

RAW FILE
ITU INTER-REGIONAL WORKSHOP
ON WRC-19 PREPARATION
NOVEMBER 20, 2018
9:30 A.M. CET

Services Provided By:

Caption First, Inc.
P.O Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
1-877-825-5234
+001-719-481-9835
Www.captionfirst.com

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

>> CHAIR: Ladies and Gentlemen, good morning. Could you please take your seats. We will start in a minute. And while you take your seats I will check the interpretation. English?

>> This is the English channel. English channel.

>> CHAIR: The French? The Spanish? No. 4. This is Russian. Good morning. No. 5, Chinese? Good morning. And No. 6, the Arabic. Good morning. Thank you very much.

So I would like to welcome on the podium the representatives of the regions, Chairman of the CPM and the director of the BR. If you could please come with us and take your seats on the podium. So the representatives from the regions, APT, ASMG, ATU, CEPT, CITELE and RCC. If you could kindly join us.

So thank you very much again for being with us this morning to start this second workshop on WRC-19 preparation. This is the ITU interregional workshop. We met last year. We had a good exchange of views already on the studies being prepared for

WRC-19. And this morning we meet here for the second workshop to look at the results of the studies and in particular the content of the draft CPM report that will be presented during the three days. I would like to welcome on the podium Mr. Francois Rancy, Mr. Khalid Al-Awadi, Chairman of the CPM. Also we have with us Dr. Kyujin Wee, the Chairman of APG, representing APT. Mr. Tariq Al Awadhi, Chairman of ASMG and Kezias Mwale, the representative of the ATU General Secretariat. And then we have Mr. Alexander Kuhn from Germany. And Mr. Jose De Jesus Arias Franco, he is alternate Chairman of the CITEC CC2 representing the group in charge of the preparation for the WRC in CITEC. And then we have Mr. Albert Nalbandian, the Chairman of the RCC Working Group on the preparation for WRC and we have also representative from the Government of Egypt. So I would like to welcome also Ms. Basma Alaa Tawsik, sorry for the bad pronunciation. You are welcome to join us on podium. I would like to give the floor to Mr. Francois Rancy the director of the BR.

>> FRANCOIS RANCY: Ladies and Gentlemen, good morning. It is a pleasure to welcome you on behalf of Houlin Zhao the Secretary-General of ITU for this second workshop on WRC preparation. I see that you came in very large number to participate in this event which is I believe a key milestone in building the consensus necessary for the success of WRC-19. So thank you for being here. I think this step is important in the sense that it is a opportunity to informally engage and better understand where we stand in the regional preparations, where we stand in the ITU-R study process. Before we meet in CPM in two months and finalize the CPM report which will be the basis for the studies reported to the conference and therefore the basis for the proposal of Member States to this conference. So it is an important date today and tomorrow for discussing actually on the day after tomorrow for discussing where we stand and better understand each other.

I'm very much pleased by the degree of consensus that we have already built, seeing commonality of views or convergence on views and many of the draft proposals which are emerging from the original preparatory processes. And I believe that if we continue the efforts that we have already made we'll be in a position in

Sharm El Sheikh in one year to have a very successful conference. I visited the facilities in Sharm El Sheikh that the government of Egypt is preparing for us and I was very much impressed by the quality of this facility. So I believe excellent facilities and excellent preparation. You can make WRC-19 a success. With that I would like to wish you the best success for this workshop. And thank you for your attention.

(Applause.)

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Francois Rancy. And now I would like to invite on the microphone Mrs. Basma Alaa Tawsik -- we have a request for the floor, please. Go ahead. Mr. Arasteh.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Distinguished Colleagues, Ladies and Gentlemen, good morning, to all of you. Welcome to this second work for the WRC-19. As I mentioned yesterday in the Study Group 5 it is a great pleasure to see many, many people at this room, some of the young people. We have seen them very recently. It gives us great pleasure. Distinguished Colleagues, it is also sad, very sad, not to see people that we have seen for many, many years. Those who have served the union for almost more than a century or half a century in active life. On the 16th of October the ITU and television community in the world has heard the sad news of that of the father of television, Professor Marc Kichev who is and will be an icon for ITU, is a very well-known figure around the world for more than half a century. He became the Chairman of Study Group 11 in 1972 and at that time he was thinking of digital television and digital satellite broadcasting. He had a vision. And this vision become reality. And all of us benefitting from the digital satellite broadcasting and in particular digital terrestrial television. Under his Chairmanship more than 150 recommendation were developed for television services and for the satellite broadcasting as well. He is the author or coauthor of more than 90 or 95 documents, books and many printed publications. He was always writing. He was always giving advice. Any time he came and saw me which is a strong finger putting on my body saying that you must do this in order me and I like this order and I like calling my father. In 2015 professor Marc Kichev was given the ITU award which was the only award given to one international personality. Although it was not simply enough to cover all the contributions that he made due to enormous value in ITU, we ITU deeply mourns the death of Marc Kichev which is inrepairable. He is not physically with us but he will be with other mind and our heart. Distinguished Colleagues, the minimum I suggest one minute of silence in standing in our honor of our father, professor Kichev. Thank you.

(Pause).

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Arasteh for these kind words. And we will for sure remember professor Kichev. Now we -- I would like to invite Mrs. Tawsik come to the microphone and present some information regarding the Sharm El Sheikh venue.

>> BASMA ALAA TAWSIK: Ladies and Gentlemen, good morning,

everyone. This is Basma. I am working on the national telecom regulatory authority. I am responsible for the world radio communication conference all the logistics of the conference. I came from the airport to help you with anything related to the conference. Allow me to give you a brief presentation about WRC-19 preparations.

As you all know that the World Radio Conference usually held in Geneva because of its large number of participants, and because of all its requirements, it is not easy that any country can host such an event like this. And because Egypt used to hold such conferences successful conferences such as the symposium for regulator with a great success this encourages you to host one of ITU events such as the WRC-19. WRC-19 will be held in Sharm El Sheikh, city of peace because it is characterized with many facilities such as the different varieties of hotels and also large, huge conference hall, which is to consist of 36 meeting rooms. And because the WRC requires many meeting rooms, not only 36 meeting rooms, we have designed a new extension for the Maritime that offers about meetings rooms. To the capital and Summit which are the biggest meeting rooms and hold around 3500 participants respectively. The new extension offers for all the requirements facilities of the WRC-19 such as VIP rooms, relaxation, ITU services and coffee breaks and meeting rooms for the participants. Now I'm going talk about the host country facilities for the participants. First thing is the entry visa. Of course, entry visa will be free of charge for all participants and participants which have Egyptian representative and counselors at country should apply at the representative desk and showing the confirmation of registration of the event to obtain their entry visa. And Egypt now in order to facilitate obtaining the entry visa has already informed all the Egyptian representative around the world that we will be hosting the WRC-19. So this will facilitate your entry visas. Only participants who don't have Egypt representative or counselor at their country will obtain their visa upon arrival. We have something new called e-visa. It is listed for some countries and it is on our website. I will show it to you after of the meeting. The second thing is the accommodation. City of Sharm El Sheikh characterized with a variety of hotels and different prices and WiFi. We have 17 list of hotels with a very good rate for WRC-19 participants. Around 3,000 rooms. We have more. But these rates currently are not the final. It can be lower than that and we will send you the final rates for the hotels.

And for the transportation from the airport to the hotel -- to the official hotels will be free of charge. And also from the official hotels to the venue will be available and

buses -- there will be shuttle buses every ten minutes at the doors of the official hotels. Some important information I would like to share with you, currently we have two e-mails that anyone can send an e-mail on it. We have the WRC hotel at RA.gov eg. Any participant would like to make any reservation in any of these 17 official hotels should send his confirmation of registration, his name, of course, on the country and entity and the hotel requested to book in it and we will get back to you with the confirmation, but this website will be working at the beginning of December 2018. Also we have another sorry e-mail and we have another e-mail for the visa entries and this e-mail will be working for December 2018. Waiting for you in Sharm El Sheikh because WRC will not be a great success without you. I am going to show some current pictures of the Maritime and the new extension. They have been taken during the world youth Forum held last month in Sharm El Sheikh. These pictures are the new extension of the current Convention center of Sharm El Sheikh and now I am going to present you the final thing a short film about Sharm El Sheikh and showing the Convention center as well.

(Video)

>> BASMA ALAA TAWSIK: Thank you and see you in Sharm El Sheikh.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much Ms. Tawik. We have already applauded this presentation that you saw on website of this event and we will add the photos that we saw this morning and the video is available on Youtube and I would like to give the floor to the Chairman of CPM, if you would like to provide some opening remarks. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADI: Sorry. Thank you very much Philippe. Ladies and Gentlemen, good morning. And welcome to this second workshop interregional workshop for WRC-19 preparations. And this time we are approaching the end of our cycle for the conference. The draft CPM report is ready and published. And we are also approaching the second session of the CPM19. Our aim at this time should be to facilitate as much as possible the work of the conference, the WRC-19. We should do that in a way to -- that would make sure that we have a easier approach to find compromises. And I think the way to achieve that is as I understand to reduce as much as possible the methods to satisfy each and every agenda item that we have on our agenda for the conference. The way we can do that is to have a better understanding between the regional groups and to have better understanding of the ideas and requirements that we have in our regional groups. And this is basically what I believe is the purpose or the goal of the workshops that we are having. During the first workshop that we had we were still during the studies

and we understood that we would require or the participants would require a better understanding of the agenda items. A better understanding of details and requirements for these agenda items of that's why we arranged, we scheduled the first interregional workshop in a way that we included the industry ultimately all the agenda items we are having are going to facilitate the industry for us. We needed the players to be there so we have a better understanding of the requirements of these agenda requirements. During the second workshop we have the CPM report ready. We have the methods available to satisfy each and every agenda item. I think now is the good time, now is the best time for us as regional groups to come together, to discuss these methods that are available. And try to get closer to each other. To understand what are the requirement of each regional group and find some sort of middle ground. Last week I know many of you are exhausted we spent the last three weeks in Plenipotentiary Conference 2018 which was held in Dubai. We were honored to receive many of you in the conference and we had a very nice and successful three weeks full of exhaustion I understand but we had some sort, almost more than 70 Resolutions discussed and agreed and I think that raises the bar for us in the radio sector have a very successful and good conference next year.

But this week is going to be different than last three weeks. I'd like you to imagine this week as a relaxation, as a resort. So imagine yourself when you enter this room as you are entering to the movie theaters. You have a relaxing Chairs over here. I want you to sit down and enjoy the movie and look at the scenarios and look at the transcript of the movies and I want you to think that would be the best finishing for these movies. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much Mr. Khalid. And I would like now that we have more minutes before the break to give the opportunity to the regional groups representatives to say a few words about the actual preparation of these regional groups regarding preparation for WRC-19 and RA19 and as information that you may think of interest for the participants at this opening session of the workshop.

So I would like to propose to start with Mr. Wee, Chairman of the APG, the group in charge of preparation of WRC-19 and RA-19 of the APT.

>> KYUJIN WEE: Thank you. Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen. Distinguished Delegates, I appreciate that we are providing this opportunity for us and also organizing this workshop as well. As you know the APG is one of the work programs of the APT which is responsible for the preparation of

the WRC. The more information about the APT and the APG you can find from the document 10 to this workshops. However the document 10 was developed during the -- our last meeting in March which was well before the work of the responsible group in ITU-R. So that document most of the area doesn't cover the recent studies of ITU-R. However I believe that the APG representatives in this workshops, in every sessions they are ready to discuss the issues, what we have to resolve during the CPM and during the WRC. And the other things in our APT preliminary view we have a standard sections which is the -- what is the issues for the next meeting. The one of the common world rankings in this section we will try to reduce the other views to make a better harmonized view of the APG. I believe we work together in such a way. Thank you for your attentions. Thank you.

(Applause.)

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much Dr. Wee. Now I would like to invite the Chairman of the ASMG Mr. Tariq to say a few words about the preparation in the Arabic region. Please.

>> TARIQ AL AWADHI: Good morning. Good morning, everyone. Thank you very much Philippe and I would like to on behalf of all of you to thank you ITU for organizing this second interregional workshop for WRC-19. Indeed it is a pleasure to see all again. And many of you also have been working with him for the last three weeks in Dubai for Plenipotentiary and it was really exhausted and hopefully these three days will be good for us as rest as Mr. Khalid was saying it is a movie to compare what happened last few weeks and comparing what happens in the next WRC. We have so many important things on the agenda and all the world is looking to see the result, it will depend on industry and changing in the sector. With regard to the ASMG group that we are having now coming two meetings. The first meeting will be this December 9 to 13 December in Oman, Jordan. And next meeting last meeting before WRC will be in Sharm El Sheikh, ASMG meeting in Sharm El Sheikh. We are waiting to see when we can do it because the see the result of the CPM and then we have to see what the time. We'll inform you on that one. So the coming meeting of this one we are focusing on preparing a document for the CPM. As Khalid was saying in order to have very successful and easy conference if we can reduce the number of methods which has been identified for each agenda item and the CPM will be a good way to see those methods and to see how possible that we can reduce those methods to satisfy any agenda item. And ASMG group also working towards that one. We are having a number of important issues. So we are going to prepare proposal to the CPM. And, of course, we would like to invite all regional groups, groups, I believe the letters have already

been received by the head of regional groups for upcoming meeting. On the last day we have a meeting with our regional group to exchange information. In the last year for whole year December 2017 until now I was involved in the preparation of the Plenipotentiary Conference. And having a chance to Chair the Arab group for preparation of Plenipotentiary Conference and we had this similar interregional workshop. It was good to exchange the information, the position of each regional group on different topics. So we encourage these kind of meetings or this kind of workshop to exchange information, to exchange a position between regional group in order to see where we are and to see how we can reduce the gap between the regional groups. So we hope that this kind of workshop to continue like this between regional groups. We always encourage and we support this kind of initiatives by ITU and we show the success today and coming two days also for this workshop. Thank you very much. Looking forward to see you.

(Applause.)

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much Mr. Tariq and I would like to invite Mr. Mwale, representative from the ATU general Secretariat.

>> KEZIAS MWALE: Many thanks to you Mr. Philippe because without you no one speaks. So thank you so very much. Second, is to say thank you to the BR, Mr. Francois Rancy for working so hard and to it we indeed do all the good things in the RA sector, including this workshop. So thank you. Thank you to all of us for coming because I do not think Mr. Francois Rancy could have had this workshop without us showing up. So thank you to all of us.

Allow me now to develop my points which I prepared for you just five of them. The first one is regarding greetings from the African region. First on behalf of the current Secretary-General, who would have loved to be here but because of the Plenipot decided to go home straight to his office to catch up on one or two pending issues. Second is greetings from the Secretary-General elect of the African union. Now likely enough Mr. John Amor is with us today for I guess see in advance what we see -- what we do in the RA sector. So allow me now to simply invite Mr. Amor to right so you can simply see him.

Thank you. So that's Mr. John Amor the Secretary-General elect. He takes office after 1st January 2019.

The second point is congratulations from the African region for the just ended ITU elections. So first the ITU leadership including Mr. Mario, the director elect for the radio sector. Also the IRB members and as well as the Council members. We wish them well from the perspective of our region.

The third point, Ladies and Gentlemen, is to simply give you

in very brief terms the states of preparations for WRC as well as the Radio Assembly 2019 from our view. If you have checked the document that is input to this workshop, as much as it is informal, it would give you a good picture of where we are. And therefore I would characterize our preparations as great at this point. Why? Because at the last meeting in Egypt we managed to reach some -- some gentlemen's agreement, others would insist that they are gentle lady's agreement of issues in total. And therefore from the Egypt meeting, the APM193 we are looking at progressing on the 15.3% that did not -- those issues that we are not like enough to have an agreement, a preliminary agreement.

