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| Summary:  |
| This paper considers the possibility of the CEPT setting up a system, provided by ECO, of monitoring of coordination in íts area under the GE06 Plan and Agreement. This would seek to ease the process of rearrangements which at least some CEPT countries may want in order to accommodate mobile services in the 700 MHz, consequent to mobile services acquiring Primary Status in the Radio Regulations from 2015. The ECO makes two alternative proposals, both based on administrations providing information; either summary information at the level of multilateral groups, which will in any case need some form of internal recording/memorandum or precise information which would in any case be prepared under the terms of GE06. In both cases the ECO envisages that its role would be restricted to setting up a centralised document structure or database, but not to a significant ongoing management role. |
| Proposal:  |

|  |
| --- |
| The ECO suggests two alternative approaches, both of which would be based on self-upload of information by administrations or multilateral regional coordination groups.**Option A**. Would provide a central document area for regional groups or individual administrations to report their progress in GE06 Plan modifications directed at partial or whole reattribution of the 700 MHz band from broadcasting to mobile. **Option B**. Would list details of GE06 broadcasting plan notifications/coordinations which were for the purpose of alternative resource for GE06 plan entries being cleared to make way for mobile services.Option B in particular would probably require an agreement such as an ECC Decision to make use of the tool sufficiently widespread to be of any value. Option A would require at least some guidelines to the groups/administrations, for some consistency in understanding, although some flexibility should be allowed also.These proposals would require as-yet unestimated effort on the part of ECO to establish, although neither proposal would be particularly difficult to realise. Neither should require intensive ECO involvement in supervision and management, at least in principle, since we have not identified a real need or added value in ECO involvement, with these proposals.Both proposals include that the ECC should agree a framework for the activity, which will require some study by a WG or PT.The Steering Group’s advice at this meeting will be used to enable a proposal, including alternatives, to be made to the Plenary.The ECC SG is also asked to note and comment as necessary, on the following principles:* The ECO does not recommend seeking to define new metrics for equitable access to spectrum, as it is pessimistic about the chances for reaching Europe-wide consensus which would give a technically efficient outcome which also reflected countries’ diverse requirements. In other words, this has been tried before and is summarised by the RSPG Report on the coordination issue as, more or less.´, ‘GE06 as agreed = equitable access’.
* The ECO would be willing to undertake analysis of the coordination processes subject to available resources and within a framework agreed by the ECC (a PT or CG). However, ECO recommends that its contribution should be focused on listing the processes rather than attempting to analyse them. Any analysis of what a change means is pragmatically probably best left to the coordinating parties who are reporting the process, and who understand what can be a complex, individual and nuanced negotiation.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Background:  |
| The Berlin ECC Plenary in November considered the possibility of CEPT monitoring the progress of bilateral and multilateral coordination in the 700 MHz range, where that coordination is based on at least some countries expecting to use that range for mobile services. The ECC tasked ECO to investigate how information on results of coordination agreements could be collected and presented in a way that would enable a visible overview of the progress of the coordination process, while not causing too much burden to administrations. ‘Light and meaningful’ were adjectives offered as guidance.ECC(13)069 was the proposal document from the ECC Chairman. It was triggered by various experiences, including with 800 MHz, but in particular by the RSPG Report on the subject. This had recommended a coordinated approach to migration from the present position to a future one – whatever that may be. It also recommended CEPT-level monitoring, primarily aimed at achieving consistency in progress.In any case, the mobile service will acquire co-primary status in 2015, resulting from the decision of WRC-12. With or without any European harmonisation measures this triggers a different set of possibilities for how administrations handle the provisions of the GE06 agreement, which provides for coordination and protection of assignments to primary services other than broadcasting.Other relevant documents include:* CEPT Report 29: “Guidelines on cross border coordination issues between mobile services in one country and broadcasting services in another country”.
* ECC Report 142: “Rearrangement activities for broadcasting services in 790 - 862 MHz”
 |

**Elements of proposal for ECO tool**

So far, we have identified two approaches.

**1) Central document area for regional groups to report**

The tool could at its most basic be a central document area for the regional groups, so they can see what each other is doing. Groups like WEDDIP could summarise their progress against some broad criteria agreed by ECC. This could for example identify the approximate number and coverage of GE06 plan entries in the 700 MHz range for each country at a certain point in time (2006), and the extent to which this has been compensated by newly coordinated/negotiated alternative plan entries, or acceptance of loss of coverage/services as the necessary price for implementing mobile services in your own or a neighbouring country.

**2) Register of agreed or possible modifications to GE06 plan entry data (subset and some extra information)**

An alternative approach would be to establish a strong agreement, let us say an ECC Decision, requiring all broadcasting proposals to be uploaded to a visible ECO database with an agreed set of data such as:

• Status within GE06: is it an allotment/assignment proposal already notified under the GE06 procedure (Art. 4)?

