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Dear XX,

STG recognised at its 32nd meeting (3-5 October 2012) that the hard coded assumption of 3 dB desensitisation used in the blocking calculation should be modified, so that the user can directly use a different desensitisation value, which allows a more friendly use of the tool. WGSE supported this approach in its 63rd meeting in January 2013.

STG would like to inform, all project teams, that SEAMCAT will be changed, in the proposed way, in one of his next release.

As a consequence this would change the calculation of the victim receiver attenuation as shown in the equation 2 and 3 below (the red text shows the changes):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| mode | Calculation | Comments |
| Eq1 (mode: user defined):  (no change) | Avr = Bmask | Here Bmask is similar to a “blocking response” (as used in STG(12)25) in dB (positive values) |
| Eq2 (mode: protection ratio): | Avr\_BlockingRatio=Bmask + C/(N+I) + (N+I)/N | Here Bmask is in dB (positive and negative values) |
| Eq3 (mode: sensitivity): | Avr\_sensitivity = Bmask + C/(N+I) – sensitivity\_receiver - I/N | Here Bmask is similar to a “blocking level” i.e. the maximum acceptable interfering power in dBm |
| Note: Bmask is the input from the user and extracted from the standard. | | |

This is mainly for information but we invite your group to respond if necessary.

Best regards

Jean-Philippe Kermoal

STG chairman

Email: [Jean-Philippe.kermoal@eco.cept.org](mailto:Jean-Philippe.kermoal@eco.cept.org)