And therefore sometime in quarter 3, so this could be July, August, September depending on the final agreement with the host country which would be South Africa for a fourth and final meeting, we would be looking at first of all confirming the 86.7% issues for which the Egypt meeting reached some gentlemen's agreement as well as finding your way, concluding on the 13.3% that remained. Now just before the final deciding meeting which is the fourth African preparatory meeting for WRC we may have, we may have working group meetings. There are so many thoughts around how we can make sure that we benefit from a cost -- cost savings and efficiencies to see if we can put the Working Group meeting on the first day and then let the deciding meeting from Tuesday to Friday. That has not been decided but that's sort of what we are thinking that we may not indeed this time around have the Working Groups meetings separate from the deciding meetings. But rather try to have them back to back. After all we made such significant progress at our last meeting.

Today's events as well as other African union events we continue to extend a warm welcome. If for some reason we haven't sent an invitation letter to you, please invite yourself. You are able to write to us, express your interest to participate. We normally and will ayes, and welcome. We try to send official invites to all our colleagues in the other regions.

The last point, Mr. Moderator, Mr. Philippe this morning for me, is to besiege you once again for the WRC-19 as well as the Radio Assembly that we should try and endeavor to exercise towards each other the goodwill that is necessary for the success of these conferences.

So first is a kind request for goodwill towards our key issues as well as the goodwill towards the host country which happens to be Egypt, which happens to be in Africa this time around. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much Mr. Mwale and now I would

like to invite Mr. Alexander Kuhn Chairman of the CEPT group of RA-19.

>> ALEXANDER KUHN: Thank you very much Philippe. Good morning, everyone. Good morning, Delegates. Good morning, colleagues. Maybe also all around the world. First of all, on behalf of the CEPT my whole heart congratulations to the BR for the excellent organization of these workshops during this one. Also my personal thanks to the leaving BR director Mr. Francois Rancy for his excellent leadership throughout the last years. And, of course, the congratulations to the director elected and the directees elected. I hope she is still in the room and I am happy that we have already a lady on the team of the leadership of the ITU. And CEPT would be happy to see some more leadership ladies also in the term of the WRC. Maybe you can have a look in your own Delegations to find the right people forward and Europe will do that in order to move forward.

Also my sincere thanks to the Egyptian Government for hosting the WRC and I am happy they made this nice presentation to us. I had the pleasure to visit Sharm El Sheikh a couple of months ago and see that they are doing everything to please us and bring forward some excellent facilities to the WRC and we should look forward and be excited for being there for the four, five weeks and extension to CPM23 as well. In order to inform you about the state of play CEPT prepared also a lengthy and bulky presentation to you and this is available on the website. We will not go through all of them but you can see we have made our homework and we have done all of the preliminary positions for each and every agenda item. But we haven't done yet is starting our preparation for RA-19. I think we still have something to do there and we are doing this in the next year and with more exercises in that direction. What is coming up in terms of timing we still have three meetings to go. Our next meeting of the conference preparatory group of Europe will start next week in the Netherlands and we will have two meetings to go. One is end of May in Sweden and last one most likely in the Russian Federation end of August. So you can all prepare your schedule already for your traveling arrangements due to meetings. Everyone from the region groups is welcome to discuss with us. And the information on the project teams are also contained in our presentation.

What I would like to say as well is what we do now is creating already some European common proposals that we can bring to your attention later on and then later on we can have an in-depth discussion on the different methods. What we would like to achieve with you during the course of the now upcoming year is continuous dialogue which is very, very good on a professional way, not dealing only with words but finding the

design for the future of radio communication which is from our perspective an essential part for the digital society in all terms and there we need definitely then also to think ahead, not only on one service but also on the balance between the different services and there we also need to have take in to account the ITU study results and also the need for protection of other services there as well. We cannot create the word new if we don't look back in history. Otherwise we will create a lot of legacy issues and maybe some critical issues which cannot be solved and we have see some of them we can solve later in many WRCs and we are open for dialogue and we would like to use every opportunity during this CPM and this informal workshop to and look forward to find the right solutions at the WRC-19. Thank you very much for your attention.

(Applause.)

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Kuhn for this introduction of the CEPT preparation. Now I would like to invite Mr. Arias the alternative Chairman of CITELE to provide some information on the preparation in CITELE, please.

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: Thank you very much Philippe. I would like you to join the previous speakers with regards of the thanking to the BR for the organization of this workshop. And also to congratulate Mr. Francois Rancy for this period in front of the ITU-R. Thank you very much for your leadership and also thanks to Philippe for the leadership on the organization of this workshop.

Well, good morning, everyone. Good morning, colleagues. I am Jose Arias. I am the alternate Chair of the PC2 from the CITELE organization. At this time I am representing Carmen who is the Chair of the WRC preparations within the CITELE. I would like to mention that I would prefer to speak in Spanish for two reasons, for two main reasons since all my experience inside of the ITU is not very initial to hear Spanish in the meeting room. So this is the first reason I prefer to speak in Spanish and to try to get the support of our translators, translators colleagues. And the second point is also because English is not my mother tongue. So I feel more comfortable to speak in Spanish. So I will switch to Spanish to try to hear a little bit of Spanish inside of the room. So I will switch to Spanish. If everyone has translator, please try to change to the English because I will speak in Spanish. Thank you very much. As I just said I am substituting for Carmen who is the Chair of this Working Group for preparation for the conference within the CITELE region. I am not sure whether we have interpreters here in the room.

>> Yes, this is the English booth.

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: I am substituting Carmen

Rivera. He was the Chair of the preparatory group for the conference within the CITELE region. He sends all his greetings. He couldn't be here with us today in this meeting. Within CITELE we have at least five sessions in preparation for the conference 2019, the last meeting was held in Mexico where we began the preparatory process for the conference for the WRC. We will have three further meetings at least before the conference next year. The next year will be held in Brasilia in two weeks' time where we hope to look at various proposals. We have seven inter-American proposals from seven different agenda items already. I am going to explain a little bit approximate about our preparatory procedure towards the conference. We have four different types of documents within the preparatory process. The first is a preliminary view where a Member State of CITELE sends a contribution on a specific agenda item. The second item is a preliminary proposal where a country openly shows its position towards the preparatory process in relation to a specific agenda item. The third type of document which we have in the CITELE region is a draft inter-American proposal where a country sends a contribution on a certain item towards the conference and this has to be supported by at least one other Member State and then another document we have the inter-American proposals. These are the proposals that are sent to the WRC where -- which are supported by the a least six Member States who are supporting this proposal on a certain agenda item and is not opposed by more than 50% of the number of support obtained. So the different documents we have. And we have at least seven inter-American proposals from different addressing different agenda items. We also have two further meetings next year, the first will be in April next year which is dates is yet to be confirmed. The last one before the WRC will be held in Canada in Ottawa. And dates are yet to be confirmed. This is the preparatory process which we have in place before the WRC. CITELE prepared a document and a contribution for this meeting where it lays out all the details of the proposals I have been submitted to date across the four different scenarios that I mentioned of the contributions are identified as a contribution 14, document 14 you can find the details of all of these positions which we have within CITELE region to date. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Arias. Now I would like to invite Mr. Nalbandian the Chairman of the RCC Working Group on the preparation for WRC and RA-19.

We noted a bit of misconnection with Arabic channel. So if you could check that in the interpretation booth. Thank you.

>> ALBERT NALBANDIAN: Colleagues, good morning. I should

like to welcome all participants to this meeting. Now because I'm the last to speak in this first part of the meeting I should like to say that many things that I was intending to say have already been said. So I would like to thank speakers who spoke before me for that. I should like to echo all the warm words that were addressed to Mr. Francois Rancy, to the Chair of the CPM and to all present in this room. Now this isn't first time that we have met in the context of these interregional meetings. This workshop to share our points of view and to exchange our experiences. A tradition which is an integral part of the preparation of the WRC and I should like to highlight that we are on the final path for the preparation of WRC. And the RA and I would like to just say a few words to compliment what has been said this morning. We have heard that at the end of WRC-15 we noted that we would have to give greater attention to consensus based decisions on issues examined by the conference. We have said on a number of occasions we need to reduce the number of methods to deal with items on the agenda before the second session of the CPM. We believe that we must ensure that there is a level playing field and an understanding previous to the conference. Now we know that's not always possible but as they are a large number of questions and items I think that we should look to make decisions based on consensus and the CPM should allow all countries to prepare proposals whether these be on a joint or individual basis to resolve this issue.

Now the CPM is taking place in just a few months and until then, we propose to continue our preparations in the context of the RCC to prepare the conference in the CPM, but especially the second session of the CPM and then we will have the possibility of preparing our own positions based on the CPM report and to compare our positions with those from other regional groups. I should like to call your attention colleagues to the fact that we should not forget that all ITU member states don't necessarily participate in the work of the regional organizations. We should not forget that. Because there are some countries who for a whole number of reasons are not members of these recognized regional organizations. So that's something that we need to keep in mind. Because the conference may adopt decisions which concern all states who are members of the ITU. So in conclusion, if I might I should like to say that what's within this interregional workshop is something that might not be sole objective but what's in mind for the organization and the program of this workshop is that we also have a meeting of the informal preparation group. We have a coordinator with us. Now this is informal preparation. It will allow us to draw out the outline for a successful CPM and to prepare as best as possible for the conference. So once again I hope that we will

just have one method allowing us to resolve the majority of questions. So that we can enjoy a conference which is crowned with success. So thank you all for your attention and I wish every success for our work over these three days. Thank you.

(Applause.)

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much Mr. Nalbandian. Now we had planned a break but if you give me five minutes I would like to show you where we stand in ITU with the preparation for WRC. So to start with, this short presentation, I would like to refer you first to the document 16 of the workshop, you can find that on the Web page of that workshop as input document along with all the other documents that will be presented or referred to during this workshop. So the Web page you can see here and on the right-hand side you have access to this information.

I would like to stress also that this workshop has a Webcast in all the six languages of the union. And we will also be archiving this discussion. So it could be further consulted after this workshop. As it was the case last year with the first workshop. As the program of the workshop during the next three days is summarized on in slide. So we'll try to go through all the chapters of the draft CPM report and the different agenda items included in those chapters which are summarized also on this slide by topics. So with that we have the presentation by the Rapporteur of the chapters of the draft CPM report and we will have representatives of the regional groups also present in the different sessions to provide views of the regions on those agenda items and issues. And we will have also the possibility for you participants in the room representing your administration or other organizations international organization or other entities to provide comments during those discussions.

Our preparation for WRC-19 is now reaching major milestone which will be the second session of the CPM19 and you could see the date here and the link to the invitation letter that have all been issued already. Subsequently you heard final meetings of the regional groups after CPM-2 and you hear the date of WRC-19 and RA-19 in case you didn't note them already. What I would like to add is the issuing at the end of the last week of the formal invitation letters for the RA and WRC. Invitation letters which are sent to, of course, the Member States but other entities as well.

And this is available on the WRC-19 main Web page. And as the same also available on the RA-19 main Web page as you can see on the slides. I said that we and you heard that we have now completed the draft CPM report. The draft CPM report was to be available three months prior to the CPM-2. This report is available in the six ITU languages on the CPM Web page. The

next major event we will have, I mentioned CPM-2 but the work of the ITU-R responsible groups and Study Groups is not finished yet. They will still have meetings. They met within ITU-R Study Group 5 the last two weeks and yesterday study group 5 approved a number of reports or recommendations related to the work of WRC and this approval process and final development will be continuing next year after CPM-2 and there will be again final meetings of the Study Groups prior to RA-19 to approve as much as possible those supporting material.

If you look at the draft CPM report general overview gives list of draft methods that are contained and you can see that we have multiple options in the draft CPM report. The draft CPM report has also exceeded the number of pages of the previous one by about 10%. So I would like to encourage all the participants to look more closely at the different options and see how we could converge in that respect.

And this is one of the major aspects of the second session of the CPM is to try to further discuss the issues and reconcile as much as possible to prepare a consolidated CPM report to WRC-19. We count on contributions from the membership. CPM is one of the last opportunities for sector members to contribute directly to the process. As you know for WRC this is proposal from Member States but, of course, we have contribution from Member States at CPM as well. So I invite you to carefully take note of the deadlines that are mentioned on this slide for the submission of contributions. We have a firm deadline on 4th of February 2019 at 600 hours UTC. Which means after this deadline the contributions are not acceptable and will not be issued to CPM-2. CPM-2 will look at the first version of the direct [ar's](#) report to WRC-19 as well as other issues. To help preparing contributions to CPM-2, I have put slides here to provide for the contribution. This all available in the C -- in the CPM Web page as a guideline for preparation for (inaudible). I put this slide to remind you the use of CPI tools and again you would find on the CPM Web page all this information necessary for the preparation of CPM-2. It was mentioned already the work of the regional groups, future meetings which are summarized on this slide and I would like to end this presentation to mention to you the workshop that is 4 to 6 December 2019. I thank you all distinguished panelists present with us this morning on this opening session and I invite you to come back at 11 o'clock in this room. We will start session 1. Thank you very much to all.

(Applause.)

(Coffee break).

>> CHAIR: We will start the session 1 of the workshop. And now that the Rapporteurs for chapter 2 and chapter 3 of the

draft CPM report have joined us on the podium I invite the representatives of the regional groups. If you could kindly come and take your seat so that we can start with this session 1 that will address very important agenda item, and a number of issues. So we will start with agenda item 1.13, then we will continue with agenda 9.1 issues 9.1.1 and 9.1.2 and they are related to the topic on the IMT.

So again thank you very much for coming back and taking your seat. I also invite the ATU representative to join us while we start the presentation on agenda item 1.13. And without delay I would like to give the floor to Mr. Jose De Jesus Aria Franco who will introduce to you the main results of the draft CPM report starting with agenda item 1.13. You have the floor.

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: Thank you very much. (No audio)

I have prepared a presentation for this agenda item. Going to begin with agenda item 1.13 which is quite a complex agenda item and with a content for the preparatory conference. So I am going to continue with this presentation and also for the benefit of my colleagues who are representing the different regions who are here on the podium with me, the -- what we are going to do is that I will go through the presentation, and at each frequency band I am going to pause in order to try to encompass some of the opinions and positions from the regional group and I am going to do this with each frequency band that we come across. I am going to begin with the presentation then.

Given that this is a presentation which I prepared for all of chapter 2, firstly I am going to give an introduction for the different agenda items within chapter 2 and then I'll move on to further detail for each agenda item. So I'm going to jump over now straight to agenda item 1.13 and as you can see the task group 5.1 was the group in charge of working for the WRC-19 agenda item 1.13.

This agenda item given what is written Resolution 238 to ensure that this group is charged with looking at this agenda item. Briefly this is description of the spectrum needs between 24 and 25 gigahertz and 86 gigahertz and the mandate of this group was also to look at sharing compatibility studies for each frequency band under study and so articulate some methods to address this agenda item. And also to look at regulatory and procedural considerations for each frequency band on that study.

