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DRAFT CEPT BRIEF ON AGENDA ITEM 7

7 to consider possible changes, and other options, in response to Resolution 86 (Rev. Marrakesh, 2002) of the Plenipotentiary Conference, an advance publication, coordination, notification and recording procedures for frequency assignments pertaining to satellite networks, in accordance with Resolution 86 (Rev.WRC-07) to facilitate rational, efficient, and economical use of radio frequencies and any associated orbits, including the geostationary‑satellite orbit.

# ISSUE

Resolution 86 (Rev. WRC-07) “Implementation of Resolution 86 (Rev. Marrakesh, 2002) of the Plenipotentiary Conference”

resolves to invite future WRCs

1. to consider any proposals which deal with deficiencies and improvements in the advance publication, coordination, notification and recording procedures of the Radio Regulations for frequency assignments pertaining to space services which have either been identified by the Board and included in the Rules of Procedure or which have been identified by administrations or by the Radiocommunication Bureau, as appropriate;
2. to ensure that these procedures and the related appendices of the Radio Regulations reflect the latest technologies, as far as possible, and invites administrations to consider, in preparing for PP-10, appropriate action with regard to Resolution 86 (Rev. Marrakesh, 2002).

# Preliminary overall CEPT position

CEPT is studying possible improvements of the coordination and notification procedures for space services. CEPT supports retaining the current process of continuing evolution at successive WRCs of the regime governing space services. CEPT intends to develop specific positions susceptible to bring improvement to the regulatory process.

CEPT favours the review of any RR provision which can bring accurate solutions to specific detected inconsistencies and develop new improved provisions with emphasis on solving the most urgent issues, i.e. well characterized issues whose improvement is urgent and impacting.

CEPT also favours a stable and predictable regulatory framework for efficient and economical use of spectrum and orbit resources.

## CEPT positions on specific issues underAgenda item 7

These may later be divided into two sub-categories for which CEPT is intending to submit ECPs or not

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Issue | Title | CEPT position | Annex |
| A | Factors related to the BIU of frequency assignments of non-GSO systems subject to coordination | CEPT supports the fact that the studies should be focused on bringing into use (BIU) procedures for the frequency assignments to FSS and MSS non-GSO systems. Elements linked to a minimum number of satellites to be deployed and a phased approach regarding BIU may be taken into account. In assessing possible solutions to this Issue, CEPT will seek a balance between the need to prevent spectrum warehousing, the proper functioning of coordination mechanisms and the operational requirements related to the deployment of a non-geostationary satellite system.  CEPT notes that the recently adopted RRB RoP on the BIU of non-GSO systems is considered an essential interim measure to be readdressed at the WRC-19 in light of the solutions to this AI 7 Issue A and that the networks subject to the RoP will be reassessed based on the finding of the AI 7 Issue A. CEPT believes that the solution to this issue should give regulatory certainty to networks and give recognition that constellations of non-GSO satellites may generally take time to be fully deployed. CEPT seeks a balance between the initial filed requirements at the early stage of system design with that required to operate an initial basic service within the 7-year regulatory period, while recognising that constellations may expand to fulfil their full potential in a period that may exceed the 7 year period.  CEPT is also of the view that adequate provisions should be developed so as to avoid that the same space station may be used to gain undue advantage in the deployment of the constellation by bringing into use multiple filings. | [1](#_ISSUE) |
| B | Modification (characteristics reduction) of a recorded assignment under AP 30 and 30A Regions 1 and 3 List | CEPT supports a possible modification of certain specific characteristics (i.e., reduction of service areas, frequencies or polarization usage) of an assignment after it has been successfully recorded in the Appendices 30, 30A Regions 1 and 3 List, with the purpose to better reflect the actual situation and thus increase the efficiency of spectrum use. In addition to the characteristics mentioned above, CEPT also supports studies towards a possible modification (reduction) of additional specific characteristics. | [2](#_ISSUE_B) |
| C | Discrepancy and/or inconsistency between the regulatory provisions dealing with any changes to the characteristics of an assignment | CEPT supports alignment of the wordings in paragraph 8.13 of Article 8 of Appendix 30B with the wording of No 11.43A of Article 11 while ensuring that this alignment should not change current regulatory practice. | [3](#_ISSUE_C) |
| D | Identification of those specific satellite networks and systems with which Coordination needs to be effected under Nos 9.11A, 9.12, 9.12A and 9.13 or 9.21 | СEPT proposes that the Bureau publish in the CR/D special section the “definitive lists” of those specific GSO networks or non-GSO systems, as appropriate, with which coordination under Nos 9.11A, 9.12, 9.12A or 9.13 needs to be effected, similarly to what is currently done under the provisions of No 9.36.2.  CEPT understands that, once the relevant software currently used by the Bureau will be amended as needed, such an approach would not significantly increase the daily workload of the Bureau for producing such lists. In fact, the Bureau carries out a similar analysis to produce the list of Administrations currently published in the BR IFIC under the provisions of No 9.36.1; the proposed changes would just modify the details published in the BR IFIC, together with simplifying the administrative burden currently born by many Administrations.  CEPT supports adequate amendments to the Radio Regulations to implement the proposal above. | [4](#_ISSUE_D) |
| E | Harmonization of Appendix 30B with Appendices 30 and 30A | CEPT believes that any modifications of Appendix 30B should be based on the practical difficulties of applying existing Appendix 30B procedures faced by administrations or the Bureau. CEPT could support further modifications of Appendix 30B only in the case if such modifications will lead to simplifications of regulatory procedures while ensuring protection of existing networks.  CEPT supports splitting the consideration of the three proposals into three separate issues under WRC-19 Agenda item 7. CEPT supports the development of appropriate regulatory text for introducing in Appendix 30B the concept of time-limited agreements. CEPT does not support introducing into Appendix 30B provisions similar to §§ 4.1.24-4.1.25 of Appendices 30 and 30A. | [5](#_ISSUE_E) |
| F | Enhancement of regulatory provisions of Appendix 30B to observe the principles based on which it was initially established | CEPT considers that this Issue is outside the scope of WRC-19 Agenda item 7, because the proposals contemplate a complete review of Appendix 30B.  CEPT believes that any modifications of Appendix 30B should be based on the practical difficulties of applying existing Appendix 30B procedures faced by administrations or the Bureau. CEPT could support further modifications of Appendix 30B only in the case if such modifications will lead to simplifications of regulatory procedures while ensuring protection of existing networks. | [6](#_ISSUE_F) |
| G | Updating the reference situation for networks under Appendices 30 and 30A when provisionally recorded assignments are converted into definitive recorded assignments | CEPT supports that when a network enters the List under § 4.1.18 of Appendix 30 or 30A, the reference situation of the “victim” network shall only be updated if and when the Bureau is informed that the agreement has been obtained. CEPT suggests to modify § 4.1.18 to reflect this view. | [7](#_ISSUE_G) |
| XX | Application of coordination arc in the Ka band, to determine coordination requirements between FSS and other satellite services | СEPT supports to study and analyse the introduction of the coordination arc mechanism to determine the coordination requirements between mobile-satellite service and fixed-satellite service (FSS vs MSS) geostationary satellite networks and between MSS geostationary satellite networks (MSS vs MSS), in the portions of the Ka-band where both services, FSS and MSS, are allocated. Coordination arc criteria would substitute the ΔT/T>6% criteria that currently applies, improving and making more efficient the coordination procedures, while keeping the possibility for Administrations to request ΔT/T criteria under No 9.41. Consideration should be given to whether this approach would apply only to MSS and FSS frequency assignments on primary status (Option A) or even to MSS secondary frequency assignments without modifying the current conditions related to the category of allocation applicable to assignments to be taken into account in coordination (Option B).  CEPT considers that this matter should be studied as an issue of WRC-19 Agenda item 7. | [8](#_ISSUE_XX) |

# Background

In response to Resolution 86 (Rev. Marrakesh, 2002), WRC-03 adopted Resolution 86, which resolved that the scope and criteria of Resolution 86 (Rev. Marrakesh, 2002) of the Plenipotentiary Conference to be considered by future WRCs were as follows:

* to consider any proposals which deal with deficiencies in the advance publication, coordination and notification procedures of the Radio Regulations for space services which have either been identified by the Board and included in the Rules of Procedure or which have been identified by administrations or by the Radiocommunication Bureau, as appropriate;
* to consider any proposals which are intended to transform the content of the Rules of Procedure into a regulatory text;
* to ensure that these procedures, characteristics and appendices reflect the latest technologies, as far as possible;
* to consider any proposals intended to facilitate, in accordance with Article 44 of the Constitution, the rational, efficient and economical use of radio frequencies and the associated orbits including the geostationary orbit in accordance with resolves 2 of Resolution 80 (Rev.WRC‑2000) and resolves to request the 2003 and subsequent World Radiocommunication Conferences of Resolution 86 (Rev. Marrakesh, 2002) of the Plenipotentiary Conference;
* to consider any changes to provisions of the Radio Regulations for space services that would result in the simplification of the procedures and the work of the Bureau and/or administrations;
* to consider any changes to the Radio Regulations that follow from decisions of a Plenipotentiary Conference on space matters.

