN bands outside IMT spectrum be subject to the same interconnection, quality-of-service and other obligations as terrestrial mobile services? If not, which obligations should be change/removed/modified?

D2D services in bands outside IMT should be subject to the same interconnection, quality of service and other obligations applicable to terrestrial operators.

Q.15 What emergency calling obligations should apply to D2D services in Anguilla?

The same emergency calling obligations applicable to MNOs should equitably apply to D2D providers.

During periods of public emergency, D2D service providers should be mandated to ensure the continuity of service during force majeure events in line with section 53 (5) of the Telecommunications Act⁷. Providers must enable emergency calling and routing even where such use falls outside normal licence conditions.

Consistent with section 53(4) of the Telecommunications Act⁸, D2D networks should also be capable of prioritizing government communications where directed by the governor, including communications required by Government agencies and first responders during an emergency. Such priority should take precedence over all other traffic to the extent required to support public safety.

Q.16 Do you agree with our proposals for E-band? If not, please provide comments with justifications.

Digicel has no objection to the proposals for E-Band.

Q.17. Do you agree with our proposals for W-band? If not, please provide comments with justifications.

Digicel has no objection to the proposals for W-Band.

Q.18. Do you agree with this telecommunications licensing fee approach? If not, what are the alternatives given the existing legislative requirements?

Digicel supports the Commission's non-discrimination mandate and agrees that NGSO satellite operators providing broadband services in competition with terrestrial mobile, fixed wireless, and fibre offerings should be subject to the same fee-setting methodology as terrestrial licensees not a preferential regime justified merely by delivery mechanism.

⁷ Telecommunications Act, Revised Statutes of Anguilla, c. T6, s. 53.

⁸ Telecommunications Act, Revised Statutes of Anguilla, c. T6, s. 54.

Q.19 Do you agree with this spectrum authorization fee approach? If not, please provide alternative proposals with justifications.

Digicel agrees in principle with the PUC's proposal to apply a flat, per -band annual fee for shared spectrum bands used for satellite services. However, Digicel proposes the following for the Commission's consideration

The PUC ought to clarify how spectrum pricing will operate in circumstances where spectrum will be shared with MNOs. It is further posited that the C\$10,000 per band annual fee applies to only shared bands (KU or Ka and non-IMT 3GPP NTN bands) accessed by satellite operators independently

Digicel cautions against the creation of duplicative fee structure for MNOs using its already licensed IMT spectrum. For which spectrum fees already payable under its existing frequency authorization.

Further Digicel is of the view that a single EC\$10,000 fee applied uniformly across Ku, Ka, V, E, W and non-IMT NTN bands does not reflect the commercial value of these bands. Instead, Digicel proposes a tiered fee structure that reflect the commercial utility of the bands.

Question 20. Please provide any other comments you have on the consultation as a whole including supporting evidence where available and provide justifications.

The introduction of satellite-based internet services into Anguilla will have significant implications for both existing telecommunications providers and consumers. While technological advancement and innovation are welcome, it is imperative that such services are introduced in a manner that preserves fair competition, safeguards national investment, and protects consumers from fragmented or unregulated service environments.

Digicel urges the PUC to consider the following:

1. Disruption without a level playing field will undermine existing suppliers:

Mobile and fixed broadband operators have collectively made substantive investments in:

- Spectrum acquisition and licence fees
- National network infrastructure (towers, fibre, microwave backhaul)
- Universal service obligations and public safety infrastructure
- Local employment, retail, and customer support networks

If satellite-based services are allowed to enter the market without equivalent licensing, regulatory obligations, or financial contributions, this would represent a serious distortion of competition. It would effectively reward offshore or asset-light providers while penalizing those who have built and sustained the national communications infrastructure.

This form of regulatory asymmetry would not only destabilize current operators' business models, but also disincentivize future investment in infrastructure upgrades, rural expansion, and service quality improvements.

2. Satellite Services may fragment the Consumer Experience

While satellite internet may offer basic connectivity in remote areas, it poses several challenges from a consumer perspective:

- Higher latency compared to terrestrial networks, impacting real-time applications

like video conferencing, gaming, and VoIP

- Unclear consumer protections, particularly where the provider lacks a local presence

- Lack of integration with national emergency services, early warning systems, or

lawful intercept frameworks

- Potentially higher prices, particularly where foreign currency billing or dynamic

pricing models are used.

3. Market Entry must be fair, structured, and fully regulated

We do not oppose the introduction of satellite services per se, but we insist that their entry be governed by:

- Full licensing with equivalent financial and regulatory obligations

- Enforceable consumer protection standards

- Participation in national infrastructure obligations (e.g. infrastructure sharing/access

emergency services)

- Transparency in pricing, data usage policies, and customer service standards

Without these, the impact on existing operators will be harmful, and the benefits to consumers will be unreliable and potentially short-lived. We urge the Commission to adopt a cautious, structured, and enforcement-led approach that ensures satellite providers are held to the same standards as terrestrial operators.

We wish to also state the following:

- All Satellite providers should be mandated to submit an interference report prior to commercial launch

- Any and all satellite telecommunication service providers may be required to

block/throttle devices being used to access their satellite services.

- Any and all satellite telecommunications service providers must declare revenues

earned in Anguilla and pay the requisite regulatory fees/levies/taxes as at when due.

- The PUC should ensure that all players are operating on a level playing field. A level playing field where operators participating in the same market are subject to the same competitive conditions (i.e., regulatory obligations such as Quality of Service and Consumer Protection).