So this is an overview of what is in the preparatory text for the conference in the CPM text. This text includes the summary, includes a background, the summary and analysis and results of studies and includes methods. And regulatory and procedural considerations. It also includes this text on frequency bands under analysis. These frequency bands are

listed and identified with a letter and this letter represents each frequency band under analysis from letter A to letter L. So if you look at the screen you can see the different frequency bands. The text also includes a no change method for each of the frequency bands. This is very important because each frequency band has a possibility for to not be considered for IMTs and finally, all of the frequency bands except item B consider other methods for the possible identification of frequency bands for IMT. These methods have two main considerations which are below, the series of alternatives for identification for IMT and it contains protection conditions in accordance with each of the particular characteristics of each of the frequency bands. And this you can see in detailed fashion in the CPM text. As I mentioned we are going to go frequency band frequency band and I am going to take a pause at each one. The initial frequency bands is 24.25 to 27.5 gigahertz. As I mentioned this has an option for no change to develop IMTs and in method 2, which is allocation for IMT and in the text you can see the importance for those working parties. There are two identification alternatives. The first of these is alternative 1 which is allocate the frequency band to the mobile service, except aeronautical mobile on a primary basis in regions 1 and 2. This because region 3 already has this identified for mobile services. And to identify the 24.25, 27.5 frequency band for the terrestrial component of IMT and this is important within the land mobile for service in regions 1, 2, 3. So the difference with alternative 2 is that there is no distinction between identification, 24, 25 and 27.5 and the terrestrial component of IMT. What we can see moving on, so that we have the conditions for this method for this frequency band you can see a list of different conditions which goes from A to G. From 2A which is protection measures for the EESS, the passive service, 23.6 to 24 gigahertz and you can see A to G which are protection measures for multiple services and something I would like to comment upon as relevant as mentioned by the people working in working parties, they all have different options within this. Despite that we have protection, this protection also has three different options within it. And for further details you can consult the CPM text which established the different working methods and the different options which are in place for protection measures for all services. I am going to take a short break with the aim of addressing this frequency bands and I would like to begin with the encompass some of the regional services from the frequency band. Let's begin on left with RCC. We just like to see on 24.25 to 27.5 gigahertz frequency band what is the position of the RCC regional group with regards to this frequency band.

Thank you.

>> SERGEY PASTUKH: Thank you very much. Thank you, Chair. It is an honor to open, to start the ball rolling to explain the regional groups on this frequency band. Firstly, I would like to say that we are favorable towards this frequency band in our region. We would like this frequency band to be identified for IMT services, international mobile telecommunications. Our main concern or our starting point for this frequency band is that the services need to be protected, need to be protected. Those passive services in the adjacent bands. Above all the research services and the space services in the 23-26 gigahertz band, 24 gigahertz. We feel furthermore, in the band 50 gigahertz -- (no audio).

(Captioner standing by. Can't hear the speaker).

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: Thank you very much for your comments. I will move on to the CITELE position, please. Thank you.

>> LUCIANA CAMARGOS: (No audio).

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: Thank you very much for expressing CITELE's vision. I will move on straight on to CEPT's position. Thank you.

>> STEVE GREEN: (No audio) (captioner standing by.)

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: Thank you very much for those comments. I hope that was useful to the room. I am moving on to my right the position from AT. Please you have the floor.

(Captioner standing by. No audio).

>> The protection of other services we deal -- they are not necessary at this point in time. Thank you.

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: (No translation).

>> It is my pleasure to present the preliminary study of the ACT presentation -- so with regards to agenda item 1.13, within frequency band, considering the required limits within the range of minus 32 to minus 37 and between minus 28 to minus 32DB. Keeping in mind that protection of existing services within the band or even the adjacent band is something that is important for administrations. We are keen to have a protection without unnecessary burdens or constraints on the deployment of IMT-2020 in all countries. So in addition to the 24.25 to 27.5, within the frequency band 40.5 to 42.5 gigahertz. Keeping in mind that we are not in favor of introducing any sort of proposal for 27 gigahertz within the coming WRC. So for -- with regards to the remaining frequency bands we are still considering the position on other frequency band probably in the next meeting of ASMG. Thank you.

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: Thank you very much more the position. Mainly the main idea for the discussion is to go

through band by band. So at this point in time I would like to know first of all, the views for this frequency bands 25 to 28 and later on we will be passing across different professionals. Thanks for the views of ASMG. So we will pass through to the last regional group, APT, please.

>> HIROYUKI ATARASHI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, everyone. With respect to the APT views for this frequency band, we mentioned in the opening session APT preliminary views were developed in this March. So we didn't take in to account any final results of that TG51 but for this particular frequency band it is the Plenary views contains one sentence. So I will read this. Subject to satisfactory results of sharing and compatibility studies APT members have a preference in prioritizing considerations for IMT identification in the 24.5 to 27.5 gigahertz frequency band or portions thereof. So in general APT members are supported for this frequency band. But with respect to the conditions for this IMT identifications APT members have not yet discussed details based on the results of the ITR studies. And I believe we are going to discuss this matter at the next APG meeting to be held January next year. Thank you.

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: Thank you very much. Because although we have taken note of the agreement that we are reaching for this frequency band, I think that we might be able to set a good record for consensus on decision of this frequency band. There is no possibility for -- possibility for the frequency band but we will move rapidly through this. The work that has been done in the preparatory conference, if you want more details on that then you can -- I will now move to 37 to 40.5. We have a no change option. Then we have a series of conditions for the (inaudible) to include (inaudible) and as you can also see on the screen there are different options for each kind of protections and different conditions established for the frequency band.

I'd also like to -- adopt for the sessions, we are going to have a frequency band for the different regional group opinions and then we will have some time for questions and answers for each frequency band for colleagues who are with us from the regional groups.

I can see the floor is being requested. So I would like to ask if (inaudible).

>> Yes. Please go ahead.

>> Thank you, sir. I almost agree with you but due to the importance of some of the matters perhaps you may slightly modify the way you want to process these issues and after each band you have some discussion. The importance of this meeting is to have interactive participation. And we have to do that.

One question to you and to all other colleagues, you need to establish (inaudible) Distinguished Delegates. They have to have some balance between the time of presentations. Not a long presentation because we would not have such time. This is internal for you and others but now on the 24 gigahertz band for 2016, it seems that most of the people almost agree with identification. A problem is the conditions. What conditions to be met? One Delegate mentioned something about national. I want to make it clear that ITU does not deal with the national issues. Do not refer that this should be done internationally. It does not deal with the national policy of each country. So let's take it out of the discussion. Second is the conditions, yes, with conditions we could establish the identification but conditions, there are two types of conditions. Some people want completion as an option. Some other mandatory. Chair, for the time being since all WRC I have never seen any optional conditions. One administration decides for the others a group of admins decides with the others. Conditions should be discussed and should be set out in a way that it should be (inaudible). Thirdly still there is an issue of technical matters for the ESSS. It is not as simple as that one. So these are the things Chairman we need to discuss and have a lecture. This is the most important part on the agenda item 1.13. We have to carefully study that and now have translation (inaudible). Sorry in at this stage. I suggest that we take it band by band but not at the end because we may forget. Thank you.

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: Thank you very much. Thank you for your comments. Well, firstly I don't see anything against taking questions by frequency band but perhaps I would ask for guidance here. Or whether we should have all frequency bands and then have questions afterwards.

All right. I should like to request the room's support to adopt a methodology to have questions at the end. Perhaps if we go through frequency by frequency band we might take too much time and we might not be able to complete all the things on the agenda. So that's the proposal that we have. It is for time reasons. It is not that we don't want to address the items in a detailed fashion. So my recommendation as Moderator of this panel would be to take note of the opinions of the groups and to have time at the end of each session to have questions and answers. I think that we have had two questions posed so far. And I would also like the regional groups and their representatives to take note of those questions so that at the end they can provide us with their comments. So I would like to ask for the room's support to proceed in that way. And to try to get to the end of the meeting having had a discussion of all

points which have been in our discussion, particularly. So I would like to ask for the room's support in this manner. And this is for time management. I have Tanzania asking the floor. Please go ahead.

>> TANZANIA: Thank you, Chair. I think the spirit of this meet something to harmonize if there is spirit of views and I propose that we go band after band because if we go through all the bands coming back again you might find that some points have been forgotten. So my proposal is that whenever there is a divergence of views we take time to discuss so we harmonize the positions. Or understanding a certain region has taken this direction and not this direction. Thank you.

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: Okay. Thank you for those comments. Once again I should like to ask for the room's guidance.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So you noted that we are very short in time for this session. But maybe you have some bands which are more straightforward and therefore you may try to merge some of them and take comments all together for some of the bands so that you can present more bands during this first hour and leave more time for the next two issues at the end. Thank you.

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: Thank you. So for this frequency band we could have time for questions and answers so that we can discuss that and make use of regional representatives and have their comments. So questions, there are options within the conditions, draft -- some are working (inaudible) in an obligatory manner. We would like to hear from the regional representatives and they would like to provide information about the regional initiative on how the options or conditions have been delineated. So if anyone has any comments on that and in this case if you would like to take the floor please let me know.

>> SERGEY PASTUKH: Thank you. I should briefly like to look at what was said on the conditions. It is a very important question especially in the frequency band. I should like to highlight the fact that the RCC has not comprehensively discussed this. We do intend to note during our next meeting which will take place in January 2019. Having said this, our coordinator I have a -- satellites can be found and how to protect these measures and how (inaudible).

Therefore be respected in an obligatory manner. These measures should be respected with no risk of being protected. Some countries take some measures and others will take others. So as a result I think the first thing to do, this is what we will look at is to establish how we can make these protection conditions obligatory. Secondly I would like to recall that

concrete protection measures should be (inaudible) for the different frequency bands and there might be different positions. Some colleagues have said that we might have to limit, for example, base stations, (inaudible) so those of you agree. So that might be a limitation. It might be a (inaudible). In practice in the past when we have to protect them, we have a mask with regard to the vertical. But what we had done was to set a wider view for (inaudible). Isn't able to defend descriptions which might be higher than the base stations. So that mask allowed us to protect -- another important element which would be underlined here. The first thing is protecting our frequency bands (inaudible). Now perhaps there are different things, exceptions to 40. We perhaps need to have 85 and so on. This is an issue which hasn't yet been examined comprehensively within our community. First level set and the protection of frequencies which should be -- perhaps we shouldn't have a level to learn. We need to protect these different bands. 34.25, cannot be used in protecting such a large range of our bands. Too rigorous and having other frequencies as well but I repeat that industry must -- industry would be obliged to have very costly devices which may then prevent the market from developing. So those are just some general reflections that we would like to put forward. RCC countries decided that we should ensure secondary level harmonization or second harmonic in recommendation 300. This category (inaudible). So that's just a recommendation to show what is being made here. Obligatory, that would be impact. As we said we have to protect all receiving information, to have protection in Europe, if it is not possible those measures would not make any sense and would not allow us to ensure the protection that we want. So as a result we think that the studies which have been initiated and confirmed, a certain amount of influence over passive frequency band 50 gigahertz. So that frequency band should be protected. Thank you.

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: Thank you very much Sergey for the RCC's comments.

So CITELE if you would like to take the floor on these comments. I know we are a bit short of time. So I just like some very brief comments on the conditions which have been marked as either obligatory or optional. If we can start with Luciana Camargos.

>> LUCIANA CAMARGOS: From the CITELE perspective we have just one proposal. So it is a draft inter-American proposal on this band that addresses conditions ATA. We expect that to be rectified soon. We do not have anything at this stage that goes over the other conditions but we don't have a Resolution at this stage. So once the Resolution comes in we might have -- we

might address some of the conditions. But at this stage we only address conditions actually. Thank you.

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: Thank you. CEPT, would you like to take the floor? Go ahead.

>> STEVE GREEN: Thank you, Chairman. CEPT is working on the detail of this proposal at the moment. But you will get a flavor of what we are thinking from what we -- lead to the (inaudible) meeting that we were looking at the draft CPM text. We are not dealing in optional conditions. There is only one optional issue and that's (inaudible). That's an option. (Inaudible). As far as the technical conditions for the protection of the other services are concerned, we are just proposing mandatory conditions. So for the adjacent band ESS we are proposing some levels to go in to Resolution 750. That's for the base station. And then for the main beam pointing we have got a -- we are thinking of a draft Resolution and conditions in the result of Resolution that would be mandatory conditions. So conditions we are proposing there, they are all mandatory.

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: Thank you very much Steve for those comments. Any additional comments to my right? ATU.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As the previous speakers also explained before the ATU group in terms of protection of existing services just in band look at ESS and we noted that deployment of IMT is going to impact on operation of the ESS passive. However, the studies that were done by TG51 resulted in a range of a division limits and we also note that very stringent limits is going to be very costly in terms of equipment and availability of devices. And also to result in very large Government. So we evaluated those studies in light of our objectives in Africa with a view of arriving at a balance that provides a sweeter protection for ESS passive. So we -- from our evaluation we came up with a range of values that will protect ESS passive. So we set out for a range of minus 32 to minus 37 for base station and also minus 28 to 30 gigahertz. So those are mandatory conditions that are going to be included in Resolution 750. So that is one of the conditions that we have looked at. However for the other conditions we are still evaluating the necessity of it. Thank you.

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: Thank you very much. ASMG.

>> Probably agree with my colleagues if we like to have deployment in 2020. Keeping in mind the need to protection the exist ing service. We need to think about what is the practical approach to have a size met. In ASMG we have been looking to FSA issues carefully and even how we can affect these limits. We have been considering the limit within the range of minus 32 to minus 37 to base station and from minus 28 to minus 30 for

UAE and if we consider where to reflect these values an matter of result from WRC, this is something that is under (inaudible). So we have different options. We have seen, for example, proposals for new Resolution to possibilities or a present resolution 750 or even recommendation to reflect that. Keeping in mind that the current situation we have right now that we have different type of understanding to the limits required to protect the existing services. Like, for example, the ESS services and with this I'm not sure how far we can go with reflecting this in the Resolution, for example. So all the options are being considered right now within ASMG. We are probably coming to the next CPM with a proposal to revise Resolution 750. Thank you, Chairman.

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: Thank you very much ASMG. Finally I would like to hear from APT. And then I also have a director's request. So finish with APT. Go ahead.

>> HIROYUKI ATARASHI: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I mentioned at the last APT meeting we didn't have any concrete discussions of condition of the use of this frequency band. But so I can't provide any idea from APT perspective. But from my personal observations some APT members have provided their studies to TG51. So I hope those APT members provide their ideas on the condition of the use of the next APG meeting. And such contribution may stimulate the discussion among the APT members. So I hope I can provide something in the next regional function. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: Thank you very much APT. And I have a request from BR director. Please go ahead.

>> FRANCOIS RANCY: Yeah. Thank you very much, Chairman. Yes, I just would like to make a comment on the fact that the ambition of The World Radiocommunication Conferences is to build a sustainable ecosystem for radiocommunications in the long term. And I would like to echo what Alexander Kuhn said this morning, we have to learn from history. If you look at a very rare situation in which WRCs in the past have made mistakes from this Point of View of creating something sustainable, I can only find two examples. One in conference in '92 where we made the allocation to 1.6 gigahertz band. Without looking at the implication astronomy. And we have 25 -- more than 25 years to solve this problem. And meanwhile radio astronomy would not be able to operate. And the second mistake in my mind was in WRC-2003 where we made the allocation to all lines in the five gigahertz band with some conditions which appeared later on not to be enforced.

So I think the lesson we can learn from that is that we have to make sure and this is what we are discussing, that we have the conditions to protect all services which could be affected

in band or out of band and that's what we are discussing here out of band. And second, we have to make sure that this conditions are enforceable. It is not enough to say they are mandatory. So I think it is something we should address in the next 12 months we have before the conference. Thank you.