WRC-07 considered proposals under the above scope and criteria and also modified Resolution 86 (WRC-03) itself so as to create a standing Agenda item for future WRCs.

WRC-12 amended the title of the Agenda item from the version in the WRC-12Agenda in order to allow for options other than making changes and to clarify the overall goal of the Agenda item.

WRC-15 didn’t change Agenda item 7. But the ITU-R meeting conditions have changed since the last study period as the Special Committee has been suppressed and the WP 4A meetings have been prolonged. Furthermore, it is suggested that the 1st WP 4A meeting of 2018 preferably is the last meeting to consider identification of additional WRC-19Agenda item 7 “Issues” and that the 2nd WP 4A meeting of 2018 is thereby dedicated to finalize and agree on the draft CPM text for all WRC-19 Agenda item 7 issues.

Regarding the draft Brief structure, the issues included in the CPM Report to WRC-19 under Agenda item 7 should be considered issue by issue in separate Annexes to this Brief. The numbering of issues should follow the CPM Report and before that is available they should follow the labelling made by WP 4A. In addition to the seven issues currently identified by the ITU-R, it should be noted that other issues have been debated in the past within the ITU-R and/or have not (yet) explicitly being categorised under Agenda item 7. CEPT should still be open to include them in this draft CEPT Brief as appropriate.

Regarding the conclusion of CPG19-1 that “The coordinator on Agenda item 7 is invited to suggest her coordination team as appropriate", no formal team has been initiated as of yet, even if support has already been provided by several Administrations.

# List of relevant documents

ITU-Documentation (Recommendations, Reports, other)

* [WP4A/196](http://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=R15-WP4A-C-0196) – Chairman’s Report of 2nd meeting WP 4A, in particular Section 4.3:

Treatment of frequency assignments with a bandwidth less than the stated averaging bandwidth

Range of notified characteristics of recorded frequency assignments of GSO satellite networks

At this stage, it is proposed not to include the two points above as formal AI 7 new issues in the draft CEPT brief as they have not been consolidated as such at WP4A level.

* [Annex 23](http://www.itu.int/md/dologin_md.asp?lang=en&id=R15-WP4A-C-0063!N23!MSW-E) of the WP4A/63 WP 4A Chairman’s Report of the 1st meeting: WD on issue B
* [WP4A/196](http://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=R15-WP4A-C-0196) – Chairman’s Report of 2nd meeting, in particular Section 4.3 and the following Annexes in addition to the main report:

[Annex 29](https://www.itu.int/md/dologin_md.asp?lang=en&id=R15-WP4A-C-0196!N29!MSW-E): Work plan, highlighting that it is preferred to consider identification of final additional WRC-19Agenda item 7 “Issues” at the 1st WP 4A meeting of 2018 and that the 2nd WP 4A meeting of 2018 is dedicated to finalize and agree on the draft CPM text for all WRC-19Agenda item 7 issues.

[Annex 07](https://www.itu.int/md/dologin_md.asp?lang=en&id=R15-WP4A-C-0196!N07!MSW-E): WD on issue A

[Annex 30](https://www.itu.int/md/dologin_md.asp?lang=en&id=R15-WP4A-C-0196!N30!MSW-E): WD on issue C

[Annex 31](https://www.itu.int/md/dologin_md.asp?lang=en&id=R15-WP4A-C-0196!N31!MSW-E): WD on issue D

[Annex 23](https://www.itu.int/md/dologin_md.asp?lang=en&id=R15-WP4A-C-0196!N23!MSW-E): WD on issue E

[Annex 24](https://www.itu.int/md/dologin_md.asp?lang=en&id=R15-WP4A-C-0196!N24!MSW-E): WD on issue F

[Annex 25](https://www.itu.int/md/dologin_md.asp?lang=en&id=R15-WP4A-C-0196!N25!MSW-E): WD on issue G

[Annex 22](https://www.itu.int/md/dologin_md.asp?lang=en&id=R15-WP4A-C-0196!N22!MSW-E): WD on issue XX

CEPT and/or ECC Documentation (Decisions, Recommendations, Reports)

EU Documentation (Directives, Decisions, Recommendations, other), if applicable

# Actions to be taken

All are encouraged to review the issues under Agenda item 7 already being identified by ITU-R but also to consider other possible changes and options to advance publication, coordination, notification and recording procedures for frequency assignments pertaining to satellite networks to facilitate rational, efficient, and economical use of radio frequencies and any associated orbits.

* Develop preliminary CEPT positions and eventually draft European Common Proposals (ECPs) for the WRC-19 issue by issue.

# Relevant information from outside CEPT (examples of these are below)

## European Union (date of proposal)

## Regional telecommunication organisations

APT (date of proposal)

ATU (date of proposal)

Arab Group (date of proposal)

CITEL (April 2017)

Preliminary Views

Canada:

For factors related to the BIU of frequency assignments of non-GSO systems subject to coordination, Canada is of the view that the current seven-year period may not be enough to deploy a “mega” non-GSO constellation. In trying to address this issue, it is important to adopt a balanced approach, taking into account the financial, technological and planning challenges posed by the multiple launches required to deploy this type of constellation but also the need to prevent any abuse that may lead to spectrum reservation. In this context, a milestone approach appears to be an appropriate solution.

For issues relating to Appendices 30 and 30A and any potential modifications of their associated provisions, Canada is of the view that the specifics of the Region 2 Plan for BSS and its associated feeder links should be maintained.

RCC (14 April 2017)

The RCC Administrations consider it necessary further improvements in the notification, coordination and recording procedures for frequency assignments to satellite networks in different services in order to ensure equitable access of ITU Member States to orbital and frequency resource.

## International organisations

IATA (date of proposal)

ICAO (2016-09-16)

No impact on aeronautical services has been identified from WRC-19 Agenda items 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.15, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9.1 (issue 9.1.1), 9.1 (issue 9.1.2), 9.1 (issue 9.1.5), 9.2 and 9.3 which are therefore not addressed in this position.

IMO (date of proposal)

NATO (27 June 2017)

This NATO military assessment summary is a common military assessment of the NATO Nations on the potential impacts and benefits of Agenda Item 7. It does not constitute a common position of the NATO Nations:

NATO Military Assessment - a common military assessment of the NATO Nations on the potential impacts and benefits of Agenda Item 7:

The issues currently being studied under this AI are of no immediate threat to NATO at this time; however, NATO will monitor the issues under study, develop NATO military Assessments and Positions for the issues of interest to NATO, and present a logical defence of its continued use of access and frequency bands covered by this AI should any proposed regulatory actions threaten NATO’s access to satellite resources.

SFCG, ESA (June 2016)

SFCG supports possible changes to the Radio Regulations to improve the handling of the advance publication, coordination, notification and recording procedures for satellite networks. SFCG has not yet identified issues of specific interest to space science services.

SFCG shall monitor this AI to ensure that any possible change will not adversely impact space science services.

WMO and EUMETNET (date of proposal)

## Regional organisations

Eurocontrol (date of proposal)

## OTHER INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL ORGANISATIONS

EBU (date of proposal)

GSMA (date of proposal)

CRAF (date of proposal)

NATO (date of proposal)

1. Issue A: Factors related to the bringing into use of frequency assignments of non-GSO systems subject to coordination

# ISSUE A

Issue A considers the need to change the Radio Regulations related to bringing into use of frequency assignments for non-GSO systems subject to coordination under Section II of Article 9.

# Preliminary CEPT position

CEPT supports the fact that the studies should be focused on bringing into use (BIU) procedures for the frequency assignments to FSS and MSS non-GSO systems. Elements linked to a minimum number of satellites to be deployed and a phased approach regarding BIU may be taken into account. In assessing possible solutions to this Issue, CEPT will seek a balance between the need to prevent spectrum warehousing, the proper functioning of coordination mechanisms and the operational requirements related to the deployment of a non-geostationary satellite system.

CEPT notes that the recently adopted RRB RoP on the BIU of non-GSO systems is considered an essential interim measure to be readdressed at the WRC-19 in light of the solutions to this AI 7 Issue A and that the networks subject to the RoP will be reassessed based on the finding of the AI 7 Issue A. CEPT believes that the solution to this issue should give regulatory certainty to networks and give recognition that constellations of non-GSO satellites may generally take time to be fully deployed. CEPT seeks a balance between the initial filed requirements at the early stage of system design with that required to operate an initial basic service within the 7-year regulatory period, while recognising that constellations may expand to fulfil their full potential in a period that may exceed the 7 year period.

CEPT is also of the view that adequate provisions should be developed so as to avoid that the same space station may be used to gain undue advantage in the deployment of the constellation by bringing into use multiple filings.

# Background

Currently, BIU of frequency assignments to a space station of a satellite network is regulated by the provisions of No 11.44. As a practice by the Bureau, for a non-GSO satellite network, a frequency assignment to such a satellite network is considered as having been brought into use when a single satellite with the capability of transmitting or receiving that frequency assignment has been deployed on one of the notified orbital planes, irrespective of the number of satellites and orbital planes in the satellite network constellation. A continuous period of at least ninety days of operation of that satellite is considered necessary to confirm the BIU. The notifying administration shall so inform the Bureau within thirty days from the end of the ninety-day period.

