

CABLE AND WIRELESS

Response to Public Utilities Commission (PUC)

Public Notice 2026 – 2

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

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Cable and Wireless (Anguilla) Limited dba Flow is pleased to provide comments and remarks on The Commission's **PN 2026 – 2 Consultation on Satellite Spectrum and Licensing Framework, Including NGSO Broadband, Direct-to-Device Services and Satellite Earth Stations** (the Consultation Document) published July 6, 2026.

1.2 Flow expressly states that failure to address any issue raised in the Consultation Document does not necessarily signify its agreement in whole or in part with any position taken by the Commission or respondents. Flow reserves the right to comment on any issue raised in the Consultation Document at a later date.

1.3 Please send all responses to this Consultation Document and any matters arising to Jade Reymond at jade.reymond@libertycaribbean.com and Melesia Sutherland at melesia.sutherland@libertycaribbean.com.

2. Flow's Response to Commission's Questions

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

- 2.1** The Commission has stated that its objectives are as follows:
- to create a clear and forward-looking regime that is based on the following principles:
 - flexible within existing legislative parameters and capable of adapting to new circumstances so that it supports the rapid deployment of satellite connectivity and competition;
 - transparent to stakeholders including sound consultative practices;
 - proportionate to the risks;
 - non-discriminatory among equally placed parties;
 - technologically neutral except where interference avoidance requires technology specific requirements;
 - investment friendly by providing sufficient regulatory certainty;
 - innovation friendly including regulatory innovation by way of self and co-regulation;
 - supportive of public safety; and,

- one that ensures coexistence with existing terrestrial services and neighbouring jurisdictions.

2.2 Flow supports the thoughtful and robust objectives considered by the Public Utilities Commission (PUC).

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

2.3 Flow considers the following prioritization viable:

- (i) NGSO broadband to static user terminals in Ku/Ka bands (FSS) — highest priority, as it can provide additional broadband coverage, resilience and emergency connectivity with limited interaction with terrestrial mobile spectrum.
- (ii) D2D/D2C using IMT spectrum under the control of the relevant MNO spectrum licensee — high priority for extending coverage into unserved areas and providing resilience during emergencies or terrestrial network outages. Where appropriate, additional suitable spectrum blocks should be considered to facilitate D2C without unnecessarily reducing terrestrial mobile capacity.
- (iii) Gateway and feeder-link earth stations — to support satellite broadband and D2D services where required.
- (iv) D2D/IoT/M2M using 3GPP NTN non-IMT spectrum — appropriate as a medium-term option, subject to demand, applicable regulatory obligations and interference protection requirements.

2.4 Any D2D use of IMT spectrum should remain under the control of the relevant MNO spectrum licensee and no satellite usage should be allowed to interfere with the provision of terrestrial services.

Question 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?

2.5 Flow considers the residual interference risk of satellite services to be real but manageable, dependent on the specific service and frequency band. For NGSO Ku-band operations in 10.7–12.75 GHz, potential coexistence with terrestrial 11 GHz Fixed Service links should be addressed through applicable ITU-R protection criteria and coordination.

2.6 D2D services using IMT spectrum should be assessed separately, including potential co-channel, adjacent-channel and aggregate interference to terrestrial mobile networks. Flow therefore recommends Anguilla-specific interference assessment and coordination where required, together with a clear process for mitigation where harmful interference is identified.

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

2.7 The proposed Ku- and Ka-band proposals are workable, provided that existing terrestrial and satellite services are protected from harmful interference. Particular attention should be given to the 10.7–12.75 GHz Ku-band downlink due to its potential coexistence with 11 GHz terrestrial microwave links. For this range, Flow recommends compliance with the applicable ITU-R protection criteria, including Recommendations ITU-R F.1494 and ITU-R SF.1482.

2.8 For the remaining proposed Ku- and Ka-band ranges, Flow recommends compliance with the applicable ITU Radio Regulations, coordination requirements and relevant ITU-R sharing/protection criteria. Any authorization should ensure the continued protection of existing licensed terrestrial services.

Question 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.

2.9 Proposed use of V-band must be subject to the applicable Radio Regulations, and the temporary use of E- and W-band pending WRC-27. Satellite use should not preclude terrestrial use. E-band in particular (71–76 / 81–86 GHz) is an important resource for high-capacity terrestrial microwave backhaul and must remain available for terrestrial Fixed Service, with satellite deployments subject to appropriate coordination and protection of existing and future terrestrial links.

Question 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.

2.10 Existing terrestrial services that may require protection include fixed point-to-point microwave links, particularly in the 11 GHz range, and terrestrial mobile networks operating in licensed IMT spectrum.

2.11 Potential interference include co-channel and adjacent-channel interference from satellite downlinks or earth-station transmissions into terrestrial receivers. Any D2D/D2C operation in licensed IMT spectrum should therefore be coordinated with the relevant terrestrial spectrum licensee. Operators can provide detailed technical information to the Commission, where required for coordination.

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

2.12 Flow recommends an Anguilla-specific interference assessment where satellite operations may coexist with licensed terrestrial services, particularly for gateway earth stations and other high-power deployments. The assessment should consider co-channel and adjacent-band assignments, PFD/EIRP and applicable ITU protection criteria, antenna characteristics and geometry, aggregate interference

where relevant, and coordination with existing terrestrial services. Cross-border coordination should also be considered.