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: Thank you very much director for those comments. So this is for consideration of the room that they should not only be mandatory but they should be something that's enforceable at the end of the day. Thank you very much to everyone for your cooperation. 24.5 gigabyte to 27.5. I would like to know if anybody in the room has any comments on this frequency band. Yes, please go ahead.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: I don't understand the meaning of enforceable. We come to other points some people mention that protecting a service by recommendation, that is not correct. (Iran)

We had this better experience in 2012 on 700 megahertz. We could not agree on any conditions because of (bitter) (inaudible). Chairman, recommendations to need to be approved by all Governments. One single Government could block the recommendation. So if you put an operational system subject to recommendation that may be no recommendation at all for years. The most appropriate issue would be to resolve the issue at the conference by the Resolution of the conference and under the atmosphere and environment of the conference that people are forced to negotiate with each other and to have consensus.

Leaving the matter after that by recommendation Chairman. Recommendation is not mandatory. It is optional, Chairman. And one Government could look the approval recommendation. We have this case for many years in ITU-R now. Since 2007 it is a proposal for recommendation. So we should be quite careful. This is better to settle the matter in order that IMT should have the possibility to do this band but not to the recommendation. Thank you.

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: Thank you very much Iran for your comments to be considered by this room (inaudible). Are there any further comments? Yes, please (inaudible).

>> Thank you, Chairman. Probably just comment with regards to the way we can adopt certain conditions while deploying, for example, service considering the consensus to the service. I think in some different conferences, previous conferences when we got the choice to go for a recommendation was very easy. The reason at that time there was no agreement on a single value that makes everyone let's say the same -- in the same direction. I think at that time we had some different views how we can achieve the protection of the other services. Maybe for, you know, service X, convert to service Y. Not willing to get the

specific example here. In that case when we have no agreement on single value for out of band mission for protection of the other service the recommendation might be a solution in there case. Keeping in mind to Resolution 750 and look to resolves 2 urge administrations to take all reasonable steps to ensure that unwanted emissions of active service stations in the frequency bands and services on the table do not exceed the recommended maximum levels contained in that table. So definitely I mean the options are available, open. Depending on the situation we are going to reach. We can probably get agreement on a single value. Thank you.

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: Thank you very much. There any other further comments from the panelists. Seeing none, we still have 30 minutes remaining. We are going to move on to the remaining frequency bands if case there is any particular comments from the room, I ask you -- given the time that we have there are still a number of frequency bands remaining. I would like to give a presentation on what is on the screen and seek the opinions of the different regional groups because we don't have enough time to discuss frequency band by frequency band. I would like to ask your support to proceed in this manner. As we were saying the frequency band (inaudible) only have one option of no change. Given the results of these studies. And the frequency bands -- has two options, identification and no change. The identification has two alternatives. The commissions are listed from (inaudible) and these have two options. For further detailed conditions and options we have a place to look at (inaudible) CPM text itself. So frequency band 40.5 and 42.5 gigahertz and this has two alternative identification. Very different matters. Different A to C. Each of these has different protection measures with services and these services have different options. Frequency band 42.5 to 43.5 gigahertz, two alternatives with three different conditions from A to C and different options.

Frequency band 45.5-47 (inaudible), once again we have two alternatives in this case and develop to (inaudible). Next we frequency band which is 47 to 47.2. And also has two different conditions. It is important to understand the frequency bands 45.5 and 47. There are no studies undertaken in the group. Simply frequency (inaudible).

Item 8, 47.2 to 50.2 frequency band, different methods from A to D conditions. I think 50.4, 52.6 frequency band, three different protection measures, four different services with different options in one.

Frequency band of 66 to 71. In this case there are three possible solutions. No change. Identification by IMT. And a third option which talks about continuing series on possibility

of identification within (inaudible). For the positive text measures for existing services there are three different matters with different options within them. Frequency band 71 to 76, three different methods within different options with different options. And finally, frequency band 81 to 86 gigahertz with different protection measures for assisting services. And different options in each of these protective measures. There is a different frequency band which have been analyzed during the process of the details can be found in the presentation which you can see on the screen as well as in the CPM text.

In the remaining time I would like to consult the regional groups to get their visions with the different frequency bands in this case. There needs to be an overview consolidation of all the regional positions because we don't really have enough time to get in to further detail. But we should have enough time just to deliver an overview of the different regional groups and the different frequency bands mentioned. So the same as methodology from before. Let's start with Sergey and then we will move across the panel.

>> SERGEY PASTUKH: Thank you very much, Chair. Might we be able to look at these frequency bands? Can we have them on the screen? Because it might be easier for me and for all of our colleagues here so that we can follow the frequency bands. The first frequency band which you mentioned is 31 gigahertz. Here we have a position, we are fully in support of the method in the draft CPM text, no change. The reason is clear. It is linked to the impossibility to ensure compatibility with the navigation systems, the following frequency band 37 to 40.5, band C, on this frequency band our position at the moment we don't have a concrete position at the moment. We are still studying the situation. However, we can say that in the region we have outlined the priority frequency bands for the 30th IMT. This frequency band has not been considered as a priority. Essentially because it is largely used by fixed services for the backhauling of base stations. That's why we will continue to study the situation for this frequency band and bring our position. This frequency band we have a -- better defined. We think this frequency band could be identified for the IMT systems. Yet also with conditions to guarantee the protection of services. And these conditions we have still not discussed these within our region. Therefore we don't have a firm position on this for the time being. So the following frequency band, 42.5 to 43.5 gigahertz this is frequency band B, in this frequency band we have a regional position. We think that the identification in this frequency band is not a desirable. So not in favor of identification of this frequency band. The main reason for this, this is used by satellite systems fixed systems

from radiocommunication by satellite is largely used throughout our region and therefore this frequency band is the limit for the IMT system. This is very important to ensure the normal development of IMT system in this frequency band. The following frequency band, following three frequency band from 47 to 52.6 gigahertz, at the moment we still don't have a concrete position on this. However, we would like to highlight that the first two frequency bands there are no studies undertaken in the CPM report. These are frequency bands where there are no studies in place and that's all. In our region no studies have been put forward. So the interest in the frequency bands doesn't seem so heightened for us. On these frequency bands we still do not have a fully flushed out position. The frequency bands (inaudible), frequency band J this is a priority. We have reviewed the frequency band where identification might have a potential importance of harmonization throughout the world. However the recent research were taken on this frequency band have shown that it is a whole series of research work which has still uncompleted with those frequency allocation within this frequency band. Therefore we think this is a priority. However there is no concrete position from our region for the moment. Returning to the last two frequency bands, for the moment we still do not is a regional position on these. However these two frequency bands are widely used throughout our region by fixed services, backhauling. And therefore we think that we need to determine whether these might be used by IMT. The use of these -- some of these frequencies are used for radar or transport of cars. But limit for IMTs in the frequency band 71-76, 81 to 86 might be considered quite important. The use of IMT could be quite limited. So I would like to repeat officially we still do not have a regional position on these frequency bands. We will continue our work.

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: Thank you very much for those comments. Luciana perhaps you might be able to share details or vision on this?

>> LUCIANA CAMARGOS: For CITELE we have two additional proposals. They remain as a -- in process as a preliminary proposal. We have a proposal for bands C, D, E. It is a proposal for the identification of 37 to 43.5 gigahertz. They joined all those three bands together in a single footnote. That footnote recognizes the footnote 5.516B which brings the identification to HDFSS. And which identification could lead to constraints to IMT. So it identifies the whole band. With also calls for Resolution but like in 26 gigahertz the Resolution at this stage is only a placeholder. We have not addressed the conditions that could be in this resolution. I expect we will be discussing that in the upcoming meeting of CITELE. One thing

though with respect to adjacent compatibility with ESS and 36, 37 gigahertz proposal does not bring that in. It considers it to not be necessary. That's the only condition that has been discussed prior to this -- to this previous CITELE meeting. Once the CITELE meeting was before the final meeting (inaudible). Proposal on the table is a proposal for 66 to 71 gigahertz. Brings identification to IMT and calls for a Resolution but the Resolution is a placeholder and I expect that to be discussed for upcoming meeting of CITELE. For all the other events we don't have proposal on the table at this stage. Expecting changes in the upcoming meeting.

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: Thank you very much Luciana. Now I give the floor to Steve to hear more about the CEPT position.

>> STEVE GREEN: I will deal with C, D. As far as C is concerned CEPT has no intention of using this band for IMT and we are not going to propose an identification in band C. But we recognize that there are other areas of the world that do have an interest there. So we don't intend to oppose that going forward. Further areas are making proposals there. We do have systems there that are operating adjacent bands. We want to make sure those are protected as necessary. Our focus in this area is on D and D and E and we are bringing proposals to identify those a block for IMT. And looking at similar technical conditions we take to the services that are sharing the band in the same way that we are doing at 26. We are on -- moving on to F and G and H. We are still developing our position on those. Keep an eye on what CEPT doing. We don't have a developed condition there. We are still working on those and on band I. And then we are looking at then the 66 to 71 gigahertz band. And for that band we are -- we think that it is IMT and the other systems the wireless broadband, MGWS, quality of access there. So we want to highlight this, this is a band that IMT used but also that is that in quality of access for the other types of non-IMT mobile systems. We have three no change bands that we decided we want to say propose no change. That's the 32 gigahertz which I think is a common with everyone else here. And then also the 71 to 76 and 81 to 86 we are looking at no change proposal for CEPT. Thank you.

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: Thank you very much Steve for the CEPT comments. I would like to give the floor to the ATU representative.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the band B, 31.8 to 33.4, as the studies have indicated we discussed consensus on this band and group is no change due to the unfavorable results of sharing of studies. For band C37 to 40.5, the ATU supports identification of the band to terrestrial component. We do not

see a condition necessary with respect to ESS and lower band. Since the band is also located in primary basis to mobile services. And co-existent conditions ESS passive already currently addressed in Resolution 752. With respect to band D, 40.5 to 42.5, we support identification of the band to IMT. This entails upgrading the mobile allocation to primary services. And also identifying the band for IMT through a new footnote. With respect to band E, there that is 42.5 to 43.5. The ATU also supports identification of this band to IMT on account of favorable results of sharing studies among other factors. However we believe that the other -- that the conditions are not necessary. For the two bands F and G, 45.5, 47 gigahertz and 47 to 47.2, the ATU group is still studying these two bands. So at the moment we don't have a position on the two bands. For band H, we support identification of the band of IMT. Due to favorable result of the sharing studies among other factors. We also support condition to protect ESS. For band I 50.4 to 52.6, similarly we also support the identification of the band to IMT with a condition of protection of ESS.

For band 66 to 71, we support identification to IMT and also we also recognize also non-IMT applications that would like to use this band. So we also support taking in to account the technical characteristics of IMT and non-IMT systems. So that they can share the band. For the band 71 to 76, that is band K and L. We don't have a particular position for this two bands. So we are still examining possibility or not of supporting these two bands but at the moment we don't have a position on these two bands.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: Thank you very much for those comments. And then move on to the ASMG.

>> Thank you, Chairman. ASMG had discussion regarding first of all the band C, D and E and everyone understands that the current deployment of HDFSS might differ from one region to another. It was to support the D and E options here from 40.5 to 43.5 and this is for identification for IMT-2020. As I mentioned earlier there was no clear concrete position on the remaining bands whether to for or object. However, we are considering the remaining bands in the coming period, keeping in mind or taking in to account that some of the urbanization have shown some interest in some of these events. I would like to keep it brief for in time but in the next regional workshop might have more details on the remaining bands.

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: Thank you. Turning to comments in the APT.

>> HIROYUKI ATARASHI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Concerning

these remaining frequency bands none of the frequency bands is mentioned in the APT preliminary reviews for the time being but some APT members provided their views for these frequency bands at the last APT meeting. And concerning the frequency band B, 32 gigahertz some APT members show interest to this frequency band but as you know no change method is only available for this frequency band. So I need to seek their updated views at the next APT meeting. Concerning the frequency band for C to E, some APT members around 6 to 7 APT members showed interest for these frequency bands or portions thereof. So I think some support exists in APT for these frequency bands. For the frequency band for F to I no APT members provided their views, specific to these frequency bands. And concerning the rest of the frequency band, J to L a few APT members showed their interest for these frequency bands. Anyway APT needs to update their views on these remaining frequency bands. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: Thank you very much for your comments from the APT region. We will now -- I have another comment from Sergey and then we can give the floor --

>> CHAIR: Sorry to interrupt this -- the interpretation to resume at 2 p.m. So maybe last words now and then we will continue this discussion for about ten minutes at 2 p.m. before looking at the 9.1.1 and 9.1.2 issues and then condition with the normal program.

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: Thank you very much Philippe. And then Sergey your comments, please. And then after lunch we will take questions from the floor.

>> SERGEY PASTUKH: Thank you very much. I would like to be very brief to telling to frequency band D. I heard, I noted that the RCC position corresponds to some regional positions, frequency band D and E are different by -- can be differ by the satellite services. Frequency band D, is the space to earth link. So the receiver is on the earth but for us -- for E, sorry it is earth to space. So the receiver is in space. Therefore the compatibility conditions are going to be different. And if we bring together these two frequency bands under one block, there will be superfluous conditions. In frequency band D, E I wanted to make this comment because we are setting within RCC, we are looking very closely on this aspect of the issue and that's why frequency band E removes in favor of identification for this frequency band. Given the proximity of this -- of the proximity of frequency band D and the constraints put upon IMT, so this is a small comment I would like to make. I wanted to make this because the other -- we heard divergence of points. Thank you.

>> JOSE DE JESUS ARIAS FRANCO: Thank you very much for

your comments. Now we are going to meet again at 2. I would like to give the floor to Philippe to give us a few more instructions in that regard.

>> CHAIR: Thank you to the panelists for this first part of session 1. We still have to consider a few more comments on 1.13 as well as 9.1.1 and 9.1.2 that propose to continue at 2 p.m. for not more than half an hour and then we continue with the normal program as scheduled. Thank you very much and have good lunch.

(Session concluded at 12:32 p.m. CET)

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

Raw file..

November 20, 2018.

1400 CET.

ITU.

Second ITU interregional workshop on WRC 19
preparation.

Services Provided By:

Caption First, Inc.

P.O. Box 3066

Monument, CO 80132

800-825-5234

www.captionfirst.com

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

***.

This is a audio test for captioning, do you hear me?

>> This is for captioning. How do you hear me? This is an audio test for captioning.

(standing by).

>> Take your seat, please. We are about to start.

>> Hello, hello. Hello, everybody. Can you take your seats, please? We are about to start. Can you take your seats, please? Hello, everybody. Welcome back, colleagues, to this meeting. In the previous session, we were just about to finish the discussion about 1.13, however, I would like to have at least ten minutes in

this session in order to see if somebody from the room have questions or opinions about 1.13. This is the time when you can ask to the panelists questions or provide some comments, with regard to 1.13. If anybody from the room has a question, please this is the time to ask the panelists. The idea of this workshop is to have these discussions between the groups and all interested parties. If anyone in the meeting has comments or questions for the panelists.

(audio is very faint).

Okay. So I'd like to ask my colleagues from the panel if they would like to provide additional views to 1.13. Anyone? I see no one. I think with this we end the 1.13 discussion.

The presentation is available on the SharePoint. Also if you would like to have more details about this topic, you can check the CPM text which is also available ...

(voice trails away).

I would like to change to 9.1.1, which is the next agenda item. I will go through presentation. I will switch into Spanish.

This is the presentation for 9.1.1.

(audio is very faint).

(sorry, I'm hearing both Spanish and English, I can't understand the English, it's very faint).

Frequency band allocated [inaudible] terrestrial components and IMT and satellite components of IMT. [inaudible] found in the last bullet point on the slide. This is what was carried out during the

working party during the cycle.

(sorry, I'm hearing both Spanish and English, I can't understand or hear the English).

