

Hi. I am writing in on the public consultation paper on the review of COPIF.

I am doing so as an end user and also as a former chairman of a MCST of my condominium (2010-2015).

The review of the COPIF is useful as I have the onerous task of trying to make sure that the mobile coverage of the property was adequate especially in the basement 1 car park as the lift lobbies also located in the basement.

There was no provision by the developer to make sure that there was good mobile coverage in those spaces despite the property being completed in 2009. Repeated enquiries with the mobile providers to ensure that there is good coverage all ended in the issue of costs that the MCST had to bear (on an annual recurring basis) to have the coverage.

I am not sure if the proposed COPIF updates would address this issue, but I am quite certain that without some regulatory framework to mandate coverage, it will be just left on a case by case basis.

In addition to the mobile coverage, I note the issue of the cabling and faceplating needs with the residence.

In the property that I am in, which we moved into in 2009, while there was CAT 5 cabling embedded, the faceplates were only showing RJ11 ports. When highlighted to the developer, they said that there was no need to provide RJ45 but the cabling was all that was needed.

Unfortunately, they refused to provide a written statement on this, despite my repeated requests as the chairman of the MCST.

Suffice to say, when the fibre system was finally turned on, many of the residents were not made aware of the fact that there was already CAT 5 cabling and, instead, went into the additional expense of putting in fresh cables.

I hope these comments would be useful and thank you for the opportunity.

Best regards.

--

Harish Pillay h.pillay@ieee.org