A frequency assignment to a space station of a non-geostationary satellite system with a notified date of bringing into use more than 120 days prior to the date of receipt of the notification information shall also be considered as having being brought into use if the notifying administration confirms, when submitting the notification information for this assignment, that at least one space station with the capability of transmitting or receiving that frequency assignment has been deployed on one of the notified orbital planes of the non-geostationary satellite system and maintained for a continuous period of time from the notified date of bringing into use until the date of receipt of the notification information for this frequency assignment. The date of deployment of the first satellite at its intended orbit shall be within the seven-year time limit for bringing frequency assignments to a space station into use under No 11.44.

To avoid uncertainties with regards to this current practice by the Bureau before any WRC-19 decisions can be implemented, this was clarified in the Rules of Procedures on No 11.44 as amended at the 74th meeting of the Radio Regulations Board in October 2016. The Rules of Procedure which was adopted by RRB concerns only FSS and MSS satellite networks.

The BR Director brought to the attention of the WRC-15 in his Report under 9.2 that the conference may wish to consider re-defining the notion of BIU for non-GSO satellite networks as this could lead to spectrum warehousing and resurgence of so-called “paper satellite networks”. He also noted that a possible approach could be, for example, a phased approach with milestones based on either one satellite or a percentage of the total number of satellites deployed at the end of the seven-year time limit (No 11.44) and the completion of the total deployment within a reasonable period after the BIU in either one or two steps (e.g. original date of bringing into use plus [3] years and [6] years). Failure to meet one of these milestones would, for example, result in cancellation of the frequency assignments for the milestone at the end of the seven-year time-limit, and adjustment of the notified information of the non-GSO system based on the actual number of satellites and orbit characteristics in operation at the end of the [3] years and [6] years milestone.

WRC-15 discussed the issue at its seventh plenary session and recognized a lack of specific provisions in the Radio Regulations but was not able to conclude on the issue. Hence, WRC-15 invited ITU-R to examine, underAgenda item 7, the possible development of regulatory provisions requiring additional milestones beyond those under Nos 11.25 and 11.44 with regards to non-GSO systems. This study may also consider the implications of the application of such milestones to non-GSO FSS/MSS systems brought into use after WRC-15.

The 1st meeting of WP 4A in April 2016 received one US input contribution initiating development of draft CPM text for this issue under Agenda item 7, on the possible need to change the RR related to BIU of frequency assignments for non-GSO systems subject to coordination under Section II of Article 9. The document noted that there is a great variety of non-GSO systems, both existing and planned, and the document begins to describe the characteristics of such systems as they relate to the ITU-R concept of bringing frequency assignments to non-GSO systems into use for purposes of notifications under Article 11. It was agreed to accept this topic as Issue A and to carry the document forward as a WD towards draft CPM text. In addition, it was noted at WP 4A that BR in parallel with the development of Issue A underAgenda item 7 plans to issue a draft RoP for comments before the RRB October 2016 meeting possibly drawing conclusions from the WRC-15 debate with regards to mandatory clarifications to be submitted when reporting BIU of non-GSO systems.

The 2nd meeting of WP 4A in September-October 2016 received several inputs contributions on issue A from Canada, Iran, USA, France, Indonesia and Luxembourg. These contributions were all compiled in a Working Document towards a Preliminary Draft New Report on studies relating to the BIU of frequency assignments to non-GSO FSS satellite networks/systems, the idea being that if an agreed report on this topic can be developed then draft CPM text could be derived from the report.

As WP 4A tentatively agreed that the focus of this Report should be limited to the BIU of frequency assignments to non-GSO FSS satellite networks/systems, this may lead to exclusion of regulatory provisions potentially developed by WRC-19 of frequency assignments to non-GSO satellite networks/systems operating under other services. Also, if WP 4A would later on determine that the scope of the issue should extend beyond non-GSO FSS (including feeder links for non-GSO MSS), non-GSO BSS, and non-GSO BSS (sound) systems/networks, it will be necessary to discuss relevant parts of the issue with other relevant responsible ITU-R group(s). Furthermore, the issue of BIU of non-GSO satellite networks/systems other than the above is also planned to be addressed at a later stage.

The compiled Working Document towards a Preliminary Draft New Report (PDNR) contains four potential options addressing the issue, based on the input contributions:

* Option 1 consists in a formalization of the current practice of the Bureau
* Option 2 contains a number of possible alternatives to a milestone-based approach for the BIU on non-GSO networks and systems. Each possible milestone is characterised by the time it should be met, the conditions that would ensure that it is met and the consequences for meeting it or not
* Option 3 introduces many aspects including continuous coverage of service, BIU per plane, parameter deviation tolerance, 90 days and a “minimum satellite constellation criteria” (MSCC) according to which a complete BIU of a satellite filing is achieved only if all partial BIU are carried out
* Option 4 is based on the introduction of a Deployment plan defining a fixed time window for a complete BIU, a minimum BIU time requirement and introducing a BIU factor. The BIU factor interconnects the 7 years BIU period and the Deployment plan; based on the number of satellites deployed within the 7 years’ regulatory limit, the BIU factor is a value (to be determined ranging between 2 and 10) that would determine how many satellites the filing could support if deployed within a time lapse (to be determined, ranging between 7 and 10 years) after the 7 years’ regulatory limit of the filing. Additionally, this option proposes that networks that are brought into use after the approval of the RoP in October 2016 be all subject to the suggested and agreed BIU conditions.

It can be noted that, among the above Options, Option 1 reflects only the current procedures of the BR: CCRR/57 Rule of Procedure on No 11.44 as well as the Rule of Procedure as amended at the 74th meeting of the Radio Regulations Board in October 2016, while the remaining options propose a more detailed submission and examination of the BIU information.

At its February 2017 meeting PTB received two contributions PTB(17)16 and PTB(17)22 proposing a solution based on milestones. The following summarises the results of PTB discussion of such proposals in detail as a possible solution:

* Before the expiry of the 7-year regulatory period, at least [x%] of the satellites of such final constellation configuration are launched and the notifying Administration can BIU the frequency assignments corresponding to the final constellation. A special procedure needs to be developed if it launches less than [x%];
* A special procedure needs to be developed to identify those frequency assignments brought into use by physical satellites;
* At [a] years after the 7-year regulatory period, a minimum of [y%] of the satellites in the final constellation are launched.
* A penalty needs to be developed if it launches less than [y%]. For example, it would not be allowed to have more than [z%] of the filed number of satellites retained in the MIFR;
* At [b] years after the 7-year regulatory period, 100% of the satellites in the final constellation are launched; otherwise the constellation parameters in the MIFR are modified to reflect what has actually been launched and is capable of operating on the notified frequencies.

There has been much discussions about the minimum number of satellites required to BIU a NGSO constellation, ranging from the current BR practice – a single satellite – to much larger percentages of the declared constellation. CEPT will consider all types of constellations.

# List of relevant documents

ITU-Documentation (Recommendations, Reports, other)

* Section 3.2.2.4.4 of [WRC-15/4](http://www.itu.int/md/R15-WRC15-C-0004/en) (Add.2)(Rev.1) – Report of the BR Director to WRC-15
* Section 3.21 of [WRC-15/504](http://www.itu.int/md/R15-WRC15-C-0504/en) – Minutes of the seventh Plenary meeting on the 20 November 2015
* [Annex 07](https://www.itu.int/md/dologin_md.asp?lang=en&id=R15-WP4A-C-0196!N07!MSW-E) of [WP4A/196](http://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=R15-WP4A-C-0196) – WD towards preliminary draft new Report in the Chairman’s Report of the 2nd WP 4A meeting
* [CCRR/57](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CCRR-CIR-0057/en) – BR draft Rule of Procedure on No 11.44
* [Summary of decisions](http://www.itu.int/md/R16-RRB16.3-C-0011/en) by the 74th meeting of the RRB (17-21 October 2016) item 4.3
* Approved minutes of the 74th meeting of the RRB (17-21 October 2016) item 4.3

CEPT and/or ECC Documentation (Decisions, Recommendations, Reports)

EU Documentation (Directives, Decisions, Recommendations, other), if applicable

# Actions to be taken

* Further develop the preliminary CEPT position and eventually a draft European Common Proposal (ECP).

Encourage inputs summarising operational and planned NGSO systems recently made public in order to define [x], [y], [z], [a] and [b] numbers as defined in Background section. To review it for the next PTB meeting.

Summarise the inputs on possible methods submitted to WP4A with a view to minimising the number of options to be carried forward.

* Review the CCRR/57 draft Rule of Procedure on No 11.44 as well as the Rule of Procedure as amended at the 74th meeting of the Radio Regulations Board in October 2016.

# Relevant information from outside CEPT (examples of these are below)

## European Union (date of proposal)

## Regional telecommunication organisations

APT (date of proposal)

ATU (date of proposal)

Arab Group (20 April 2017)

* Initial support for explicit provisions of the Radio Regulations regarding the status of non-geostationary systems along the lines of the regulatory status of geostationary systems.
* Follow-up of the results of the studies of the options presented and the achievement of the following basic objectives:

To achieve the appropriate equivalence between optimal utilization and equitable access to spectrum and orbital resources for non-geostationary satellite networks and other satellite networks

Not to create opportunities for misuse of notification procedures for the operation of the geostationary constellation and without complicated regulatory procedures that are difficult to achieve or implemented.