Now we have four scenarios [inaudible] A1, interference by the base station, for the satellite, the interference levels for the base, IMT to the base station to IMT, we can see that these are high level details

(sorry, I'm still hearing both Spanish and English, I can't hear the English).

There may be operational measures which would mitigate ...
[inaudible]

These are scenarios which were examined [inaudible] I would propose we use the same methodology [inaudible]

I'd like to start from my left. What would be your comments.

>> Organisation, the first thesis is that we support the development and adoption of relevant regulatory measures which would ensure compatibility of terrestrial and satellite components of IMT systems. At the same time, when we discussed and considered what types of regulatory provisions these could be, we came to the conclusion that first of all, we could use the existing provisions of article 9 of RR, but in order for these to be applicable, we will need to amend annex 5 and annex 7, in order to ensure that we can calculate the coordinating zones within the frequency band.

If we go into detail on this issue, then the parameters which

need to be introduced in annex 5 and annex 7 of the RR, they need to be based on the agreed characteristics of terrestrial and satellite components of IMT which were adopted by the ITU. These documents already exist, including report on IMT systems, M2292 report contains all the necessary characteristics in order to make amendments to annexes 5 and 7. So thanks to these measures, we think that the scenarios which were presented on the slides, these possible conflicting situations of interference can be resolved. Thank you very much.

>> Thank you very much, Sergey for your comments and we will now move to CITEC, Luciana Camargos if you would please provide us with your comments.

(now I'm hearing no audio at all).

>> They also propose to modify resolution 212, and for the proposed change and resolution, that is the only issue we have had in CITEC so far. And we haven't heard anything else from any other country.

>> Thank you very much.

>> In TPT we have satellites up in this band, and they are being used for systems for components. For us particularly the A1 interference path, on the diagram you see two A1 paths, the path from the user equipment for the satellite is not a problem. It's first the issue would occur if base stations are used in that frequency bands, the 1982 to 2010 megahertz bound. And that could

cause interference to the satellite, that would affect services that are being provided over the CEPT region.

So, for us we are looking into possible ways to avoid that happening. We still have a number of ways that we are considering whether that is a requirement, that particular band is not used on base stations for some EIRP limits that would apply in that band, and also whether those would be global limits or on a regional basis, so we still have a number of possibilities to work through, but first the key thing is to ensure that we don't get disruption to the satellite services that are being provided in CEPT. Thank you.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The ATU group also supports development of possible technical operational measures, as well as regulatory provisions with a view of protecting services for geographical areas across different countries. We are also cognizant of the fact that deployment of both terrestrial and satellite component of IAT on all coverage and cofrequency basis is not feasible unless techniques such as the use of appropriate guard band or other techniques are applied, so that those two systems can coexist and be compatible.

We also noted the divergent views on the results of the study, and the ATU group is still considering this agenda item, and at this position in time, we don't have a particular decision on this agenda item. We are looking at developing a position at subsequent ATU meeting. So this position we don't have position at this moment.

Thank you.

(sorry, I cannot hear the English of the Chairman).

>> Good afternoon, colleagues. With regard to agenda item 9.1.1 the registration support the consideration of acquired technical elevation and precisional measures to ensure compatibility between the terrestrial and the components of the IMT systems in the given bands. However, the preference in the ASMG demonstrations is going to use the terrestrial component of IMT in these bands. With regards to the options, they are still being considered, probably in our next meeting in December, we are going to consider one of these options as suitable. Thank you.

>> Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. With respect to this issue, APT feels that the APT members support conducting ITU-R studies in accordance with resolution 2.12. So we only have this kind of high availability description for this plenary views. So as far as regulation is required at the next APG meeting, but at the last APG meeting we have received some input for this issue, and in those contributions so APT members expressed concerns on the interference issue in scenario A1, that means interference from base stations, IMT base stations into MSS satellite stations and some other APT administrations expressed their views that interference issue for scenario B1 can be addressed by the existing provisions in the radio regulations.

According to the process for the ITU-R joint studies by working

party 4C and 5D, I saw some different views by some APT members. So this issue might be a difficult one from the APT perspective, so we need to further discuss this issue at the next APG meeting. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much [inaudible]

(receiving no English translation, hearing only Spanish).

I do not see requests for the floor. Before I continue, I'd like to give the opportunity [inaudible]

(receiving no English translation).

>> Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, to you and everyone. With regards to this issue, 9.1.1, as was noted in the discussion, there were a number of views with regards to how the studies were going to be, the results of the studies concluded, the difficulty I think that we have been having with regards to the studies certainly is obviously there is interpretations of what issue 9.1.1 really is intended to do at least from the perspective of the United States, we have been trying to follow the scope and try to, as indicated, under the .1.1 is try to identify technical and operation mitigations to try to address issues of cross border between IMT satellite and IMT terrestrial.

But in some cases, views have expanded this to include perhaps much broader issues of protection of just the MSS and MS services which is perhaps a little bit beyond the scope of 9.1.1, and given the fact that we are really giving a mandate under this issue to

look at these operational technical mitigations, it appears that more that we are now proposing regulatory changes to the radio regs, and as my colleague from CITELE says the U.S. is looking to maintain flexibility to allowing administrations to address these issues, mostly on a bilateral or multilateral basis between country A and country B or other countries that may also be affected.

It's very complicated issue, almost to the point where we should have considered this one as a full agenda item. This is not a issue that came out of the blue. It has been ongoing since 1992. Resolution 212 has gone through many iterations from conference to conference, and this is an issue I think that we certainly will try to hopefully provide additional conclusions through working parties 5D and 4C who are working coordinating between themselves, but our view is that we would like to maintain flexibility to the administrations to allow to address this issue without having to change the radio regs. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United States for those comments.

(english barely audible).

Discussion for --

(receiving no English translation).

Compatibility between systems can be managed by [inaudible] whether there should be [inaudible]

Complex issue which will have to be dealt with during the CPM.

(very faint audio).

I should like to ask if anyone in the room has any more comments on 9.1.1. If not, we will move to the next item. Additional comments? [inaudible]

We will have a break in which I will give microphone to my colleague who is going to bring us to 9.12 and we will continue.

>> Thank you very much.

(i'm sorry, I can't hear and understand the English translation).

The aim was to implement the provisions [inaudible] make decision on this issue ...

(if someone could help with the audio, please, I'm hearing two languages, I can't hear and understand the English over the original language).

This frequency band was identified for use [inaudible]

Additional actions will be required. [inaudible]

>> March this year, and it said APT members supports regulatory and technical studies being conducted by ITU-R and the second element is APT members of the view that appropriate regulatory and technical measures should be developed to ensure coexistence and compatibility between IMT and SSR in this frequency band. The plenary views are high level description. We need further elaboration of the next APG meeting. But and I'm also following the ITU-R studies by working party 4 A and working party 5D in ITU-R and in these studies process, different views were expressed by some

APT members.

They have different interests how to use this frequency band for IM terrestrial IMT or others that are interested in two use for DS S band so similar to the previous issue, this issue would be difficult one, from APT perspective. So we need further discussion at the next APG meeting. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> Issue 9.1.2 the initial position is that no obstruction should be involved in use of IMT deployment within the frequency band 1452 and 21492. In addition ASMG support no change to the ITU-R delegation for protection of BSS, in addition to this, to propose setting within article 21 of the RR port number, protection of IMT. Mr. Chairman, this is the initial position set in the last meeting. As I mentioned earlier this would be the view according to the options given today and probably going to come to specific position on one of the methods mentioned. Thank you.

>> Thank you very much. Good afternoon to you all. 1452 to 1492 megahertz.

(loud buzzing).

Very important looking at services to which it is allocated, support the studies regarding protection criteria for both IMT and the ESS sound. The position of [inaudible] eight possible actions, we are still studying feedback to come up with position for Africa for the next meeting will be a position. When we look at this agenda item and we are looking at footnote number 5.346, we find that the

44 out of 52 African countries have identified this band for IMT, and we will continue to support both working party 4A and working party 5D status on sharing between IMT entity SS sound, take the position that to ensure the protection of IMT in this band. Thank you.

>> Very clear position, support this method. I think we do not need to wait for the next meeting in order to defend your position [inaudible]

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. CPT has closely followed the studies in ITU in 4A and 5D.

(loud buzzing).

As a result of technical work in those studies CPT supports the limit in article 21, limit of minus 112DBW per square meter megahertz for regions 1 and 3, and also modification of appendix 5, the regions 1 and 3 countries that wish to continue to apply 9.11, and so would be limit in their applying to that. We think these are measures that will be necessary to implement [inaudible] technical studies in the ITU. Thank you.

>> [inaudible]

>> Agenda item with these issues pertinent to regions 1 and 3 only, CITELE has concluded the deliberation with Inter-American proposal that whatever decision is taken by regions 1 and 3, it does not affect the situation in region 2, region 2 stays out of the agenda item as specified and we will be following closely whatever changes

we will be making in regulations to make sure it does not have any consequence in our region.

>> Thank you. In conclusion [inaudible]

(sorry, receiving no English).

(have loud buzzing noise).

(sorry, receiving no English).

(sorry, receiving no audio).

(standing by to receive audio).

>> The first, no change to the RR. Then you can see that there are three different methods, A2, A3 and A4, with different characteristics for each one of those methods, to enable outdoor operations, including possible associated conditions for the new EIRP limits, and the other method A3 is the resolution 229 but this is the same conditions of use as defined for 5250, and finally method A4 which is revision to resolution 229 to enable in vehicle use of RLAN, with EIRP40000000 watts.

So that is for 5150, 5250, for 5250, 5350, there is only one method identified which is method B, and there is no change to the RR. We have three other methods. Those are for no change for method C, and then we have method D, 5725, 5850, there are three methods, D1, D2, which would be new worldwide allocation, mobile service and D3 which is to accommodate in a existing. 5850, 5925 which only have one method, method E which is no change to the RR.

Once again, these can be found in detail in the text which is

available. These are different options which have been laid out for the different frequency band. This is the item on agenda item we are looking at 1.16 and I'll give the floor to the regional groups to hear their positions and know what work they have been doing on this. We will start on my right with the APT region.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With respect to the APT preliminary views for this agenda item, there are three elements, APT members support studies being conducted by ITU-R, and second element is that APT members of the view that protection of the incumbent services including their current and planned use in the frequency bands concerned for this agenda item, result in constraints on the services.

The last element is that in the frequency band, radio frequency band C on the select APT members support no change to the radio regulations. With respect to the other frequency bands, some APT members express their views, different views. For the first frequency band, frequency band A, some APT members have a preference for no change, unless sharing compatibility conclude action to modify solution in the frequency band continues to ensure the protection of incumbent services.

On the other hand, some other APT members support sharing compatibility studies with a view to enabling [inaudible] for the second frequency band, frequency 1B some APT members support no change. For the fourth frequency band, some APT members support

no change, while some other APT members supports the worldwide use of the band for mobile services, taking into account [inaudible]

For the last frequency band, some APT members support no change to the radio regulations. So according to the situation of the last APG meeting, APT members needs further discussions how to deal with frequency bands so different methods to satisfy agenda items are prepared. We need to discuss which one is the best solution for this. Thank you.

>> Thank you very much for those comments. I'd like now to hear from ASMG, please go ahead.

>> Thank you, Chairman. With regards to the agenda item 1.16, for the band 5150, 5925 megahertz, ASMG supports that protection for existing services should be ensured without adding any sections on these services. In addition, the initial position was not to change the RR, and there is no need to identify additional bands unless studies ensure feasibility between these services.

Accordingly, Chairman, the current methods in CBM would be reviewed in the next ASMG meeting, will be important to decide if there are any portion or any portion of the bands would be considered for support in systems. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much [inaudible]

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. From the point of view of ATU, our concern is protection of existing services. We note additional constructs so for the band 5150, 5250 megahertz band A, the ATU

supports method A1 which is no change. We are also looking at method A3 which is looking at global allocation, and enabling use of wireless systems.

There is no agreement that has been reached at the moment. We are still continuing with the discussion on this band. The view is that no change, method A3, so the discussions are still going on, with view of achieving consensus.

On the next band, 5250, 5350 megahertz, the consensus is no change, due to coexisting changes with existing services. For the band C5350, 5470, the decision is also no change, due to sharing studies that showed sharing with the incumbent services may not be feasible. And there is additional mitigation measures. Or band D, 5725, 5850, preliminary view is to A go for no change method 3, or consider method A2, so we are not yet reached consensus on this band. Discussions are still ongoing within our region, so that we have consensus on this band.

For the last one, 5925, we support no change, difficulties in coexistence with the current services. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for the comments made for your region. We would like to move to the E BT. Alexandre, we would like to hear your view.

>> I'm pleased to present the CPT position on the agenda item. First CPT has been conducting studies for all bands which are listed. We will start with the first one 5150, 5250 megahertz. We recognize

relaxation of the usage of RLAN applications with in part in common services in that band (indecipherable) however we continue possibility of [inaudible] in vehicles, combined together with mitigation techniques, for example, reduced power in order to allow, currently this corresponds to method A4 where we speak about 40 million-watt. However, we still have a number of countries that would go along with method A1 no change for that part.

If I move forward to the next one, 5250, 5350 megahertz, we came to the conclusion similar to the whole ITU-R that no change would be necessary to radio regs in order to resolve the particular band. The reasons are straightforward. The compatibility issues with incumbent services, in this case would be ESSS. If I continue the next one, 5350, 5470 many of you recall the discussions in the previous conference, that was the discussion we spent a lot of time debating that band, whether it should be this agenda, frequency band, this agenda item, again because of the issues in relation to compatibility with incumbent services, particular protection of ESSS and also radio transmission service CPT concluded that no change should be made to the allocations for that particular band. The next one, what we can find is supportive document that CPT would allow mobile service in that band in view of accommodating RLAN if mitigation techniques would be available to protect incumbent services. What is behind this thought is that we still have different views from CPT members on that band, I know that they have

also specific applications that band like wireless applications, SRDs as well as earth systems, also ICM band radio regulation and therefore some of the countries would support allocating of the mobile service in that band in view of accommodating RLAN through country footnote if respond to method 3 of the CPM text, however there are a number of countries that support no change, issue of protection of sources in particular information service, noting in some countries of CPT there are frequency cannot be protected with current. If I continue with the last one, which is one of the bands [inaudible] similar to ITU-R we conclude no changes are required to the radio regulations for that band. The main reason for that is the protection of ITS applications, mobile band as well as reception of the satellite reception of the FSS.

For those bands we have proposal 5250, 5350, and [inaudible] have developed already so called no change proposals, subject to approval and adoption at the next meeting of the CP G to take place next week. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Alexandre for the CPT comment. We give the floor now to Jose to share with us the CITELE viewpoint.

>> For agenda item 116 in CITELE we have five proposals and one draft Inter-American proposal. As mentioned this morning, proposal is supported by one country and the draft Inter-American proposal is supported by two countries. I'll go by number, from 5150 to 5250, the group A, there is a proposal of no change from

Brazil, because of the sharing studies not demonstrating that sharing is possible yet.

There is a proposal from Mexico allowing the outdoor use and accompanying that there is proposed modification of resolution 229. That will be discussed at the CITELE meeting two weeks from now, and based on this and other proposals.

Moving to the next band 5250 to 5350, there is only one proposal that is from Brazil for no change, because the sharing studies have not demonstrated the sharing is possible, the mitigation techniques have not been proven.

The next band is 5350 to 5470, and that is the one where we have a draft Inter-American proposal supported by two countries, Canada and Mexico. The proposal is no change, for the same reasons that sharing has not been demonstrated to be possible. The next band from 5725 to 5850, there is a preliminary proposal from Mexico, and that's to add a new footnote, allocating this band to the mobile services in certain countries, there are already countries that have it and the idea is to include other countries in another footnote to the same effect. For band 5852, 5925 there is only a proposal of no change from Mexico.