Question 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?

2.13 Gateway earth stations should be registered and subject to site-specific coordination before deployment. Coordination zones, exclusion zones or other technical restrictions should be applied where justified by the interference assessment. Cross-border coordination should also be required where there is potential impact on neighboring administrations.

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

2.14 The Commission's licence framework seems comprehensive and is usefully presented as modules, allowing operators to choose modules and build the required licence. Flow's only caution is that complexity be minimized, if not avoided. Agreed that the licence application form should specify all licenses available and the applicant should be able to submit a single application.

2.15 Flow's technology neutral Licence allows the Company to offer D2D/ D2C service in Anguilla. The Commission's proposal suggests that Flow would need an additional licence, namely *Individual - Direct-to-Device / Non-Terrestrial Network Using IMT spectrum Supplemental - Satellite Backhaul for Mobile Network Operators*. It does not appear that this should be the case. Nevertheless, should the Commission maintain this approach, then the additional licence should be issued to existing licencees, with technology neutral licences, and subject to agreement of licensees, without need for submission of an application by licensees.

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

2.16 The proposed requirement is good. Applicants should also provide an Anguilla-specific interference and coordination assessment considering existing terrestrial services and neighbouring jurisdictions. Any required mitigation should be determined through the coordination study and may include operational or technical measures consistent with the applicable ITU Radio Regulations and ITU-R Recommendations.

Question 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.

2.17 Flow agrees that MNOs should be permitted to provide satellite services using spectrum already assigned to them. This does not preclude the Commission from also, in consultation with industry, identifying specific spectrum blocks that are suitable for satellite D2D/ D2C service.

Question 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.

2.18 The proposed power limits is an initial baseline for interference protection. It should be complemented by appropriate spectrum selection – that is suitable spectrum blocks, including additional blocks where available, to avoid unnecessarily reducing existing terrestrial mobile capacity. The framework should allow spectrum blocks, geographic areas, and operating conditions to be adjusted as network requirements evolve.

Question 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.

2.19 A 10° minimum elevation angle is an appropriate baseline. Flow supports that, where justified by local interference assessments, the Commission should retain flexibility to apply additional coordination or a higher elevation angle.

Question 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?

2.20 Irrespective of spectrum used, where satellite-based services offer the same or similar functionality as services provided by terrestrial providers, they should be licensed within the same licensing regime as terrestrial providers and be subject to all the terms and conditions, taxes, and regulatory payments as existing terrestrial providers. Core obligations relating to consumer protection, interconnection, emergency communications, security and QoS apply.

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

2.21 Emergency calling obligations apply based on the capabilities available on the service. Where technically supported, emergency calls and messages should include appropriate routing, best-available location, and callback information. Requirements are expected to evolve.

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

2.22 E-band is used in the Caribbean Region for high-capacity microwave backhaul. While Ofcom's guidance is useful, it may not have necessarily replicated the conditions of use for E-band in the Region. Flow suggests that the Commission reviews E-band use in Anguilla and neighbouring islands to evaluate the feasibility of temporary use of E-band for NGSO gateway operations. Moreover, E-band (71–76 / 81–86 GHz) should remain available for terrestrial Fixed Service, with satellite use subject to appropriate coordination and protection of terrestrial services.

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

2.23 The Commission proposes to make W-band available for gateway feeder links on a no interference and no protection basis. It is imperative that satellite use of W-band remains on a strict non-interference and non-protection basis and does not constrain existing or future terrestrial services. Any harmful interference to terrestrial services should require prompt mitigation or cessation of the satellite operation.

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

2.24 All service providers licensed in Anguilla and/ or providing service to or in Anguilla must contribute to the legally established Telecommunications Levy (the Levy). This approach is non-discriminatory. The Levy and the formula used are already applied to existing licensees.

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

2.25 Flow has concerns with the Commission's spectrum authorization fee approach. The spectrum fee for satellite providers can no longer be determined solely on the basis that satellite spectrum is shared and mobile spectrum is dedicated.

2.26 Now that there has been a seismic shift and satellite providers are operating in the same markets as terrestrial providers, the cost of satellite spectrum must be reviewed in light of the new markets now available to satellite providers. Mobile spectrum fees, in particular, incorporates market dynamics and so should satellite spectrum fees.

2.27 Not doing so will result in widening arbitrage over time as satellite services mature, subsidized by lower spectrum costs, while terrestrial mobile spectrum costs remain higher. The Commission needs to address how parity in spectrum fees is/ will be maintained between mobile/microwave spectrum and satellite spectrum where terrestrial and satellite/ Non-Terrestrial Networks (NTNs) are providing similar/same services in similar/same market(s) as terrestrial providers. Parity in costs is a fundamental element of technology neutrality.

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

2.28 Flow commends the PUC for the Consultation which comprehensively addresses the various aspects of satellite licensing. Flow requests that the Commission considers the following as it implements the framework:

- (i) Protection of existing terrestrial services through appropriate ITU-based coordination and interference assessment;
- (ii) E-band must remain available for terrestrial providers and protected from interference by satellite services.
- (iii) Existing service providers can offer D2D/D2C under existing technology neutral licences; and

- (iv) Spectrum price parity between terrestrial spectrum and Satellite/NTN spectrum is a key element of technology neutrality.

END