* Consult with Bureau for consideration of the question of providing tools for querying and reporting on the operation of the non-geostationary satellite network for various options under consideration.
* Support the decision of the Radio Regulations Board regarding the designation of interim procedures for the development of satellite networks in the BIU service, but that such procedures should be modified in accordance with the results of the 2019 Conference.

CITEL (date of proposal)

RCC (14 April 2017)

The RCC Administrations consider that special procedure for bringing into use of frequency assignments of non-GSO systems/networks shall be developed only for systems/networks in the fixed-satellite and mobile-satellite services. The issue of applicability of the above mentioned regulatory provisions for other satellite services should be further studied.

The RCC Administrations consider that the Rules of Procedure on bringing into use of non-GSO systems/networks, approved by the 73-rd RRB meeting, should be taken into account in the studies on Issue A.

The RCC Administrations consider that the special procedure should not be applied to frequency assignments of non-GSO systems/networks in the frequency bands identified by the Radio Regulations for safety of human life.

## International organisations

IATA (date of proposal)

ICAO (date of proposal)

IMO (date of proposal)

SFCG (date of proposal)

WMO and EUMETNET (date of proposal)

## Regional organisations

ESA (date of proposal)

Eurocontrol (date of proposal)

## OTHER INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL ORGANISATIONS

EBU (date of proposal)

GSMA (date of proposal)

CRAF (date of proposal)

1. Issue B: Modification (characteristics reduction) of a recorded assignment under RR Appendices 30 and 30A Regions 1 and 3 List
2. ’It was agreed at the WP 4A May 2017 meeting to suppress the earlier Issue B as portrayed herein and replace it with a new Issue B, namely Issue XX as portrayed in Annex 8 in this draft CEPT Brief. Hence the information below is outdated and will be updated for the next CPG PTB meeting.

# ISSUE B

Issue B considers possible modification of certain specific characteristics (i.e., reduction of service areas, frequencies or polarization usage) of an assignment after it has been successfully recorded in the Appendices 30, 30A Regions 1 and 3 List, with the purpose to better reflect the actual situation and thus increase the efficiency of spectrum use.

# Preliminary CEPT position

CEPT supports a possible modification of certain specific characteristics (i.e., reduction of service areas, frequencies or polarization usage) of an assignment after it has been successfully recorded in the Appendices 30, 30A Regions 1 and 3 List, with the purpose to better reflect the actual situation and thus increase the efficiency of spectrum use. In addition to the characteristics mentioned above, CEPT also supports studies towards a possible modification (reduction) of additional specific characteristics.

# Background

Currently, it is possible to modify the characteristics of an Article 4 submission at the coordination stage due to the agreement seeking process before entering into the List under § 4.1.11 of Appendices 30 and 30A but not afterwards. The regulations assume that once coordination of the initial proposal is complete, the final characteristics are submitted under § 4.1.12, the relevant assignments are entered into the List, notified under Article 5, and then brought into use for a period of 15 years. The concept of modifying the characteristics in order to reduce the interference produced by an assignment in the List (such as reducing power or reducing service area) was never considered under Article 4. This aspect is covered under § 5.2.1 d) of Article 5 of Appendices 30 and 30A.

Article 4 of the above-mentioned Appendices has no specific provisions to modify the characteristics of an assignment after it has successfully entered into the Region 1 and 3 List of additional uses except for § 4.1.23 where an assignment may be deleted from the List. If the assignment in the List is no longer suitable, the notifying administration has only the option to submit a new proposal under § 4.1.3 of Article 4 in order to replace the assignment in the List.

This issue of modification to a recorded assignment in the List under Appendices 30 and 30A was raised within WP 4A during the last ITU-R study cycle but was not included as an issue under Agenda item 7 in the CPM Report to WRC-15. Instead, based on an Israeli input contribution the conference considered the issue.

This issue was also raised in the Director’s Report to WRC-15, where the Conference was invited to consider the issue with a view of modifying the provisions of Article 4 of Appendices 30 and 30A to permit such modifications in cases where the interference into other networks is reduced.

At WRC-15, CEPT did not establish a common CEPT position for the issue. WRC-15 concluded that further study of this issue is required. In particular, the Iranian delegation stressed that any decision concerning a matter of such critical importance should be postponed until after conducting careful studies to ascertain that the suggested course of action is in line with the principle on which Appendices 30 and 30A were based. The ITU-R was therefore invited to study this issue under Agenda item 7 with the aim of finding an appropriate regulatory and technical solution to this issue to be presented for consideration at WRC-19.

The 1st meeting of WP 4A in April 2016 received an Israeli input contribution initiating development of draft CPM text for an almost identical issue under Agenda item 7 but restricting it to modification of certain specific characteristics within the envelope characteristics, i.e. reduction of service areas, frequencies or polarization usage, of an assignment after it has been successfully recorded in the Appendices 30, 30A Regions 1 and 3 List, with the purpose to improve the reference situation to better reflect the actual situation and thus increase the efficiency of spectrum use. Concerns had been raised the last study period that allowing a wider range of parameters to be modified (reduced) after being recorded in the List (power, gain, coverage area, frequencies, polarizations and service area) might cause a misuse of the regulations by making a recorded assignment more sensitive and thus blocking newcomers from entering the List. Therefore, the issue was limited to reduction of frequencies, polarizations and service area. The WP 4A discussion highlighted that restricting the modified characteristics simplified the issue, but that a more complete understanding of the implications of modifying such parameters was still needed, e.g. the impact this would have on those networks currently in the processing queue. It was agreed to accept this topic as Issue B and to carry the document forward as a Working Document towards draft CPM text. The WD suggests that the reduced effect (the improved reference situation) shall be updated without reviewing previous examinations but considers this to be a matter of further examination.

The 2nd meeting of WP 4A in September-October 2016 received an Iranian input 4A/117 and the meeting briefly discussed the issue further, noting that the current RR allow deletion of separate frequency assignments under § 4.1.23 of Appendices 30 and 30A. Additionally, it was noted that reduction of the service area without a corresponding coverage reduction would result in an incompatibility between the service and the coverage areas. Concerns were again raised as to how the proposed changes would be implemented and how they would affect newly submitted satellite networks. Moreover, questions were raised with regards to the reason for the limitations in reductions of parameters but the same answer as before was provided; that allowing this wide scope of parameters reduction might cause a misuse of the regulations by making a recorded assignment more sensitive and thus blocking newcomers from entering the List.

# List of relevant documents

ITU-Documentation (Recommendations, Reports, other)

* Annex [21](https://www.itu.int/md/dologin_md.asp?lang=en&id=R15-WRC15-C-0088!A21!MSW-E) of WRC-15/88 – Israel input contribution to the WRC-15
* Section 3.2.6.3 of [WRC-15/4](http://www.itu.int/md/R15-WRC15-C-0004/en) (Add.2)(Rev.1) – Report of the BR Director to WRC-15
* Sections 3.14 and 3.16-3.18 of [WRC-15/504](http://www.itu.int/md/R15-WRC15-C-0504/en) – Minutes of the seventh Plenary meeting the 20 November 2015
* Annex 23 of WP4A/63 – WD towards preliminary draft CPM text in the Chairman’s Report of 1st WP 4A meeting
* Section 4.3 of [WP4A/196](https://www.itu.int/md/dologin_md.asp?lang=en&id=R15-WP4A-C-0196!!MSW-E) – Chairman’s Report of 2nd meeting

CEPT and/or ECC Documentation (Decisions, Recommendations, Reports)

EU Documentation (Directives, Decisions, Recommendations, other), if applicable

# Actions to be taken

Further develop the preliminary CEPT position and eventually a draft European Common Proposal (ECP)

# Relevant information from outside CEPT (examples of these are below)

## European Union (date of proposal)

## Regional telecommunication organisations

APT (date of proposal)

ATU (date of proposal)

Arab Group (20 April 2017)

* Follow-up on ongoing studies.
* Initial support to propose amendments to list assignments in Appendices 30 / 30A limited to reduction only, while ensuring that such amendments does not impact the current status for national allotments and assignments in the list.

CITEL (December 2016)

Preliminary Views

Canada: For issues relating to Appendices 30 and 30A and any potential modifications of their associated provisions, Canada is of the view that the specifics of the Region 2 Plan for BSS and its associated feeder links should be maintained.

RCC (14 April 2017)

The RCC Administrations consider that when modifying (reducing) characteristics of frequency assignments recorded in the frequency assignment List in Appendices 30 and 30А for Regions 1 and 3 (namely reduction of service area, number of frequency channels, polarization types) and their recording in the MIFR, recorded frequency assignments shall be protected and additional constraints should not be imposed (including additional coordination) on frequency assignments of satellite systems, submitted to the Radiocommunication Bureau for consideration prior to the receipt of request for modification (reducing) of characteristics.