The reason is because that band already has an allocation to the mobile service and there are countries that have radio local operation so there is no need to change the radio regulations. That's all, thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jose. Sergey, the RCC viewpoint, please.

>> Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. On this issue, region has quite a clear position which has formed and which was approved at the meeting in October this year. Considering all the frequency bands from A to E, first of all, the general position which was approved in RCC countries by considering these frequency bands, we think there is a need to ensure the protection of existing radio services, and we focus on two services, which require protection, radio location service, and aeronautical radio mitigation service.

These services are arranged to ensuring safety, for this reason we focused on. We are also considering this agenda item that two bands were to replace, to eliminate the limits on the use of RLAN that now exist, and that restrict this use within, inside, and on other frequency bands, these are bands that were new allocations should be considered. We would like to also point out that this is new, not a new issue, at the conference in 2012 it was already considered, and the limits that were identified were the result of studies and the result of compromise based agreements, which were made at the WRC 12.

Now, frequency band A, we believe that no additional methods of eliminating interference were shown, and ensure compatibility when establishing RLAN outside. It is not, it is still impossible to ensure the establishment of outdoor RLAN. We support the no change

to the RR. The second frequency band, band B as far as I understand all regions have the same, more or less the same opinion, and there is also only one method here, this confirms this point of view. We also support this method, no change to the RR.

Next band, band C, here we have the same view and our region supports this view. We believe that within this band, impossible to ensure compatibility of RLANs, and therefore, there should be no change to the RR. Band D and band E are also bands that we considered and for both of these frequency bands, we are proposing no change method. Maybe it's a bit negative, all of this sounds a bit negative for RLAN, but it seems that for RLANs other frequency bands should be found, given that this frequency range, that this frequency range is used by important systems, which cannot be used to ensure compatibility. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for the comments. We have heard all the regions' viewpoints. I'd like to open up the floor to the room in case anyone has any questions or comments on this item on the agenda. Iran, please go ahead.

>> Microphone, please, to the speaker.

>> Apologies, says the Chair. It seems that the microphone is not working. Could we have support, please? No, it's not working. [inaudible] it's not working, Iran's microphone.

>> Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. This is difficult agenda items, although there are many suggestions for no

change and something I want to add, I heard from two regional groups, they are discussing that they could agree without additional constraints. This term, in the ITU-R, has no applications. There has been two reports from the two Director of the Radio Communication Bureau, that undue constraint, constraint has no applications, just to administrations but no application [inaudible] it cannot be translated to values, to decibels or any level or anything. We don't know when you say without additional constraint, there is no constraint, then you confer that with additional constraint, so we have to be quite careful using these things that we agree that the band be provided under conditions of no additional constraint, which is not possible to translate that technically. We have to take that into account in our future discussions. The same thing due constraint or undue constraint, this term was used in 2003, in agenda item 134, has no meaning at least as far as radio regulations are concerned.

This is just a piece of information. We have discussed that at level of APG and we are going to do something I hope in APG 4 to see what we can do. Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Iran, for those comments. Useful additional information for consideration at the next CPM. Are there any other comments. Go ahead.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, colleagues. I have a question with regards to the necessity of considering

Ireland, in the special based on the comments made by Sergei in this contribution.

If final situation would be that there is no spectrum available in this five gigahertz study cycle, and the necessity of dealing with RM is there as, stated by Sergei, what are alternatives? Do we need to wait for a new cycle, and then discuss it again in preparation of the WRC 2023? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the question, quite interesting question, discussed in various conferences. I'd like to know whether Sergey, you have any comments on that, and then anyone else would have a comment. Sergey, please go ahead.

>> Thank you very much, Chair. And thank you for the question. That was put to us by the Netherlands. First of all I'd like to say that for RLAN, there is complementary spectrum possible, but the ITU during its 2015 conference has also shown that we could impose a number of requirements for RLAN, and whether or not there would be satisfaction in terms of those requirements.

The question that arose was if we could add spectrum for RLAN or not. I think it would be necessary to have additional spectrum but that wasn't necessarily resolved. What would the alternative be? Unfortunately, in our region, in RCC, we haven't a comprehensively examined that question, or at least it hasn't been on our agenda. We could perhaps examine other frequency bands, for example, in 50 megahertz that has been envisaged especially during

the 2015 conference, with different regional organisations which have made proposals, but that is as far as we got.

Netherlands' question is completely relevant and perhaps all regions could take note of it, and think about it, and to look at what the solution might be for RLAN, if we continue with our discussions on 1.16, and look at other frequency bands to ensure that R land functions. Thank you.

>> Thank you very much, Sergey. Would anybody else like to elaborate on this point? Please, Alexandre.

>> Chairman, and also I think it was a good comment made by the Netherlands on this issue, and I think Sergey also provide number of information in this respect. What was said, we should separate that question from what we are discussing under this agenda item, here it involves solution to 39 and initiate say fail to provide additional spectrum to Iran would not automatically translate to look for another spectrum. However, I believe as was said by Sergey, as it is also CEPT view that RLAN needs additional spectrum. This was also shown in 11 ITU-R status and even if all the agenda, all the bands which are listed in resolution to 39 would be satisfied for Iran this would be sufficient to cover spectrum needs because as showed most spectrum is required they are currently studying under agenda item 116.

Having said that I want to provide additional information that through CEPT we have started work on additional spectrum for Iran

is band 5925 to 6425, I think Sergey could correct me. Yes, he is nodding, we had also issues with FS7 that band, that is ongoing. I think we expect the first results by the end of the year, and some decision on that next year. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Alexandre for those comments. Would anybody else like to provide additional comments? No? All right. Well, thank you very much for the responses to that question. Does anybody else have any other questions, any comments they would like to share with the room? Iran, go ahead, please.

>> IRAN: Yes, I think it works now. I think we have problems somewhere, we should not shift problem to other area, because we need to have in depth study to see the result of that. We should not move things to shoulder of the others. We have to be quite careful on that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Iran. Any other comments? Okay. Anything from the panelists on this point? No, I do not see any. Thank you very much for your cooperation on this item on the agenda.

I think we are almost at the end of the session. We still need to look at 915 and 918. I'd like to know whether we should stop now, and come back in the next session, or should we continue for additional ten minutes? I'm asking guidance from Philippe to know whether we go on or whether we have a break.

>> You can continue with the meeting for 20 minutes. Then we have the break. We will continue with the next session afterwards.

So until quarter to 4.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Philippe for that guidance. So we will finish with 1.16 and we will move now to 9.15. 9.15 was examined within working party 5A which was the responsible group for this agenda item. This item [inaudible] regulatory impacts of referencing recommendations ITU-R M16381, and ITU-R M18491, in note from 547F and 5450A of the radio regulations. This resolution 764 which is item 9.15, resolves to invite, to investigate these conditions and also to examine the impact and if necessary, to have a new reference in the recommendation ITU-R and 1849.1, and to look at what the impact of the result was as referred to in working party 5A technical studies were carried out, and different approaches were used for this item on the agenda. The first is approach A, which includes recommendation for M1849, on note 5, 4,000A and leads to other references are changed, the example for this change, the working party found, you can see on the screen is the modification 5452A with reference 1849.1 which you can see at the end there, and to retain 547F with no change so that is approach A.

There was another approach, approach B, having the two alternatives for the decision of the conference, that would be to update both approach B, both footnotes, removing references there and replacing them with the wording. Number 5.43A does not apply as you can see on the screen, that change has been made to 547F and 5450A you can see on the screen, so that's showing track changes

and that is for approach B.

Then finally, we have approach C, where there are no changes to the footnote text at all, as you can see on the screen, there is no change to 5447F or 5450A, and finally, for all of the approaches, A, B and C, there would be suppression of resolution 764, as you can see on the screen.

So, these are the different items for consideration on 9.15. I'd like to give the floor to my colleagues on the panel, let's start once again on my right to hear from the APT on this. Thank you. Please go ahead.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When studying this issue 9.1.5, APT feels is general one, APT support ITU-R studies, so this is a element. Second element is APT members also support to ensure the protection of the services to reach the boundaries allocated difference in this footnote. So we don't have any clear position associated with approaches in the CPM. We may need to also discuss at the next APG.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. We will continue with ASMG.

>> Thank you, ASMG as well support the studies conducted by ITU-R on this issue, 9205 agenda item 9.1 and the initial position is to ensure protection of existing services. However, the exact method and approach would be discussed in the next ASMG meeting for further consideration. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. ATU, please, your information.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Regarding these issue [inaudible] recommendation M1638 and 1849, ATU group supports the study and technical method impacts. We also have noted the different approaches and alternatives to address the issue. Our main concern is protection of existing services, preliminary position is we offer the no change approach so ATU position is no change to the draft.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for those comments. Alexandre, please.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As far as CPT is concerned we are currently studying the impact, the references to recommendation 5250A reference to recommendation 1849, in both footnotes and replacing them is information, innovation to the capability of sharing conditions and mitigation techniques which are provided in the resolution 229, as revised by the previous conference. This would mean not method B exactly what you have on your slides, but modified approach B.

But we still have some that would favor no change approach and we are still discussing this, we are studying the issue, and this would be one of the items to discuss next CP G meeting. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Alexandre for the CEPT position. I give the floor to Jose.

>> Thank you, Chairman. In CITELE, we have two proposals by Mexico and United States, they are similar but not quite, similar

to approach B. Mexico is very much aligned with this, well, they are both proposing to suppress the recommendations by reference. The difference is Mexico includes in method B a reference to number 5.43A, that does not apply. On the other hand, the U.S. proposal provides some words indicating more precisely that the allocation service, exploration satellite service active and service active shall not seek more stringent protection that was in 5446 and 5446 is a reference to resolution 229.

That is what is going to provide the protection. These are the two preliminary proposals we have in CITELE. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. We will now hear from the RCC.

>> Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. On this issue, in our region we have quite a clear position, we agreed on the main principle, we do not support changing conditions for the allocation of bands for the mitigation, any changes that will be proposed should not lead to any changes in the allocation of the band. We did a analysis concerning the inclusion of references to recommendations 1849.1, and this led to a conclusion that this does change conditions of allocations, so the results of our discussion is no change for the two references, 5447 and 5458. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Sergey.

I'd like to open up the floor for comments. We have heard from the regional groups, positions on 9.15. Any comments? United States. Please go ahead.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So we have, as my colleague from CITELE says, we have been dealing with perhaps looking at a solution that involves approach B, it's been the view of the United States that we need to find a solution for this, and it's our view that a no change on issue 9.1.5 will simply kick this issue to the next conference, because these recommendations that are incorporated by reference, particular M1638-0, and related to that recommendation M1849, are being revised as we speak, or have been.

And when we try to continually update these recommendations through the course of technology, innovations and the radars, we have to revisit this footnote every time. So does it make sense to continually revisit this issue? Is this going to be a standing agenda item at every conference? We have to find a solution that is innovative to try to address this, so it doesn't continually come up every conference. I think that the approach B at least the U.S. is looking at approach B, or some form of approach B that will help address this, try to not continually carry this issue from conference to conference. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United States, for that comment. Any other comments? Iran, please go ahead.

>> IRAN: Thank you, sir. I think there would be some solution for that, if you have a little bit of proper understanding of application of the recommendation, recommendation covers

reference, subsequent changes of that there is a possibility to resolve the matter. But what we don't expect not to have any issue for WRC 2023 nor any agenda item. We come to the issue at the end of this, we have some comment about the issue, issue for us becomes a issue which is not asked for and it has been imposed. So but for this particular subject, there would be some possibility, a little bit of cooperation among the experts sitting together with a view to resolve the matter. We could not continue this contradiction or inconsistency forever. It might happen in future in different recommendation and different aspects, but we have to find a way what we deal with the recommendation which has been modified, and there are interconnected with other recommendations, so in our view it is a possibility to resolve this matter, but not shift it to any other conference. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Iran, for those comments. It might be a good idea to take on the spirit of that and try to resolve all items on the agenda at the next conference. Thank you very much, Iran. Any other comments? All right. I see none. With this we will conclude 9.15. Before moving to 9.18 I'd like to ask the panelists whether they would like to add anything else on this point. I see none. We will move now to 9.18.

Working party 5B was tasked with this item, 9.18. They conducted studies on the technical operational aspects of radio network consistence, as well as spectrum needed, including possible

harmonized views of spectrum to support the implementation of narrow band and broadband, machine type communication infrastructures, MTC in accordance with the annex to resolution 958. These applications are also known as machine to machine communications or the Internet of Things. The results of the ITU study were that the current and future spectrum use for narrow band and broadband MTC performed as requested in resolution 958 believe there is no need for any regulatory actions in the radiocommunication regulations, with regard to the specific spectrum intended to be used by the applications.

Nonetheless, concluded that there are other mechanisms which could facilitate harmonized use of the spectrum to support the implementation of narrow band and broadband MTC. So this has been resolved in this study cycle. I'd like to give the floor to my colleagues from the regions. I'll start on my left with the RCC position, Sergey, please, if you could tell us what status is in your region.

>> Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. On this item, we also have reached agreement in the region. [inaudible] communications as very important issue, which requires harmonization at the global level, at the same time, given that harmonization can only, can be ensured without making any amendments to the radio resolutions, so with regard to the radio regulations, we believe that no changes are needed. At the same time, within the framework of the ITU, we

will actively participate and propose to develop relevant recommendations on the use of frequency band for this type of services in order to harmonize frequency bands for these allocations. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Sergey. I give the floor to Jose, please.

>> Thank you, Chairman. In CITELE we have a Inter-American proposal for this issue, and there are 11 countries supporting. Now the discussions will continue, and they will not finalize until the end of the discussion before WRC. But I think 11 countries is a significant support of proposal no change. The conclusion in line with the studies that were done in working party 5B is that there is no need to change anything in the radio regulations and there is no need to identify any specific spectrum for this type of applications. That is the current position. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jose. Alexandre could you give us CEPT position, please.

>> Thank you, Chairman. As far as CEPT is concerned our view is similar to what was just expressed by Jose. We are also of the view that no change to the radio regulation is required in order to support this agenda item, to resolve this agenda item. We believe that the current work in ITU-R also given by resolution 166 in the previous Radio Assembly execution in view of harmonizing the spectrum for both IMT based and nonIMT based communications, and

current position of CEPT is no change.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Alexandre. I will now give the ATU, please.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As the other regions, machine type communication is an important application. We also recognize that harmonized user spectra for MTC systems will provide economies of scale to facilitate deployment of narrow band or broadband machine type communication infrastructures. The results of ITU-R studies, the current and future for use for narrow band and broadband MTC conclude that there is no need for any regulatory action, and therefore, ATU has consensus of no change approach in this issue.

However, we support other mechanisms which will facilitate the harmonized use of spectrum to support implementation of narrow band and broadband MTC infrastructure, including ITU-R recommendation or reports. Therefore, our position is no change to RR. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much Gababo Wako for giving us ATU's position. The floor goes to ASMG.

>> Thank you, Chairman, with regards to 918 and 91, the ASMG has looked at this issue under two perspectives. The first one is the broadband MTC and second one is narrow band MTC in IoT, definitely noting that the widespread of IoT use cases in many countries today, the demand to further develop Smart Cities necessitates the requirement to further harmonize if possible the use of the spectrum for IoT. This is the initial view from ASMG to say that where broadband MTC and IoT applications, the ASMG support use of existing

bands identified for IMT systems to support the implementation of broadband communication infrastructures from machine to machine IoT.

