**WGFM QUESTIONNAIRE TO CEPT ADMINISTRATIONS ON INTERFERENCE CASES CAUSED BY WAS/RLAN EQUIPMENT IN THE METEOROLOGICAL RADARS OPERATING IN THE 5600-5650 MHZ FREQUENCY RANGE**

**Doc. FM(17)127 - Annex 13**

***Information to be provided in the cover of the questionnaire:***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Responding organisation** |  |
| **Country** |  |
| **Address/ e-mail address** |  |
| **Contact name** |  |

**Respondents are kindly invited to return the completed questionnaire before 31st of August 2017 to the European Communications Office (ECO)**

To: Mr Thomas Weber

preferably by e-mail: thomas.weber@eco.cept.org

or by fax: +45 33 89 63 30

Thank you for your cooperation.

**Introduction**

WGFM considered the ECC actions on meteorological radar interference issue ([ECC(17)034 Annex 14](http://www.cept.org/Documents/ecc/35311/ecc-17-034-annex-14_ecc-actions-on-met-radar-interference-issue)). As a part of the ECC action plan FM22 prepared the questionnaire below. CEPT Administrations may not be able to answer some of the questions but are kindly requested to provide as much information as possible.

FM22 delivered results of the annual interference statistics questionnaire 2016 to the WGFM. As outcome of the 2016 questionnaire, a number of administrations reported growing number of interference cases into meteorological radars from RLAN equipment: Czech Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, France, Portugal, Spain, and the United Kingdom.

In addition to the specific cases mentioned above, a number of interference cases have been reported in the general category ‘Land and satellite navigation systems as well as radiolocation (civil)’. In the absence of any specific additional information, it is not possible to identify whether these cases related to interference from 5 GHz meteorological radars or not.

Current questionnaire aims to collect information from CEPT administrations regarding the case of increasing interference from 5 GHz RLAN into meteorological radars operating in the 5600-5650 MHz band.

**Question 1:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Number of cases** | **Remarks** |
| In the 2015 - 2016 period were there cases in your country where interference was reported from 5 GHz RLAN into meteorological radars operating in the 5600-5650 MHz band? | [ ]  Yes |  |  |
| [ ]  No |  |  |
| [ ]  Unknown |  |  |
| What were the interference distances between the WAS/RLAN interfering devices and the victim radar? |  |

**It would be useful if national administrations provide additional information such as radar type, operational pulse width, pulse repetition frequency, antenna rotation speed, antenna beam width and scanning patterns associated with the victim Radars identified in Question 1.**

**It would also be useful if national administrations make available any additional evidence (if available) that would provide a real time snapshot of the nature of the interference experienced on the radar screen or console.**

**Question 2** (in cases of several different interference cases, the box below should be multiplied and used for each case)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Was the radar frequency within the operating channel bandwidth of the WAS/RLAN device? | [ ]  Yes[ ]  NoRemarks: … |
| Radar operating frequency? |  |
| WAS/RLAN operating frequency? |  |
| Operating channel bandwidth of the WAS/RLAN device? |  |
| Was DFS active in the WAS/RLAN device at the time of the interference? | [ ]  Yes[ ]  No |
| If DFS was inactive, how was it de-activated?  Via settings accessible to the user [ ]   Via different firmware/software [ ]   Via selecting a different country [ ]   Via other means, please provide details [ ]  Was it de-activated by the user? [ ]   | Remarks: … |
| What is the version of EN 301 893 to which compliance was declared?EN 301 893 v 1.5.1 (or previous version) [ ] EN 301 893 v 1.6.1, [ ] EN 301 893 v 1.7.1 [ ] EN 301 893 v 1.8.1 [ ] Unknown (it was impossible to identify the applied standard) [ ]  | Remarks: … |
| How was the interference case solved?(Re-)Configuration of the WAS/RLAN device [ ] (e.g. different operating channel)(Re-)Enabling DFS (in cases where DFS was disabled) [ ] Upgrading equipment (software/hardware) by vendor or user(to comply with European rules or later version of the standard) [ ] Other: ……………………………………………….. [ ]  | Remarks: … |
| What was the type of device/equipment that caused the interference?Individual Indoor RLAN device (private user) [ ] Individual outdoor WAS/RLAN device [ ] Outdoor RLAN network, including Mesh networks, public networks, hotspot applications [ ] Outdoor Point-to-Point (P2P) or Point-to-Multipoint (P2MP) links [ ] In case of P2P or P2MP links, the device causing the interference was operating as a Slave device without its own radar detection mechanism [ ] Other:…………………………………………………… [ ]  |  |
| Was a Notified Body involved in the conformity assessment for article 3.2 of the R&TTE/ RE-Directive?  | **[ ]** Yes**[ ]** NoRemarks: … |

**Optional Questions:**

Below are optional questions for which the answers may not always be known.

Questions 3 to 4 request details about the equipment that caused the interference.

(in cases of several different interference cases, a box below should be multiplied and used for each case)

**Question 3:** What type of antenna was used by the WAS/RLAN device?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| i. Omni directional antennaii. Directional antenna (patch, sector, …)iii. High gain directional antenna (in case of P2P links) | Please specify: … |

**Question 4:** Verification/Testing performed?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Did you check/verify by testing the compliance of the product against the ETSI standard? | [ ]  Yes[ ]  NoRemarks: … |

\*\*\*