## International organisations

IATA (date of proposal)

ICAO (date of proposal)

IMO (date of proposal)

SFCG (date of proposal)

WMO and EUMETNET (date of proposal)

## Regional organisations

ESA (date of proposal)

Eurocontrol (date of proposal)

## OTHER INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL ORGANISATIONS

EBU (date of proposal)

GSMA (date of proposal)

CRAF (date of proposal)

1. Issue C: Discrepancy and / or inconsistency between the regulatory provisions dealing with any changes to the characteristics of an assignment

# ISSUE C

Issue C considers discrepancies and/or inconsistencies between regulatory provisions dealing with changes to the characteristics of an assignment, specifically the discrepancy between the wordings in paragraph 8.13 of Article 8 of Appendix 30B and No 11.43A of Article 11.

# Preliminary CEPT position

CEPT supports alignment of the wordings in paragraph 8.13 of Article 8 of Appendix 30B with the wording of No 11.43A of Article 11 while ensuring that this alignment should not change current regulatory practice.

# Background

The 1st meeting of WP 4A in April 2016 received an Iranian input contribution initiating development of draft CPM text for the issue of discrepancy and/or inconsistency between regulatory provisions dealing with changes to the characteristics of an assignment. Specifically, it called for review of the provisions dealing with changes to the characteristics of an assignment submitted under provisions of No 11.43A of Article 11 and that submitted under paragraph 8.13 of Article 8 of Appendix 30B, as certain wording of these two provisions is different. The difference consists in that No 11.43A deals with a modification of an assignment that “has been recorded and confirmed as having been brought into use”, whilst the Appendix 30B’s provision refers to an assignment that “has been notified and confirmed as having been brought into use”. This is a relevant difference, as an assignment could have been notified but not yet recorded for a number of different reasons.

The WP 4A discussions confirmed that paragraph 8.13 of Article 8 of Appendix 30B was first adopted at WRC-03 and, while some minor changes were made to this provision after WRC-03, the issue at hand has been there since. It was mentioned that should changes be made to either of these provisions to align them, the implications of such changes need to be understood.

But in addition this issue also incorporates a wider aspect that was not thoroughly discussed at WP 4A, suggesting making a systematic search to all relevant provisions of Articles 5 and 8 of Appendices 30, 30A and 30B and comparing them with those from Article 11. It was agreed to accept this topic as Issue C and to carry the document forward as a WD towards draft CPM text.

The 2nd meeting of WP 4A in September-October 2016 received an Iranian input 4A/118 and the meeting briefly discussed the issue further. It was emphasised again that a systematic search should be carried out comparing all relevant provisions of Articles 5 and 8 of Appendices 30, 30A and 30B with those from RR Article 11, but rather as a general matter than connected to this issue C under Agenda item 7. In Section 4.3 of the Chairman’s report it is actually stated that ”The meeting further agreed to make a systematic search to all relevant provisions of Articles 5 and 8 of Appendices 30, 30A and 30B and compare them with those from Article 11 from which the former emanated from the latter.”

This issue C was thereby clarified to only address the issue of replacing the word “notified” with “recorded” in § 8.3 of Appendix 30B as the issue was re-formatted into CPM format capturing this as the one method to satisfy the issue.

# List of relevant documents

ITU-Documentation (Recommendations, Reports, other)

* [Annex 30](https://www.itu.int/md/dologin_md.asp?lang=en&id=R15-WP4A-C-0196!N30!MSW-E) of [WP4A/196](http://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=R15-WP4A-C-0196) – WD towards preliminary draft CPM text in the Chairman’s Report of 1st WP 4A meeting

CEPT and/or ECC Documentation (Decisions, Recommendations, Reports)

EU Documentation (Directives, Decisions, Recommendations, other), if applicable

# Actions to be taken

* Further develop the preliminary CEPT position and eventually a draft European Common Proposal (ECP)
* To check whether the proposed alignment changes the current practice or not.

# Relevant information from outside CEPT (examples of these are below)

## European Union (date of proposal)

## Regional telecommunication organisations

APT (date of proposal)

ATU (date of proposal)

Arab Group (20 April 2017)

Follow-up studies under this issue.

CITEL (date of proposal)

RCC (14 April 2017)

The RCC Administrations consider that the existing discrepancy between provisions of Articles in Appendices 30, 30А and 30В and the terminology of Article 11 provisions do not lead to complications when applying the relevant provisions of the Radio Regulations.

## International organisations

IATA (date of proposal)

ICAO (date of proposal)

IMO (date of proposal)

SFCG (date of proposal)

WMO and EUMETNET (date of proposal)

## Regional organisations

ESA (date of proposal)

Eurocontrol (date of proposal)

## OTHER INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL ORGANISATIONS

EBU (date of proposal)

GSMA (date of proposal)

CRAF (date of proposal)

1. ISSUE D: Identification of those specific satellite networks and systems with which coordination needs to be effected under Nos 9.11A, 9.12, 9.12A and 9.13 or No 9.21

# ISSUE D

Issue D addressed the proposal that the Bureau publish in the CR/D special section the “definitive lists” of those specific GSO networks or non-GSO systems, as appropriate, with which coordination under Nos 9.11A, 9.12, 9.12A and 9.13 or under No 9.21 needs to be effected, similarly to what is currently done under the provisions of No 9.36.2.

# Preliminary CEPT position

СEPT proposes that the Bureau publish in the CR/D special section the “definitive lists” of those specific GSO networks or non-GSO systems, as appropriate, with which coordination under Nos 9.11A, 9.12, 9.12A or 9.13 needs to be effected, similarly to what is currently done under the provisions of No 9.36.2.

CEPT understands that, once the relevant software currently used by the Bureau will be amended as needed, such an approach would not significantly increase the daily workload of the Bureau for producing such lists. In fact, the Bureau carries out a similar analysis to produce the list of Administrations currently published in the BR IFIC under the provisions of No 9.36.1; the proposed changes would just modify the details published in the BR IFIC, together with simplifying the administrative burden currently born by many Administrations.

CEPT supports adequate amendments to the Radio Regulations to implement the proposal above.

# Background

No 9.36.2 significantly decreased the administrative workload related to the identification of the satellite networks, systems and earth stations, as applicable, with which coordination needs to be effected under Nos 9.7, 9.7A and 9.7B.

However, for the cases of coordination under Nos 9.11A, 9.12, 9.12A and 9.13 or under No 9.21, the relevant Special Section of the BR IFIC includes only a list of Administrations rather than a list of specific GSO networks or non-GSO systems, as appropriate, for which those Administrations are responsible.

In order to address this issue, the Bureau could include in the CR/C special sections the list of potentially affected administrations as well as lists of their potentially affected satellite networks and systems for coordination cases related to Nos 9.11A, 9.12, 9.12A and 9.13 or under No 9.21 (only for the cases referred to as 9.21/A and 9.21/B in the CR/C special sections). The potentially affected administrations would then comment under Nos 9.51 or 9.52, as appropriate, according to the same current process but would identify in their comments (and in the SpaceCom database) the affected satellite networks or systems on the basis of the lists published in the CR/C. The Bureau would then compile and publish these comments in a CR/D special section according to No 9.53A. The process would therefore be similar to the current one but it would offer two main advantages: firstly, the comments under Nos 9.51 or 9.52, as appropriate, would be much simpler to be made as they would entail a check of a pre-compiled list published in the CR/C special section; secondly, the CR/D special section would contain a “definitive list” of satellite systems instead of a simple list of administrations.

It should be noted that the identification of the potentially affected satellite networks or systems would not require any additional tools since the coordination trigger for Nos 9.12, 9.12A and 9.13 (and consequently 9.21/B) in Appendix 5 is based on a simple frequency overlap and the technical coordination trigger for 9.21/A is based on the use of Appendix 8 (see Rule of Procedure related to No 9.36).

This issue was initiated at the first CPG PTB meeting in June 2016 by France and UK, also suggesting to submit it as a CEPT input contribution to the 2nd WP 4A meeting in September-October 2016 which was agreed within the framework of CEPT CPG PTB and submitted to WP 4A.

As the CEPT input contribution [4A/102](http://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=R15-WP4A-C-0102) didn’t propose any specific regulatory changes, Canada picked up the idea and proposed establishing a new AI 7 issue in draft CPM format in [4A/146](http://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=R15-WP4A-C-0146) which was supported by the meeting to carry forward as a Working Document towards draft CPM text in the Chairman’s Report. At the meeting, several administrations supported for BR to publish more granular information but Iran opposed to publish the list as anything else than for information. BR also confirmed that, once the current relevant software is amended as needed, to publish more detailed information will not significantly increase their daily workload.

The WP 4A output includes a method D2 to satisfy the issue through regulatory changes in Nos 9.36.1 and 9.53A. The output also includes a method D1 where no change is proposed to the RR. It is in method D1 instead believed that the modifications to CR/C and CR/D Special Sections are strictly an implementation issue that could be addressed without any further modifications to the RR.

At the CPG meeting in December 2016, the Russian Federation made the following statement: “The Russian Federation could not support the preliminary CEPT position on the Issue D of the AI 7 as the Russian Federation is of the view that the list of satellite networks or systems identified by the BR under Nos 9.11A, 9.12, 9.12A, 9.13 and 9.21 may need to be considered for information purposes only and not as a "definite list". In particular clarification is required regarding consequences of the applications of a "definite list" approach to the 9.21 provision.”