With regards to narrow band and IoT applications ASMG supports use of existing bands identified for IMT systems, such as for example the band within 694 to 960 gigahertz and to harmonize to support the harmonization of the usage of the 2 by 3 megahertz from 733 to 736 and from 788 to 791, within 700 megahertz band for narrow band applications of MTC and IoT within the concerned countries. And also capability to use whatever IMT bands for different application whether within IoT or even others.

So from that perspective, there is no need for any regulatory action in the RR, but we have agreed yesterday one report in Study Group 5 for IoT and MTC narrow band and broadband applications, and that report has addressed some of the potential possible bands within 1036 recommendation to be harmonized as possible and as feasible for IoT and MTC in particular narrow band applications.

From broadband we see there is nothing definitely acquired, all bands can be utilized, can be used. For narrow band we see potential for harmonized the use of the already identified band for MTC and IoT, as we mentioned one of the examples the bands gigahertz in particular 2 by 3 megahertz within 700 megahertz band. With this we find we are accommodating other mechanisms we are using right now like ITU-R reports or recommendations such as the agreed

yesterday for IMT usage for narrow band and broadband MTC applications.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for those comments. We will go to the APT region.

>> For this issue APT members support ITU-R studies and APT members are of the view that the possible harmonized use of spectrum to support MTC can be achieved through ITU-R recommendations or reports and there is no need to make any changes to the radio regulations, nor for any identification of spectrum to support MTC.

The view is in line with the conclusion of the CPM position. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for those comments. We have the regions' viewpoints. I'd like to ask the room if you have any comments or questions for the panel colleagues. Iran, go ahead.

>> IRAN: Thank you, sir, sometimes we agree disagree, this time we agree to agree. I imagine the term that this will be the first document to the plenary [inaudible] no change to regulation. The report and everything that the people wanted are in the report, in WRC, who would not refer to any use of anything, because the band, everything it address sufficiently, adequately, in the reports, it is approved yesterday, and we tried to do every possible things to approve that report in order to release the CPM and now CPM is clean document, no change to radio regulation. That is the first blue document to the Chairman presented. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Iran. Well, let's hope there are more documents that we agree on. Let's hope there are few that we agree to disagree on. That is the first set of documents. Thank you very much. With that we have exhausted the time allotted for this session. And we have even gone over a little bit. But I'd like to thank my colleagues who participated in the session and the previous one. I'd like to thank Philippe for the invitation to participate in this workshop. With this, we conclude this panel. Thank you.

>> Thank you very much, Mr. Rapporteur and panelists. I would like to applaud.

(applause).

Very interesting information you share with us this afternoon. Now ladies and gentlemen, we have a shorter break. I apologize for that. But I would like to resume after the break at quarter past 4, so then we keep 45 minutes for the next session on agenda items 1.11 and 1.12. Before I close the mic, I see a request for the floor. Go ahead.

>> Thank you, the GSMA is always committed to entertaining all you fine people while we are in these hallowed rooms and we would like to carry on that commitment to entertaining you tonight outside of them, to that end we would like to continue the CPM day of cinema with a informal soiree involving food, music, drink and art tonight and over these other side of the lake. Some of you will have

received a invitation. You do not need it to get in. But this has the address on. So if anyone would like one, please come to see me or one of my very dashing colleagues. I'll repeat the name, cave devalond.

(?)

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for this kind invitation which was very well noted.

I would like to break for another 20 minutes, and resume at quarter past 4. Thank you very much.

(break).

>> Ladies and gentlemen, if you could kindly come back and take your seats, we will resume the workshop and start the session.

(microphone feedback).

For this third session we will be looking at two agenda items, related to land mobile and fixed services, this is coming from chapter 1 of the draft CPM report. This is more specifically agenda items 1.11 and 1.12 on topics related to intelligent transport system. With us we have the Rapporteur for the chapter 2 of the draft CPM report Mrs. Keer Zhu, so welcome to the podium. With us we will have also representatives from the six regional groups which are now all with us. Without further delay, I would suggest that we start this session 3. So the floor is yours.

>> KEER ZHU: Thank you, Philippe. Good afternoon, Distinguished

Delegates. Under chapter 1 Rapporteur for CPM 19, my name is Zhu Keer, I could speak Chinese better but I would like to relief the workload of the translation so I will speak in English.

Chapter 1, addresses four agenda items, agenda item 1.11 for harmonization of spectrum for ISDC and agenda 1.12 harmonization for spectrum of ITS and agenda 1.14 is additional spectrum perhaps and agenda item 1.15 is try to find new identified bands for land and mobile service and fixed service applications. For this session, that we will first have discussion on the agenda item 1.11, as we know that the resolution to 36 of WRC-15 resolved to invite ITU-R to take necessary actions to facilitate global original harmonized frequencies to support the ICT and within the existing mobile service allocations.

There is responsible group is working party 5A. I would like to introduce the [inaudible] studied progress of this agenda item. As we can see that the working party 5A already developed one report which ITU-R M .2418 and this report addresses generic architecture, applications which includes categories of applications, and also five generic operations scenarios and current technologies for ICT. Yesterday, Study Group 5 meeting approved another report for this agenda item, which is the report ITU-R M.ICT usage. This report actually is initiated based on ITU-R service study, and with 38 administrations and one regional group's contribution to this study, this report addresses the technical and operational

characteristics in spectrum usage of current and planned ISDP as well as studies on spectrum needs of ICT.

Still the working party 5A is under development of the working document towards recommendation ITU-R M.ICT FRQ and this document is to address on the possible harmonization of frequencies and related frequency arrangements for ICT, and I think there is more discussion to conclude the study. Now we have three methods proposed from the CPM draft report. The first one is the method A, no change to the radio regulations, except suppression of the resolution 236 of the draft 15. The reason is that harmonization frequencies can be achieved through course of ITU Study Group work, practical ITU-R recommendations and all reports, for instance I mentioned the recommendation ITU-R F.ICT FRQ and the method B is to add a new resolution of WRC 19 and consequently suppress resolution 236 of WRC-15 with the consideration that new WRC resolution specify range for ICT provides regulatory framework in original harmonization for ISTP and provides guidance to administrations when making plans for ICT. The method C is to add a new resolution with references to the recommendation ITU-R M.ICT FRQ and consequently suppression resolution 236 of WRC-15. This is because new WRC resolutions frequency range for ICT can provide regulatory framework to guide the harmonization process, at the same time ITU-R recommendation can recommend possible global and original harmonization of frequency arrangements for ICT and can

provide flexibility. This is the methods currently proposed, working party 5A developed CPM draft report.

Now I would like to give the term to our original representatives, I think new representatives from the original groups, and I would like to ask those new experts to introduce themselves first. Thank you.

>> Good afternoon, everybody, it's a pleasure once again to be here in this second regional workshop, my name is John Lewis, I work in the preparatory group in APG as the Vice-Chairman of the Editorial Committee. I live nearby, it's easy for me to come and help this activity during this workshop prepared by the BR.

>> Good afternoon, everyone, this is Mohammed Al Jnoobi, Chairman of working group 4 on spectrum management global responsible about studies related to land and mobile wire services.

>> Good afternoon, my name is Abraham Oshadami, I'm working group 1 Chairman.

>> Alexandre Kholod I work for administration and representative here as Vice-Chairman of conference ...

(voice trails away).

>> Hi, good afternoon, I'm Luciana Camargos, I Chair one of the CITEL working groups that deals with terrestrial services, working group 1.

>> Good afternoon [inaudible]

(receiving no English translation).

I coordinate mobile services [inaudible]

>> Present original view on this agenda item.

>> Thank you very much, Madame Chair. On agenda item 1.11, in our region, we agreed on the position, and ...

(audio is very faint).

Should be conducted within existing frequency bands for mobile services, changes to radio regulations or authentication of frequency bands, at this time all applications is not necessary. We also believe harmonization can be ensured on the basis of the work of the ITU, and [inaudible]

(english translation is very faint, I can't hear or understand).

>> Thank you very much. We already have a Inter-American proposal, Inter-American proposal is for approximately eight countries, it is no change to the radio regulations to volumes 1 and 2, because believe it is unnecessary to identify the spectrum specific [inaudible] regional harmonization [inaudible] ITU-R reports and recommendations, and of course we support the suppression ...

(voice trails away).

>> Agenda item 111 is one of the items where [inaudible] advanced greatly, in particular we have already developed European proposal for this agenda item, called ECP it should be now subject to approval and adoption at the meeting of CP G next week.

Moving to the position of CPT itself, CEPT does support the harmonization of frequencies for radiocommunications between [inaudible] however, we believe this can be achieved through the ordinary work of ITU-R Study Groups, this while development of applicable ITU-R recommendations and report, therefore, we would support no change method for this agenda item, also information already achieved certain harmonization within CEPT on the basis of technology in 900 megahertz band and believe that reason, together with the fact that we are looking for the harmonization in existing mobile allocations, good reasons not to change the radio regulations on this agenda item. Thank you, Madame Chair.

>> John, could you please introduce APT.

>> JOHN LEWIS: Thank you very much.

Last March, many things have happened since, especially in the context of the CPM text being developed, and we were reviewing all this material in second week of January, in Busan in the Republic of Korea where the temperatures vary between 0 and minus 3, so this Geneva meeting is giving us some training.

At our earlier meeting, we supported studies towards global or regional harmonized frequency bands to support RSTT within existing mobile service allocations, in accordance with resolution 236, and we are of the view that international standards and global regional harmonized spectrum would facilitate the current and future development of RSTT. We also are of the view that the

implementation arrangements RSTT should not impose additional constraints on any other primary services, to which the frequency bands consumed are already allocated.

We also believe that the studies on RSTT should not be restricted to or preclude any particular relevant technology, and we understand and recognize that harmonized frequency arrangements for RSTT can support cross border railway operations. We will be looking in our next meeting at developing our positions on these different methods. At the moment all of these are active in the consideration in ABG so this would be a discussion of importance in Busan.

I can mention that some of my thunder was stolen, if you like, but we acknowledge that working party 5A and Study Group 5 these last days developed and approved a lot of material on this topic. If you wish to see the report, RSTT usage, that is Study Group 5 document 111, that was approved. We also had the Dr. Costa's written party 5A report, document 5A976, annex 8 work going on, on recommended harmonized frequency arrangements, quite a lot of detail in that text, and that is a important text to review and get opinions on as we move forward. The plan is that this would be considered at the next working party 5A meeting, which is in the first half of next year with the objective of having everything ready for the conference which would mean through Study Group 5 later in the year and eventually review by the Radio Assembly.

There are two other annexes to Dr. Costa's report, annexes 12

and 21, which provide details of ongoing work on other activities under RSTT. Those interested, I recommend you search out these texts, with the latest material available and we will look at that in the context of the development of our positions on this particular agenda item. I think that's all I need to say. Thank you.

>> Thank you very much. With regard to agenda item 1.11, actually it's as mentioned by the previous speaker, our positions are based on the last meetings which was held in last April in Marrakesh before developing the CPM text. Our position based on that, we are considering the changes happened that finalizing the CPM text in our next meeting which is in next December. The preliminary position of the agenda item 1.11 is supporting the studies about the radio communication systems between and track side within the current allocation of the mobile service, and as well as ensuring the protection of the existing services without imposing any new restrictions on them. Thank you very much.

>> ATU, we recognize the way to support development of radiocommunication system, with this we support global harmonization of frequency use. Because of this, we have preliminary view of C which entails a resolution and this is to enable us enjoy flexibility of developments in this band. Thank you.

>> Thank you all for that presentation. Now I open the floor

for any comments and question. I see Iran.

>> Iran: Thank you, sir, madame, excuse me, like 918 that the Arab group was behind that this is the Chinese agenda item, (chuckles) we call it that. Good that we have a report. I think I don't see any major differences between three methods. All of them talk harmonization could be done in one way or other way.

The only thing method B and method C there is one word that a little bit I'm not comfortable and that is regulatory framework. I have no problem with framework. When we say regulatory, you bring or open the door for radio regulations. So I think all three methods are more or less the same. Perhaps the reasons in method A it currently support no change, could be like method B and C in the resolutions saying that there is no need for change due to the fact that harmonization and continued -- the issue is that we should continue to work together, further recommendations, I don't know how many you want, but not bring any issue in the WRC in near future or maybe long term, so that should be in, my view it's better we have a resolution rather than just simple no change, and saying that the reason, because it disappear after the WRC, we need to have a sign, we need to have track of that, like a track within rail and the tracks, so I think it might be good that we have a resolution.

However, I want to go one further step, or one step further. It might be good that we have one resolution generally dealing with the issues that there is no need to change the radio regulation and

separately refer to the agenda item that there would be a track in WRC, outputs in future that we have dealt with this issue after years of extensive debate, you come to the conclusion that there is no need or there was no need to modify the radio regulations due to the fact the issue falls within the traditional activities of ITU-R and could be dealt with by recommendation, bracket S close bracket and reports bracket S close bracket.

That would be a good idea. Maybe somebody in the membership would have this courage to present maybe a overall or general resolution to the CPM dealing with this issue. But once again, I don't see any major difficulty with all three methods, if possible in method B and C we should refer to the framework for harmonizations which includes all frameworks, not only regulatory, operational, technical and so on, so forth. But not only framework for regulatory issues, framework for all those things. This is by way of suggesting, in fact, I did the same thing more or less at the first meeting. This is a continuation of that. Somebody reminded me that this was done, I said no problem, what I said before, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Arasteh. China, please.

>> Thank you, Madame Chair. Just now I listened to the presentations of regional representatives for achieving, promoting RSTT to regional and global harmonization. This is exactly the spirit of the resolution 236 of the WRC-15, as Madame Chair, you

have mentioned the report on status was already approved by working party 5, regarding various RSTT scenarios and parameters, they are having detailed presentations. However, as for which frequency bands therefore the regional or global harmonization frequency bands there is further deliberation in the past two weeks at level of R SG, there were discussions on this issue.

I believe that regional representatives should also conduct research and form positions in order to provide feedbacks in order to promote regional and global harmonization relating to agenda item 1.11. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for comments, China. Anyone else? United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madame Chair. Good afternoon to you. So yes, my colleague Mr. Levin's work together in working party 5A last week discussing this issue of harmonization, so the method B and method C essentially use the example of resolution 646 on public protection and disaster relief, more methods than I think now is following that sort of path that was developed and decided at WRC-15 under agenda item 193 on PPER so really there are many ways to try to encourage administrations to harmonize and regional and global level. This is not the only example.

ITS [inaudible] we have to take a look at how we are going to do this, what is the most effective way to encourage harmonization

amongst countries, amongst regions. Is it a resolution, is it just the continual work through the Study Groups, developing recommendations and reports that help provide guidance for harmonization, the technology and such, so we have to come to terms on that. There could be many ways to do this. From the perspective of the United States, we are advocating that today and we think that the work through the Study Groups can accomplish this type of harmonization, particularly at the regional level, it's important as my colleague from China said, it is important that we try to address this at the regional level. Maybe the RSTT efforts in the U.S. may be different from China, maybe we don't need to be completely harmonized [inaudible] we have to consider the approach.

(voice trails away).

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I think APT has something to add.

>> There is one point that came up in the working party 5A, the last week, where liaison statement was developed and that is going to be sent to APT, ASMG, ATU, CEPT CITELE and RCC, because we want to invite those organisations to provide information on the frequency bands that they are considering the possible spectrum harmonization within the existing mobile service allocations. This should help us with the replies to this liaison statement should help us in developing the recommendation, that is under way.