• Subset of characteristics: allotment or assignment? Boundary points + RPC/ location, h1 + e.r.p.- omni- or directional,

• Reference to GE06 plan entries allotments/assignments (above 694 MHz) which this is intended to substitute. Substitute in whole or in part?

• Reference to other proposals which are used in combination to substitute for GE06 allotments above 694 MHz (or other frequency allotments/assignments being discontinued to make way for mobile)

Agreements to accept increased interference to GE06 entries should also be recorded.

In this case ECO commitment would just be the provision of the tool. The data entry and reading/interpretation would be matter for administrations, the commitment varying according to their level of interest and concern. It would not be necessary to involve the ECO as a ‘shadow plan management body’ as it is not within the process itself.

Coordination of individual assignments for mobile.

We propose that mobile coordination would not be included, at least in detail, in the monitoring arrangements. This is based on the understanding that at the strategic level mobile coordination is generally covered within generalised MoUs.

Coordination of non-broadcast primary service assignments under GE06 after mobile gets co-primary status in 2015 is likely to be restricted to the case of neighbouring countries having different uses at the same time in the same band (700MHz), either indefinitely or for a finite period of time. That might reflect an agreed framework or the lack of such a framework. But in either case this is probably outside the scope of a coordinated process within part (or all) of the EU28, EEA, or CEPT areas. Here, the tool’s only value would be to highlight that this is happening at all. However, the GE06 process already provides for visibility for those administrations which monitor it.

**Some considerations on the source documents (notably in relation to ‘equitable access’)**

RSPG Report on coordination:

This covers a range of considerations and issues, including principally the EU harmonisation and intervention possibilities. In terms of technical principles and feasibility, the report places a lot of reliance on its references to the source ECC deliverables, namely CEPT Report 29, and ECC Report 142.

Its text includes the observation that “The administration seeking coordination should consider whether it needs a national policy in relation to how it would intend to obtain an acceptable state of rights from the GE06 Plan, noting that potentially it may not be possible to achieve both additional entries lower in the band and implement fixed/mobile applications in the 800 MHz band.”

ECC Report 142

ECC Report 142 was prepared independently of and prior to the EU requirement under the RSPP for use of 800 MHz for mobile. It also makes a clear pre-WRC 2012 assumption that frequencies up to 790 MHz would only really be used for broadcasting.

Extracts of text include:

* “Equitable access to the spectrum has to be understood as a limited area concept whose implementation may differ from area to area rather than imposing detailed rules for spectrum usage. The terms “equitable access” and “equilibrium” correspond to obtaining an accepted state of rights for all administrations involved.”
* “The GE06 Agreement does not cover coordination situations involving only services other than terrestrial broadcasting” *ECO note*: GE06 does allow for coordination of other primary services: and from 2015 that will be available to countries irrespective of what Europe-wide harmonisation measures may or may not be in place. However, that facility may be of limited value for public mobile outside a more comprehensive bi-lateral or multi-lateral agreement (we have not studied this point).

ECC Report 142 does not address all aspects of the strategic level transfer of resource from Broadcasting to Mobile. It talks about identifying ‘extra resource’ (for broadcasting) although the practices suggested are more about using the underlying resource more ‘efficiently’ (i.e. more transmitters, more interference), or in effect substituting one resource for another.

Perhaps the challenge is that in order to maintain equitable access to spectrum:

- a more direct equation would in principle need to be made between GE06-standard TV coverages and mobile use, (especially to deal with cases where different countries use the same part of the band for different purposes) some documentation in preparation for the GE06 Conference did consider this to a limited extent;

- countries that have a higher weighting of their overall broadcasting resources below the relevant BC-MOB break point (i.e. 790 and now 694 MHz) have to make some sacrifices to transfer resources to those countries which have had a higher weighting above it, **if** both those countries intend to have a more generic (normal and efficient) equitable arrangement for mobile on either side of their border.

Although equitable access is a major component of all bi-lateral and multilateral coordination processes it tends to be given effect by the administrations concerned than by generic provisions. It would be even more difficult to pick this up now, after the 800 MHz process is well underway, although still ongoing..

ECC Report 142 also states:

* “Current entries in the GE06 Plan as well as networks operated on the basis of such entries should not be affected to an unacceptable extent, neither by additional capacities for broadcasting nor by the implementation of the sub-band 790 - 862 MHz for mobile/fixed communications networks”.

However, in a more coordinated environment it is necessary in effect to redistribute BC resource from one country to another, and that will mean affecting current entries. This may explain the terminology “unacceptable extent”.

CEPT Report 29

This is a more technical report than ECC Rep. 142, and is intended for the case where different countries use the same part of the band for different purposes. Therefore it hardly addresses the equitable access issue at all, other than to refer to it an important principle to be applied to the process.