# List of relevant documents

ITU-Documentation (Recommendations, Reports, other)

* [PTB(16)04](http://www.cept.org/Documents/cpg-pt-b/31092/cpg-ptb-16-04_contribution-on-ai-7) – input contribution by UK and France
* [WP 4A/102](http://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=R15-WP4A-C-0102) – CEPT input contribution
* [Annex 31](https://www.itu.int/md/dologin_md.asp?lang=en&id=R15-WP4A-C-0196!N31!MSW-E) of [WP4A/196](http://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=R15-WP4A-C-0196) – WD towards preliminary draft CPM text in the Chairman’s Report of 2nd WP 4A meeting

**CEPT and/or ECC Documentation (Decisions, Recommendations, Reports)**

**EU Documentation (Directives, Decisions, Recommendations, other), if applicable**

# Actions to be taken

Further develop the preliminary CEPT position

Develop a draft European Common Proposal (ECP)

# Relevant information from outside CEPT (examples of these are below)

## European Union (date of proposal)

## Regional telecommunication organisations

APT (date of proposal)

ATU (date of proposal)

Arab Group (20 April 2017)

* Follow-up studies under this issue.
* Support No change to the Radio Regulations as the amendments proposed of the CR/C and CR/D Special Sections could be implemented without further amendments to the Radio Regulations.
* Initial endorsement of method D1, taking into account the facilitation of the operative provisions of the Radio Regulations.

CITEL (December 2016)

Preliminary Views

Canada supports extending the current Bureau identification and publication of the satellite networks or systems to be considered when effecting coordination under No 9.7 and 9.7A to other types of coordination, namely coordination under No 9.12, 9.12A, 9.13 or 9.21 as appropriate.

RCC (14 April 2017)

The RCC Administrations support the identification of specific GSO or non-GSO satellite networks which need coordination only according to RR Nos. 9.11А, 9.12, 9.12А or 9.13 as well as modification of relevant RR provisions.

The RCC Administrations oppose identification of specific GSO or non-GSO satellite networks which need coordination under RR No. 9.21.

## International organisations

IATA (date of proposal)

ICAO (date of proposal)

IMO (date of proposal)

SFCG (date of proposal)

WMO and EUMETNET (date of proposal)

## Regional organisations

ESA (date of proposal)

Eurocontrol (date of proposal)

## OTHER INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL ORGANISATIONS

EBU (date of proposal)

GSMA (date of proposal)

CRAF (date of proposal)

1. Issue E: Harmonization of RR Appendix 30B with RR Appendices 30 and 30A

# ISSUE E

Issue E considers two specific amendments to Appendix 30B for Regions 1 and 3, both stemming from harmonization with Appendices 30 and 30A.

* The first proposal considers harmonization of Appendix 30B with § 4.1.24 of Appendices 30 and 30A for Regions 1 and 3; introducing the same time validity limitation of 15 years that can be renewed once for further 15 years, as was decided when WRC-2000 revised Appendices 30 and 30A
* The second proposal considers introducing into Appendix 30B a provision derived from § 4.1.25 of Appendices 30 and 30A for Regions 1 and 3 dealing with coordination between administrations having several assignments in the List and administrations proposing to include in the List their first assignment.
* The third proposal considers harmonization of Appendix 30B with Appendices 30 and 30A § 4.1.13 for Regions 1 and 3 and § 4.2.17 for Region 2, respectively; re-introducing a regulatory option to capture obtaining agreements for a specific period.

# Preliminary CEPT position

CEPT believes that any modifications of Appendix 30B should be based on the practical difficulties of applying existing Appendix 30B procedures faced by administrations or the Bureau. CEPT could support further modifications of Appendix 30B only in the case if such modifications will lead to simplifications of regulatory procedures while ensuring protection of existing networks.

CEPT supports splitting the consideration of the three proposals into three separate issues under WRC-19 Agenda item 7. CEPT supports the development of appropriate regulatory text for introducing in Appendix 30B the concept of time-limited agreements. CEPT does not support introducing into Appendix 30B provisions similar to §§ 4.1.24-4.1.25 of Appendices 30 and 30A.

# Background

The 2nd meeting of WP 4A in September-October 2016 received an Iranian input contribution [WP4A/125](http://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=R15-WP4A-C-0125) portraying several proposals harmonizing Appendix 30B with Appendices 30 and 30A as well as enhancing certain regulatory provisions of Appendix 30B. The WP 4A meeting agreed to divide the many proposals in two issues under Agenda item 7, issues E and F, where issue E consists in harmonization of Appendix 30B in Regions 1 and 3.

The issue is introduced in the context of several WRCs making certain harmonisations between Appendices 30, 30A and 30B and Articles 9 and 11, as well as Resolution 2 (WRC-03) on “Equitable use, by all countries, with equal rights, of the geostationary-satellite and other satellite orbits and of frequency bands for space radiocommunication services”

Issue E also contains a third proposal related to Issue F as it is proposing alignment of Appendix 30B with Appendices 30 and 30A with regards to a new provision, i.e. additional system, as proposed in Issue F.

# List of relevant documents

ITU-Documentation (Recommendations, Reports, other)

* [Annex 23](https://www.itu.int/md/dologin_md.asp?lang=en&id=R15-WP4A-C-0196!N23!MSW-E) of [WP4A/196](http://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=R15-WP4A-C-0196) – WD in the Chairman’s Report of 2nd WP 4A meeting

CEPT and/or ECC Documentation (Decisions, Recommendations, Reports)

EU Documentation (Directives, Decisions, Recommendations, other), if applicable

# Actions to be taken

Further develop the preliminary CEPT position on all proposals and eventually a draft European Common Proposal (ECP) if needed

# Relevant information from outside CEPT (examples of these are below)

## European Union (date of proposal)

## Regional telecommunication organisations

APT (date of proposal)

ATU (date of proposal)

Arab Group (20 April 2017)

* Follow-up studies under this issue.
* To study the implications of proposals to align Appendix 30B with Appendices 30 / 30A and to take appropriate decision later meeting.

CITEL (date of proposal)

RCC (14 April 2017)

The RCC Administrations consider that the issue of harmonization of Appendix 30В and Appendices 30/30А should be studied based on the practical difficulties of Administrations applying existing procedures of the Appendix 30В revised by WRC-07.

The RCC Administrations consider that any modification of the Appendix 30В shall not result in the complication of the regulatory procedures and shall ensure protection of existing networks.

The RCC Administrations do not support the proposal to limit the period of validity of frequency assignments to satellite network by 15 years in the Appendix 30B with the possibility of single extension for another 15 years (harmonization of Appendix 30В with § 4.1.24 of Appendices 30 and 30A for Regions 1 and 3).

The RCC Administrations do not support the proposal to include provisions in the Appendix 30В related to the modification of the coordination procedure between the Administration which proposes inclusion of its new assignment in the List, and the Administration which has already included several assignments in the List (inclusion in the Appendix 30B of the provisions similar to § 4.1.25 of the Appendices 30 and 30A for Regions 1 and 3).

With regard to the harmonization of the Appendix 30B with § 4.1.13 of the Appendices 30 and 30A for Regions 1 and 3 and § 4.2.17 for Region 2, the RCC Administrations consider that existing provisions of the Radio Regulations allow Administrations establishing agreements for the specific period of time with the affected Administrations.

## International organisations

IATA (date of proposal)

ICAO (date of proposal)

IMO (date of proposal)

SFCG (date of proposal)

WMO and EUMETNET (date of proposal)

## Regional organisations

ESA (date of proposal)

Eurocontrol (date of proposal)

## OTHER INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL ORGANISATIONS

EBU (date of proposal)

GSMA (date of proposal)

CRAF (date of proposal)

1. Issue F: Enhancement of Regulatory provisions of RR Appendix 30B to observe the principles based on which it was initially established
2. ’It was agreed at the WP 4A May 2017 meeting to suppress the earlier Issue F as portrayed herein and replace it with a new Issue F. Hence the information below is outdated and will be updated for the next CPG PTB meeting.

# ISSUE F

This issue brings many explicit proposals when re-introducing “sub-regional systems” in Article 6 of Appendix 30B which was suppressed at WRC-07. In addition, this issue also proposes a super priority status to an administration intended to convert its national allotment into assignment with changes to characteristics of that allotment which are outside the envelope of the characteristics of the initial allotment and limited to cover the national territory of the submitting administrations.

# Preliminary CEPT position

CEPT considers that this Issue is outside the scope of WRC-19 Agenda item 7, because the proposals contemplate a complete review of Appendix 30B.

CEPT believes that any modifications of Appendix 30B should be based on the practical difficulties of applying existing Appendix 30B procedures faced by administrations or the Bureau. CEPT could support further modifications of Appendix 30B only in the case if such modifications will lead to simplifications of regulatory procedures while ensuring protection of existing networks.

