

Consultation question	<i>Homenet response</i>
<p>Question 1: Do you agree with the proposed approach to only include the wholesale bitstream service in scope of the price review and to exclude wholesale access products? If you do not agree you should provide all of your analysis and assessment.</p>	<p><i>Yes we agree in principle with the approach. We believe that a solution including access is as previously tried by CICRA is the ideal approach.</i></p>
<p>Question 2: Do you agree with the proposed approach to adopt cost orientated wholesale prices for the price review, rather than use an ex-ante margin squeeze test? If you do not agree you should provide all of your analysis and assessment.</p>	<p><i>Yes we do not agree with Retail minus we need a level playing field if you wish true competition.</i></p>
<p>Question 3: Do you agree with the proposed approach to modelling cost orientated prices using a top-down approach? If you do not agree you should provide all of your analysis and assessment.</p>	<p><i>Top down is fine however the cost should be arrived at using real costs that an efficient operator should have inured not the higher costs that JT inured due to inefficiencies.</i></p>
<p>Question 4: Do you agree with the proposed specification of the cost model, including in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- model scope;</li> <li>- model methodological choices; and</li> <li>- approach to JT's WACC</li> </ul> <p>If not, what alternative would you propose and why?</p>	<p><i>The cost should be arrived at using real costs that an efficient operator should have inured not the higher costs that JT inured due to inefficiencies.</i></p>
<p>Question 5: Do you agree with the proposed fixed fee approach set out in this Consultation and Frontier report? If not, what alternative would you propose and why?</p>	<p><i>Fixed access fee is an option and is probably the only way to go as we have no way of confirming or auditing JT if they are left to charge on a usage basis also the cost is the cost. We however believe there is a large demand for low cost lower speed</i></p>

Consultation question	<i>Homenet response</i>
	<i>broadband and this should be allowed for in any conclusion.</i>
<p>Question 6: What are your views on the relative merits of a two-part tariff approach over a fixed fee approach? If your view is that a two-part tariff approach is appropriate, do you agree with the proposed approach set out in this Consultation and Frontier report? If not, what alternative would you propose and why?</p>	<p><i>Fixed access fee is an option and is probably the only way to go as we have no way of confirming or auditing JT if they are left to charge on a usage basis also the cost is the cost. We however believe there is a large demand for low cost lower speed broadband and this should be allowed for in any conclusion.</i></p>
<p>Question 7: Do you agree with the proposed approach to other charges? If you do not agree you should provide all of your analysis and assessment.</p>	<p><i>Migration should be a simple move and cost if any should reflect that and not be higher than to cover cost so as to restrict competition this also applies to change of speed however in the Bit stream model this would be controlled by the OLO. The CP interconnect should be priced according to the actual cost to provide as OLO's are paying for the services this is just access and or JCRA should state a cost Gig this needs to be min of 10Gig but be increased or decreased without penalties.</i></p>
<p>Question 8: What are your views on the impact of the proposals set out in this Consultation? Are there any other impacts the Authority should take into account? You should provide all of your analysis and assessment.</p>	<p><i>We however believe there is a large demand for low cost lower speed broadband and this should be allowed for in any conclusion. Overall we believe if the proposal is actually implemented then it would have a positive impact on the market. However time is of the essence and implementation is key.</i></p>