

TO THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Adamo Telecomunicaciones, Adamo from now on, in response to the Consultation about 'Broadband Guidelines' is delighted to contribute to this Consultation with the next considerations.

As a disclaimer and due to our expertise, all considerations are oriented to Fixed ultrafast access networks.

- **Regarding Technological neutrality (5.2.4.2):**

Fully understanding the aim of the recommendation about technological neutrality market trend is very homogeneous and pushing clearly towards solutions based in FTTH connectivity both in the access and the transport. Level of services based in wireless solution could be a temporary possibility but, when available, solutions based in FTTH technology should be prioritise.

- **Wholesale access (5.2.4.4):**

As it is said in the whole draft, the existence of a Wholesale access offer is paramount, nevertheless, as Adamo sees it this requisite should be strengthen so to secure all market players can benefit of this network deployed with public funds. Adamo considers that the mere existence of a Wholesale access offer is not enough to secure the network is accessible for other players. It should be a competitive commercial offer that allows these players compete with the owner of the network and replicate

its retail offers but, even more relevant, the technical solution to provide wholesale access should be fully available and ready for this purpose. Supplying wholesale services requires specific systems and solutions that the aid beneficiary should have fully implemented and adapted to third parties' requirements.

Participants owing a technical solution to provide wholesale services in place should be considered as more proper to the aid.

- **Participant's ability:**

Securing aids are awarded to participants with a minimum level of expertise in deploying and building quantitative indicators should be use hence only participants with proven ability in deployments should be candidates for the aid. With this quantitative analysis, for instance: participant shall prove that has deployed and built more than 2 times the number of homes object of the requested aid, there will be some security about the success and the quality of the network build with the aid.

- **Regarding Aids refund:**

There could be cases very justified where the aid beneficiary decides to refund the aid due to any reason: project complexity, unexpected costs, etcetera; but the impact of this situations in the inhabitants is dramatic so Adamo proposes that, above certain level of aid refunding, participant should be excluded or limit its participation in future process. Adamo proposal is refunds above 50% of the aid should be translated into a limitation of the beneficiary in the immediate process.

- **Regarding Timing:**

In the Spanish specific case, where fixed ultrafast networks have reached an extremely high coverage, more than 90%, the difficulty to accomplish the timings

related to the deployment of these remaining 10% is becoming more and more complex hence Adamo considers that delivery time should be extended to facilitate beneficiaries are able to accomplish with the task.

- **Regarding Grey Areas (5.2.2.1.2):**

Supervision of the evolution of Grey Areas should demand certain level of periodical control from the Administration to secure these areas are eventually deployed. Cases where Grey Areas are, due to any reason, not deployed imposed a significant impact in the area and its inhabitants hence securing these credible are finally present is key or, if not, immediately be consider as White Areas. Going further, those participants classifying areas as Grey that are not ultimately deployed should be restrained of this process in the future.