# Background

The 2nd meeting of WP 4A in September-October 2016 received an Iranian input contribution [WP4A/125](http://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=R15-WP4A-C-0125) portraying several proposals harmonizing Appendix 30B with Appendices 30 and 30A as well as enhancing certain regulatory provisions of Appendix 30B. The WP 4A meeting agreed to divide the many proposals in two issues under Agenda item 7, issues E and F, where issue F consists in enhancement of Appendix 30B.

The issue is introduced in the context of Resolution 2 (WRC-03) on “Equitable use, by all countries, with equal rights, of the geostationary-satellite and other satellite orbits and of frequency bands for space radiocommunication services” and provides some historical perspective on various elements of Article 6 of Appendix 30B and how this Article evolved over the course of several WRCs.

This issue considers several amendments to Appendix 30B in order to re-introduce the original basic principles on which Appendix 30B was initiated, in the view of the proponents. In order to remedy the several obstacles listed in the Working Document for administrations wishing to convert their allotments, it is proposed that Article 6 of Appendix 30B is amended introducing sub-regional systems as “a satellite system created by agreement among neighbouring countries Member States of the ITU or their authorized telecommunications operating agencies and intended to provide domestic or sub-regional services within the geographical areas of those countries only”.

Many specific regulatory proposals are made for these sub-regional systems with regards to restricting the coverage areas. Also, one of the proposals is introducing a special procedure contained in new proposed Resolution AP30B (WRC-19) to treat some submissions referred to in the amended Article 6 of Appendix 30B, but only to be applied once by administrations which don’t have assignments Appendix 30B. It is proposed to consider specific rules to an administration intended to convert its national allotment into assignment with changes to characteristics of that allotment which are outside the envelope of the characteristics of the initial allotment and limited to cover the national territory of the submitting administrations. For example, this system won’t need the agreement of assignments which are not yet appearing in the List (i.e. assignments which the Bureau has previously examined under § 6.5 of Article 6 but for which the coordination is not yet completed).

This proposed Resolution AP30B has a Table 1 which is currently blank where the meeting requested the assistance of the BR in completing the input of relevant advanced statistics to this table. Furthermore, in connection to issue E under Agenda item 7, it is proposed that agreements of the administrations affected may also be obtained in accordance with this Article for a specified period.

# List of relevant documents

ITU-Documentation (Recommendations, Reports, other)

* [Annex 24](https://www.itu.int/md/dologin_md.asp?lang=en&id=R15-WP4A-C-0196!N24!MSW-E) of [WP4A/196](http://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=R15-WP4A-C-0196) – WD in the Chairman’s Report of 2nd WP 4A meeting

CEPT and/or ECC Documentation (Decisions, Recommendations, Reports)

EU Documentation (Directives, Decisions, Recommendations, other), if applicable

# Actions to be taken

* None

# Relevant information from outside CEPT (examples of these are below)

## European Union (date of proposal)

## Regional telecommunication organisations

APT (date of proposal)

ATU (date of proposal)

Arab Group (20 April 2017)

* Follow-up studies under this issue.
* Further Studies to assess the implications of the proposals submitted is needed.
* Arab states to consider the draft contribution to next WP4A meeting, urging further studies with respect to regional subsystems and special procedures.

CITEL (date of proposal)

RCC (14 April 2017)

The RCC Administrations consider that the improvement of Appendix 30В should be based on the study of practical difficulties of Administrations applying existing procedures of the Appendix 30В revised by WRC-07.

The RCC Administrations consider that some Appendix 30B modifications proposed in the Issues E and F affect Appendix 30B basic principles specified by WRC-07, therefore such proposals should be considered within the separate agenda item.

## International organisations

IATA (date of proposal)

ICAO (date of proposal)

IMO (date of proposal)

SFCG (date of proposal)

WMO and EUMETNET (date of proposal)

## Regional organisations

ESA (date of proposal)

Eurocontrol (date of proposal)

## OTHER INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL ORGANISATIONS

EBU (date of proposal)

GSMA (date of proposal)

CRAF (date of proposal)

1. Issue G: updating the reference situation for networks under Appendices 30 and 30A when provisionally recorded assignments are converted into definitive recorded assignments

# ISSUE G

Issue G considers conditions to change provisional recording to definitive and update the reference situation for networks under Appendices 30 and 30A

# Preliminary CEPT position

CEPT supports that when a network enters the List under § 4.1.18 of Appendix 30 or 30A, the reference situation of the “victim” network shall only be updated if and when the Bureau is informed that the agreement has been obtained. CEPT suggests to modify § 4.1.18 to reflect this view.

# Background

§§ 4.1.18-20 of Appendix 30 to the Radio Regulations describes the requirements and conditions for recording in the Region 1 and 3 List of a network with outstanding coordination requirements. Similar provisions are found in respect of Region 2 in §§ 4.2.21A-21D. The same provisions are also contained in Appendix 30A.

§ 4.1.18 prescribes that in the case of recording in the List with outstanding coordination requirements, this recording shall be provisional, but that the entry shall be changed from provisional to definitive recording in the List if the Bureau is informed that the new assignment in the Regions 1 and 3 List has been in use, together with the assignment which was the basis for the disagreement, for at least four months without any complaint of harmful interference being made.

In Appendix 30B, the corresponding provisions (§§ 6.25-6.29) are worded different in respect of the change from provisional to definitive recording, saying that the entry in the List shall be changed from provisional to definitive only if the Bureau is informed that all required agreements have been obtained.

The wording of § 4.1.18 are similar to those that existed in No 11.41 earlier. However, it is noted that these were deleted by WRC-12. More importantly is the principle difference between the unplanned and planned bands in that while the unplanned bands just have single-entry protection criteria, the planned bands have a reference situation which takes into account the aggregation of interference from all other networks which the protection criteria are based upon (a relative degradation of the reference situation e.g. 0.45 dB or 0.25 dB).

In entering a network provisionally into the List, the reference situation of “victim” networks with which coordination is not completed is not updated. In respect of Appendix 30B, the reference situation is updated when changing the recording from provisional to definitive, i.e. after agreement is reached.

However, in respect of Appendices 30 and 30A, t the reference situation of the “victim” network is updated when changing the recording from provisional to definitive, i.e. after four months without complaints about harmful interference. There may be many reasons why harmful interference does not occur during the first four months of operation, e.g. during this period, the “victim” network may not operate with its most sensitive characteristics (use of larger antennas, modulation/coding that is more robust, e.i.r.p.s higher than the minimum values, …) or the interfering network may not operate with its most interfering characteristics (lower EIRPs, transponders with no customers, steerable beams pointing in another direction, …..).

However, at the end of this four-month period, the reference situation of the “victim” network will be updated to incorporate the full interference from the network to which it has not given its agreement. This could severely affect the reference situation of the “victim” network and other later filings could impose significantly more interference upon the “victim” network before exceeding the relative degradation which triggers coordination. As a result, even though not having given its agreement, the “victim” network may find itself with reduced protection due to a network to which it has not given its agreement.

In preparations for WRC-15 it was too late to have this issue raised and captured in the CPM report. In discussions in CEPT, CEPT proposed that this issue could be resolved through an RRB decision. Following this advice, this issue was brought to the attention of RRB-70 meeting in October 2015 [RRB-70/10](http://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=R15-RRB15.3-C-0010), requesting that a Rule of Procedure be prepared to outline the desired practice to be followed by the Bureau. RRB-70 however was of the view that such a RoP would consist in a change of the Radio Regulations and therefore was outside the authority of the RRB.

Following this decision, a late contribution [WRC15/169](http://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=R15-WRC15-C-0169) on this issue was submitted to WRC-15. Since this proposal was made directly to the Conference with no previous studies, WRC-15 decided that “….it was felt that further study of this issue is required if this current practice is to be changed. ITU-R is therefore invited to study this issue under the standing Agenda item 7 with the aim of finding an appropriate regulatory and technical solution to this issue.”

Therefore, this issue was raised again at the first CPG PTB meeting in this study period in June 2016 suggesting regulatory changes, and also suggesting submitting it as a CEPT input contribution to the 2nd WP 4A meeting in September-October 2016 agreed within the framework of CEPT CPG PTB. However, the Administration of Russia was not in a position to join such a contribution, According to the ECC Working methods, in case one administration cannot join a contribution, it should be submitted to ITU-R as multi-country proposal instead. Hence, ECO collected supporting administrations and several administrations notified ECO that they wanted to co-sign such a multi-country contribution: Germany, Spain, France, Luxembourg, Norway and Sweden.

The 2nd meeting of WP 4A in September-October 2016 received this multi-country contribution [4A/183](http://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=R15-WP4A-C-0183) and briefly discussed the issue with support raised from Iran, Israel and several European Administrations while the Administration of Russia raised opposition. The WP 4A meeting agreed to establish this issue as a new issue G under AI 7 captured in a Working Document annexed to the Chairman’s Report still needing re-formatting into CPM text.

At the CPG meeting in December 2016, the Russian Federation made the following statement: “The Russian Federation could not support the preliminary CEPT position on the Issue G of the AI 7 as the proposed changes to update the reference situation of the "victim" network based on the bilateral agreement could lead to the degradation of environment for the third parties networks or even to regulatory uncertainties regarding already coordinated networks.”

