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| Summary:  |
| Sweden proposes changes in the Draft CEPT Brief on agenda item 1.1, in relation to current wording on protection of radar against RLAN operation, and the introduction of improved DFS or development of alternative mitigation methods.We are of the view that the condition previously proposed in the text and the vague criteria of ‘prove their efficiency’ are not appropriate for inclusion in the CEPT brief. Also, we are of the view that it is not practical to intruduce conditions related to technical features of the radar, but that such conditions should be made in relation to the over all functionality of the radar system.  |
| Proposal: |
| Sweden proposes changes in Section 3.4 of the Draft CEPT-brief on agenda item 1.1.In relation to the wording on the protection of frequency hopping radars and mitigation techniques for RLANs operating in the frequency bands 5350-5470 MHz and 5725-5850 MHz Sweden proposes the following modifications to the current text:“Introduction of RLAN in the frequency bands 5 350-5 470 MHz and 5 725-5 850 MHz shall protect the operation of radar systems, including those that employ frequency hopping techniques, by either improvement of current DFS [at a worldwide level] or any proposal of alternative mitigation techniques .” |
| Background: |
| During the 5th meeting of the project team CPG-PTD, progress was made in relation to the development of the CEPT brief on agenda item 1.1. There were significant discussions on the issue of protection of frequency hopping radars from RLAN operation in the frequency bands 5350-5470 MHz and 5725-5850 MHz. Potential requirements for improved mitigation techniques were discussed and new wording was drafted and introduced into the brief. Sweden reserved its right to make alternative proposals for the brief and to raise the matter at the CPG. |