

On 3 February 2015 at 10:34, David Cooper wrote:

Dear xxxx,

As you know, I take an interest in the Superfast Surrey project and in the past have raised a number of issues regarding claimed performance, coverage and costs.

I now have BT data from their broadband availability checker. This BT data for each address in the intervention area indicates that some postcodes that you believe to have access to "fibre" do not have access. The data is summarised in the single sheet, Appendix A attached. The full data for the "no access" premises provided in the attached spreadsheet contains a worksheet for each telephone exchange and summary sheet. Each of the exchange worksheets contains the Exchange Name and the data is in Cabinet, Postcode, Address order, with a total for each cabinet and the complete exchange.

The data also shows that at 90.4% there is more work to do to reach your contractual target of 94% of premises having access greater than 15 Mbps. Also, note that BT estimates a significant number of premises have exactly 15 Mbps.

These statistics are based on the BT best estimate speed ("FTTC A down High") and are generous. It is likely that the actual percentages of premises above 15 Mbps will be lower. Furthermore, I believe that BT Wholesale base their offer to their ISP customers on the "FTTC B Down high/low" speeds, so speeds could be significantly lower, especially in rural areas.

Since this data is at variance with what the Superfast Surrey postcode checker provides, I would appreciate any comments that you may have.

Kind Regards

David Cooper

p.s. Meeting the Government target of 95% to have 24 Mbps by 2017 looks to be unlikely. (<http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/environment-food-and-rural-affairs-committee/news/rural-broadband-report-publication/>) . I am still waiting for a reply from your FoI department regarding the questions previously raised about costs and potential to use savings to extend the reach of the fibre network. Note that the BT underestimate of costs has now been recognised at a national level, so there may yet be an opportunity to use any savings to try and meet the 95% target? <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/technology-31043548>.

---

On 10 February 2015 at 16:49, xxxx wrote:

Dear David

Thank you for the information you have provided.

The Superfast Surrey Programme has an agreed methodology for the identification of postcodes and premises for inclusion in the Intervention Area (IA), together with an agreed process for monitoring delivery and assessing speeds against the contractual targets. Whilst BT's Checker is used by us as a useful cross reference tool, it should be noted that it includes premises and equipment that are excluded from our IA.

As such, information within the BT Checker cannot be used as the definitive monitoring tool for the progress of Superfast Surrey deployment.

Kind regards

xxxx

---

On 10 February 2015 at 21:23, David Cooper wrote:

Dear xxxx,

Thank you for your reply. I must say I find the response confused.

The Superfast Surrey postcode checker returns the status "It looks like your postcode is within the Openreach or Virgin commercial roll-out programme" for postcodes in the commercial area and these have been excluded from the data I sent to you. Therefore you seem to be saying that the status on your postcode checker, "Good news - the cabinet serving your area has been upgraded, contact your internet service provider (ISP) to see if you can access a fibre service" includes some postcodes in the commercial area. Is this the case?

If the two status messages above are muddled as this suggests, a definitive list of the postcodes in the Intervention Area would also be useful. I would also be interested to hear about your methodology for assessing delivery and speeds.

Kind Regards

David

p.s. The SuperfastSurrey postcode checker actually returns the status, "It looks like your postcode is within the Openreach or Virgin commercial roll-out programme" for any postcode in the country or any old input whether or not a postcode. However, that does not affect the argument above.