# List of relevant documents

ITU-Documentation (Recommendations, Reports, other)

* Document [RRB 70/10](http://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=R15-RRB15.3-C-0010) – Norwegian input to RRB
* Document [WRC15/169](http://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=R15-WRC15-C-0169) – Norwegian input to WRC-15
* Section 3.14 of [WRC-15/504](http://www.itu.int/md/R15-WRC15-C-0504/en) – Minutes of the seventh Plenary meeting on the 20 November 2015
* Document [PTB(16)13](http://www.cept.org/Documents/cpg-pt-b/31259/cpg-ptb-16-13_update-reference-situation) – Norwegian input to PTB
* Document [4A/183](http://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=R15-WP4A-C-0183) – European multi-country input to WP 4A
* [Annex 25](https://www.itu.int/md/dologin_md.asp?lang=en&id=R15-WP4A-C-0196!N25!MSW-E) of [WP4A/196](http://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=R15-WP4A-C-0196) – Working Document in the Chairman’s Report of the 2nd WP 4A meeting

CEPT and/or ECC Documentation (Decisions, Recommendations, Reports)

EU Documentation (Directives, Decisions, Recommendations, other), if applicable

# Actions to be taken

* Develop a draft European Common Proposal (ECP)

# Relevant information from outside CEPT (examples of these are below)

## European Union (date of proposal)

## Regional telecommunication organisations

APT (date of proposal)

ATU (date of proposal)

Arab Group (20 April 2017)

* Follow-up studies under this issue.
* Study the implications of the proposals submitted.
* Consider the possibility of modifying (extend - reduce - delete) the period of time of provisional recording towards definitive recording, which allows operators to ensure that the utilizing frequency assignments.

CITEL (December 2016)

Preliminary Views

Canada: For issues relating to Appendices 30 and 30A and any potential modifications of their associated provisions, Canada is of the view that the specifics of the Region 2 Plan for BSS and its associated feeder links should be maintained.

RCC (14 April 2017)

The RCC Administrations consider it unreasonable to modify No. 4.1.18 of RR Appendices 30 and 30A, where the reference situation of the victim satellite network would be updated only after the agreement between the Administration notifying the network and the Administration notifying interfering new network.

## International organisations

IATA (date of proposal)

ICAO (date of proposal)

IMO (date of proposal)

SFCG (date of proposal)

WMO and EUMETNET (date of proposal)

## Regional organisations

ESA (date of proposal)

Eurocontrol (date of proposal)

## OTHER INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL ORGANISATIONS

EBU (date of proposal)

GSMA (date of proposal)

CRAF (date of proposal)

1. Issue xx: Application of coordination arc in the Ka band, to determine coordination requirements between FSS and other satellite services
2. ’It was agreed at the WP 4A May 2017 meeting to establish this issue as new Issue B under Agenda item 7. Hence the information below will be updated and moved to Annex 2 for the next CPG PTB meeting.

# ISSUE XX

Issue XX addressed the possibility of introducing the coordination arc concept to determine the coordination requirements between mobile-satellite service (MSS) and fixed-satellite service (FSS) geostationary satellite networks and between MSS geostationary satellite networks, in the portions of the Ka band where both services, FSS and MSS, are allocated.

# Preliminary CEPT position

СEPT supports to study and analyse the introduction of the coordination arc mechanism to determine the coordination requirements between mobile-satellite service and fixed-satellite service (FSS vs MSS) geostationary satellite networks and between MSS geostationary satellite networks (MSS vs MSS), in the portions of the Ka-band where both services, FSS and MSS, are allocated. Coordination arc criteria would substitute the ΔT/T>6% criteria that currently applies, improving and making more efficient the coordination procedures, while keeping the possibility for Administrations to request ΔT/T criteria under No 9.41. Consideration should be given to whether this approach would apply only to MSS and FSS frequency assignments on primary status (Option A) or even to MSS secondary frequency assignments without modifying the current conditions related to the category of allocation applicable to assignments to be taken into account in coordination (Option B).

CEPT considers that this matter should be studied as an issue of WRC-19 Agenda item 7.

# Background

The 1st meeting of WP 4A in April 2016 received an input contribution from Hispasat [WP4A/8](http://www.itu.int/md/R15-WP4A-C-0008/en), proposing the introduction of the coordination arc concept to determine the coordination requirements between mobile-satellite service (MSS) and fixed-satellite service (FSS) geostationary satellite networks and between MSS geostationary satellite networks, in the portions of the Ka band where both services, FSS and MSS, are allocated on a primary basis. This proposal was identified as OPTION A.

The 2nd meeting of WP 4A in October 2016 received another input contribution from Hispasat/Spain [WP4A/127](http://www.itu.int/md/R15-WP4A-C-0127/en), proposing the introduction of the coordination arc as trigger for coordination between FSS and MSS systems and MSS systems in the frequency bands 29.5-30 GHz (Earth-to-space)/19.7‑20.2 GHz (space-to-Earth), in all three ITU Regions. This contribution proposes to apply the coordination arc to services allocated on primary or secondary basis without modifying the current conditions related to the category of allocation applicable to assignments to be taken into account in coordination. This other proposal was identified as OPTION B.

In both options, Administrations can always request application of No 9.41 to include additional satellite networks that would be affected taking into account the ΔT/T > 6% criteria.

Both contributions study the characteristics of the earth station terminals used in the MSS and FSS in the Ka-band and conclude that they are quite similar. Taking into account that currently to determine if coordination is required when FSS vs FSS cases, coordination arc of 8º is applied in a successful and efficient way, Option A and Option B propose to apply the same criteria to the FSS vs MSS and MSS vs MSS cases, instead of ΔT/T > 6% criteria that currently applies.

The discussions and work performed during the meetings and the details of Option A and Option B proposals are reflected in [Annex 22](https://www.itu.int/md/dologin_md.asp?lang=en&id=R15-WP4A-C-0196!N22!MSW-E) of [WP4A/196](http://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=R15-WP4A-C-0196) Chairman’s report.

In view of both proposals considering to modify provisions of the Radio Regulations that directly affect the MSS, WP4A sent a liaison statement to WP4C inviting them to study the issue and provide its comments. This liaison is contained in [WP4C/113.](http://www.itu.int/md/R15-WP4C-C-0113/en)

# List of relevant documents

**ITU-Documentation (Recommendations, Reports, other)**

[WP4A/8](http://www.itu.int/md/R15-WP4A-C-0008/en): Contribution proposing the introduction of the coordination arc concept to determine the coordination requirements between mobile-satellite service (MSS) and fixed-satellite service (FSS) geostationary satellite networks and between MSS geostationary satellite networks, in the portions of the Ka band where both services, FSS and MSS, are allocated on a primary basis.

[WP4A/127](http://www.itu.int/md/R15-WP4A-C-0127/en): Contribution proposing the introduction of the coordination arc as trigger for coordination between FSS and MSS systems and MSS systems in the frequency bands 29.5-30 GHz (Earth-to-space)/19.7‑20.2 GHz (space-to-Earth), in all three ITU Regions, without considering whether the services are allocated on primary or secondary basis.

[Annex 22](https://www.itu.int/md/dologin_md.asp?lang=en&id=R15-WP4A-C-0196!N22!MSW-E) of [WP4A/196](http://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=R15-WP4A-C-0196) Chairman’s report reflecting the work and discussions related to this Issue and the details of Option A and Option B proposals.

[WP4C/113](http://www.itu.int/md/R15-WP4C-C-0113/en): Liaison from WP4A to WP4C inviting to study the issue and provide its comments.

**CEPT and/or ECC Documentation (Decisions, Recommendations, Reports)**

**EU Documentation (Directives, Decisions, Recommendations, other), if applicable**

# Actions to be taken

Further develop the preliminary CEPT position and eventually a draft European Common Proposal (ECP)

Consider whether the bands 20.2-21.2 GHz and 30-31 GHz should be covered by the studies proposed under this issue

In case it is agreed to create a new issue on AI 7, to suggest including WP 4C in the CPM as contributing group for this issue

# Relevant information from outside CEPT (examples of these are below)

## European Union (date of proposal)

## Regional telecommunication organisations

APT (date of proposal)

ATU (date of proposal)

Arab Group (date of proposal)

CITEL (date of proposal)

RCC (14 April 2017)

The RCC Administrations support the study on the possibility of introducing the coordination arc mechanism in the frequency bands 29,5-30/19,7-20,2 GHz to identify the need in the coordination between geostationary satellite networks in the mobile-satellite service (MSS) and the fixed-satellite service (FSS) as well as between MSS geostationary satellite networks.

The RCC Administrations consider that applying the coordination arc criterion would increase the efficiency of coordination procedure while maintaining the possibility to apply the RR No. 9.41.

## International organisations

IATA (date of proposal)

ICAO (date of proposal)

IMO (date of proposal)

SFCG (date of proposal)

WMO and EUMETNET (date of proposal)

## Regional organisations

ESA (date of proposal)

Eurocontrol (date of proposal)

## OTHER INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL ORGANISATIONS

EBU (date of proposal)

GSMA (date of proposal)

CRAF (date of proposal)