I think this is a very important activity that we will have in our upcoming regional meetings, for example our meeting with

Republic of Korea in January.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, John. I think that actually this agenda item is proposed by APT, WRC-15, seems from all the comments and presentations of the regional groups that we are all supportive of considering the harmonization of the frequency bands. The left issue is which frequency bands are we going to harmonize, regional, global level and which approach we are going to take for this harmonization.

Actually, I have an interesting question, actually, that just came out to mind, every time that we come to Geneva we enjoy a lot from the railway system, in Europe, and we can conveniently transport from one country to another in Europe. Actually, Alex already introduced CEPT has a very well harmonized frequency for ISTP and I think it's through ECC position so I'm wondering that what would be the ITU approach for the harmonization of ICT for the ITU member countries. As I understand, ECC position makes regulatory common recommendation, not recommendation level, as Mr. Arasteh this morning comment that the recommendation is optional choice for the Member States, while the resolution it's more relate to there are mandatory but even the current proposed draft resolution doesn't set that mandatory requirements. It just encourages to be harmonized.

Maybe first Alex can give some explanation. Then we have the UAE and then Iran.

>> Thank you, Madame Chair. I'm also Swiss and the Swiss railway system is also one of the probably most developed railway network in Europe, if not the world and it functions very well, and one reason for that is surey harmonization of frequencies for RSTT, within Europe. You mentioned, you refer to the ECC decision, though I don't want to teach the course here how it works in Europe, works in CPT but to mention the decision has not mandatory nature. You may decide not to implement it. It's difference what we have from EC decision, EC decision is different.

Regarding ICT we have I mentioned previously 900 megahertz band 2 times 4 which is a decision across the whole Europe, as option for 2 times 3 megahertz that countries or nations can decide to implement on their national data, up to 2 times 7 megahertz but we are revising this framework. We have specific projects within CEPT that does the work for future mobile communication systems, in particular, also, assessing spectrum needs and technologies will be used for that system.

Regarding the method itself there was a comment from Mr. Arasteh, the methods are similar. They are similar in a way that they all seek harmonization [inaudible] what was said also by you, Madame Chair, it's the degree of obligation which is different across all these methods. Method A is looking for recommendation by development of 11 ITU-R recommendations, which has less degree of obligation, when you compare to the resolution of WRC. Of course

it depends on the words that you put there, whether it shall oblige, encourage, etcetera, so everything dependent on the exact wording in that resolution, but still the recommendation from the Study Group has a different obligation level, to the resolution from the conference. I think we should clear with that. That is what I want to say.

>> Thank you, Chairman and probably to confirm the importance of harmonization whether the application is ITS or railway or IoT whatever the agenda item is 111 or 112, different applications is different, harmonization across regions or in the same region, specifically something that adds value among these administrations, and probably there is something to look at, whether we have it through the recommendation or any other tools or mechanism is something that probably can be addressed in the coming time. However, I think the current option is something that everybody can look at, and consider it for the future. But I think harmonization as a fact is something that add value for every administration.

Recommendation can help, mechanisms can also be considered if necessary. Thank you.

>> Thank you, madame. Discussion on the application and scope of work of resolution, recommendations, outside the patience of this meeting, you have a lot of things to do. But resolutions of WRC, resolution of Plenipotentiary and recommendation of ITU-R if they are incorporated by reference, they are mandatory. It is positive.

Then if they are not cross-referenced, also depends as mentioned by Alexandre which terms you use, moreover if resolution is addressed to the Secretariat is mandatory for them, but not Member States. There are moral obligation and mandatory obligation. All of them have advantage and value. I want to comment that you said that perhaps all of these things now is in the hand of the ITU-R Study Groups level. It is a good way. So let us not make WRC replacing the ITU-R and so on, so forth.

Now you have a framework, and you can continue to have, as many recommendation, as many harmonization to each other and at least that is the case. So let us go to the next agenda items 112 to see what we can do, because you are short of time. So we have another important issue, 114 which might have some more discussion. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, 1.14 is not for today agenda item. Yes, I see that we have similarity of agenda item 1.12 but because these are for the harmonization of certain applications in the mobile service -- harmonization. Thanks for the comments and I think we can move to the next agenda item 1.12. That is similar that is considering for the global original harmonization for ITS, with resolution 237, and this is also that under the study of the working party 5A, and the progress of this agenda item is quite progress. But yesterday, meeting approved ITU-R M.ITS usage report, and another report is ITU-R M.ITS arrangement.

Also, it adopted a two recommendation, one is a recommendation ITU-R M.ITSFRQ which recommends for the harmonization of frequency for ITS and which is 5.9 gigahertz band and another is revision to recommendation ITU-R M .1890, so this is a recent study progress for this agenda item.

With regards to the methods that similarly we have three methods. Method A is no change and method B is to have a new resolution, and method C is new resolution is nonmandatory reference to ITU-R recommendation which is ITS FRQ. Actually because today my session time was used by the previous session, actually for each agenda item could use around 45 minutes, now in 45 minutes, if the meeting urge me to have to finish these two agenda items in this session, then I would like to maybe first ask the regional group to brief introduce their views on this agenda item, and then we may continue at the early, at the morning session tomorrow. We have still one session for chapter 1. Maybe this time we start from John from APT.

>> Thank you madame Zhu, in fact the discussions we had during March in both Australia on this agenda item led to very similar views and mentioned under 1.11. We support the studies towards possible harmonization and frequency bands in existing mobile service allocations, and implementation of the evolving ITUs.

This should not be restricted to nor exclude any particular evolving ITS technology including [inaudible] evolution technologies. The use of the bands should not impose additional

constraints on any other primary services to which the bands are already allocated, and should take account of the potential interference from services, including FSS station uplinks. We will be considering this again in Busan, and to add to the material you mentioned if we look at the Study Group 5 meeting yesterday, two recommendations were documents 120 and 122, two reports that were approved, 121 and 123, so if you wish to look that material up, that's the documents to find. There is also annex 22, working party 5A Chairman's report in 5A976 which has further material on developments of ITS. So there is a lot of material there which will help us in our considerations as we move forward towards CPM. Thank you, Madame Chair.

>> Thank you very much, Madame Chair. With regard to agenda item 1.12 which is about the harmonize spectrum for intelligence rotation system the ASMG position at the last April meeting was mainly to support the studies going on within the ITU for ensuring the harmonization either regional or global for using ITS. The next meeting in December, it will be discussed further, in order to, I mean choosing the methods to satisfy this agenda from the spectrum management group. Thank you very much.

>> Thank you, Madame Chair, similar to 1.11, we also recognize the need to welcome development in ITS, because of this, we support the harmonization, dependent on [inaudible] because of this, we consider method C, entails new resolution, and nonmandatory

reference ITU-R recommendation, even though it's nonmandatory, we believe that reference to the most recent version of ITU-R recommendation, provided proper guide for the use of frequencies. Thank you.

>> Thank you.

>> This is another agenda item where CEPT has nearly made its mind particular responsible project in CEPT has already developed European common proposal for this agenda item, should be subject to approval and adoption at the forthcoming meeting next week.

In particular, we believe that the existing framework for ITS for the band 5855 to 5095 megahertz is sufficient and no changes to the regulatory revision is required in order to resolve this agenda item.

Harmonization at the ITU-R level can be achieved by Study Groups, this was development of 11 ITU-R recommendations. You mentioned, Madame Chair [inaudible] developed a recommendation, ITS frequencies. This work supports very good harmonization for ITS and no changes [inaudible]

>> Thank you very much. Similar to [inaudible] 110 CITELE also supports no change for this agenda item not on the basis that it's not important or the basis that CITELE is not involved in the discussions in ITS. But simply because CITELE countries supporting this proposal and there are eight countries involved believe that change to radio regulations would indeed be the best way forward

to achieve harmonization as they would create a situation, need to change, need to go through conference to change and that can be easily done in the work of working party 5A. CITEEL countries support the no change for volumes 1 and 2 and suppression of resolution ... [inaudible]

>> Thank you very much, Madame Chair. To tell you the truth I don't have much to add, because [inaudible]

(english translation is very faint).

I'd like to say a few words about [inaudible] which should be solved [inaudible] European colleagues when they make decisions on frequency band [inaudible] one country cannot implement this and the reason is not interference or [inaudible] but the lack of railway in country, there are no railways in the country, so adopting decisions on harmonization, mandatory decisions including on railways and intellectual transport systems is a difficult decision. It should not be adopted because we need to take into account the needs and infrastructures of various countries which have also need for spectrum use.

We need to use ITU-R recommendations for soft resolutions, and this I think would be the approach we support.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for efficient introduction from the regional group. Now time is 5. I think that I still can give the floor to any comments and questions.

>> Thank you, sorry to intervene. Before we continue for maybe

five, ten minutes, maximum, I would like to ask the interpreters if we can do that for the next five or ten minutes.

>> That's fine, sir.

>> I didn't hear the answer. So thank you very much for the yes.

(laughter).

Please go ahead.

>> Thank you.

>> It's quite similar agenda item compared to agenda item 1.11. I'm not expecting many comments or questions. Are there any comments? Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I think this sort of issue should not come to WR, they are manageable by ITU-R, very effectively and efficiently. Is it a long term activities of ITU-R so we go to WRC if we need to do something in WRC. But after three and a half years or three years we come to the conclusion that everything manageable to a recommendation so on and so forth and I don't think resolution of WRC which is not in the footnote and so on, serves better on that one although that resolution is a final act but does not have any other application than recommendation which is more of a stronger and so on, so forth.

Perhaps in future, I'm not talking about this, to facilitate the task of WRC dealing with the issue requires to deal with the regulatory regime, which is quite complex. We fully appreciate, what has been done by the people, good results, congratulation to

all of you. But we look into the future, how to deal with WRC agenda items. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thanks to your comment, it's question to all of us, what is the role of WRC and what solution can be discussed by WRC. APG have additional comments.

>> More thank you to colleagues in the BR. Dr. Costa's report is on the website. 5C Chairman report is on the website. We will look at it tomorrow in connection, and 5C document is 5C617. If you want reading while attending the function, they can read something and float off into the sky above our future.

>> CHAIR: John is proposing homework before the next decision. If there are no further comments, I would like to thank all the representatives of the regional group and thanks all for your participation. Thank you.

>> Thank you very much, Miss Keer Zhu and applause to all the panelists.

(applause).

Thank you all for attending this first day of the workshop. Tomorrow, we will continue still with chapter 1, the remaining two items, 114 and 115 with Miss Zhu Keer and the panelists and we start tomorrow at 9:00 in this room. You are welcome again to follow the workshop.

Enjoy the evening and see you tomorrow. Thank you.

(meeting adjourned at 1705)

Services Provided By:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
800-825-5234
www.captionfirst.com

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

RAW FILE
ITU-R INTER-REGIONAL WORKSHOP
NOVEMBER 21, 2018
9:00 A.M. CET

Services Provided By:

Caption First, Inc.
P.O Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
1-877-825-5234
+001-719-481-9835
Www.captionfirst.com

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

>> PHILIPPE AUBINEAU: Sorry. I was mixing up the numbers. I don't see the numbers here. So thank you very much. Now we are ready to start by -- you come here. So we have a little technical problem with the headphones here on the podium. Could you please make sure we have the channel connected also to our earphones here on the podium, please. And maybe we'll start in English while this is being connected. It is good. Okay. Okay. Thank you very much.

So let's start our session this morning, session 4 that will deal with two agenda items, 1.14 and 1.15 from chapter 1. We have the Rapporteur and the representatives of the regional groups. So please Ms. Keer.

>> KEER ZHU: We are going to discuss agenda item 1.14 and 1.15 and we will start from 1.14. Maybe most of you will be excited for discussion from this agenda item. So I will be briefly introduce the study progress on this item. It is to consider as a basis of the ITU-R studies in accordance with the

Resolution 160 of WRC-15, appropriate regulatory actions for HAPS within the service allocation. And the current way that we have approved the report on the spectrum requirements study on HAPS and you can see that there is draft CPM report already in the case for the different purpose of usage within their higher or lower population density and also that there are characteristics of their broad band HAPS report was approved on Monday Study Group 5 meeting as well. One of the sharing studies on their 64 to 65.20 megahertz band the report was approved also. But we have still several remaining documents and sharing under -- that's the recent study progress on this agenda item. Let's have a look at the current methods proposed to satisfy this item. So for this agenda item the current draft CPM report takes the approach that first that we agreed on all the possible methods that are considered on this agenda item which may be applied to the potential candidate. The method A is no change. And the method B is destination of bands perhaps in accordance with the Resolution 160 and with different options, and this is depending on the current regulatory situations for the different circumstances where some already have identification for the HAPS and some are newly considered bands. And the one particular band without the fixed allocation and then the method C is the suppression of the existing HAPS destination questioned to the result 3 of Resolution 161A and this is applied to the frequency bands that already have the added destinations. And then we have as a second step when considering band by band approach the relevant methods that could be considered as (inaudible) to given with band are indicated and you can have a look at these nine different frequency bands and these are different options of the methods. And as we can see even that for the different method B we have proposed several draft text for the possible conditions for introduction of HAPS and as I mentioned that sharing study is concluded and these are examples of possible conditions for introduction of HAPS particular bands and have different options for method B as well. So this is the very brief introduction. I think that because the draft CPM text for these agenda item is quite a lot of the number of page and we can have a detailed check with current CPM text. I would like to give more time to the representatives of the regional group and also to the board to have some more interactive discussions on this agenda item. I think this is much more interesting agenda item. So I think I will first invite the regional group to first introduce themselves and then have an introduction of their position one by one. I think that maybe we start from RCC this time.

>> ALEXEY SHURAKHOV: Thank you very much Madam Chair. Good morning, everyone. On 1.14 and 1.15 I will be the one

reporting. I represent the administration and member of state of RCC. Thank you.

>> JOSE COSTA: Good morning, everyone. My name is Jose Costa from the Canadian Delegation and I will be representing CITELE in this panel regarding agenda items 1.14 and 1.15. Thank you.

>> ALEXANDER KUHN: Good morning, Alexander Kuhn I am representing CEPT for the presentation of these two agenda items 1.14 and 1.15.

>> ABRAHAM OSHADAMI: Good morning, my name is Abraham Oshadami, I am representing ATU and I will be presenting on 1.14 and 1.15. Thank you.

>> (Inaudible). In order to present this position and present on agenda items.

>> JOHN LEWIS: Good morning everyone. My name is John Lewis. I'm working as the Vice Chairman of APT. Thank you.

>> KEER ZHU: Thank you for the introductions of yourself and then let's start from APT, John. Are you ready to introduce the APT on this agenda?

>> JOHN LEWIS: Thank you Madam Chair. As we mentioned yesterday we met last March and at that time a lot of material that we have available was not available. And initial views are quite general. We support the studies that were to be undertaken, have been understood taken now in Resolution 160 on the spectrum needs and we take in to account the existing frequency bands that have already been identified perhaps in the radio regulations and we would follow activities on appropriate regulatory actions. We support sharing and compatibility studies. One has been completed and others are still underway between HAPS and other services. And we will be looking at meeting in January with the new material we have available, especially the most recently approved material out of working party 5C and Study Group 5. Thank you.

>> KEER ZHU: Thank you, John. And ASMG.

>> (Translation overlap) to specify this operational and technical (inaudible). Finding technical solutions for -- (inaudible). Need to enter these -- are acceptable to the HAPS station and this was confirmed.

>> KEER ZHU: Thank you. ATU please.

>> ABRAHAM OSHADAMI: Thank you. The ATU administrations have closely followed the work of 5C and as regards compatibility studies of HAPS with existing services we have also evaluated the anticipated potential complimentary efforts of HAPS. So telecom infrastructure deployments particularly with respect to broad band deployment and has a general position, ATU administration supports advancement in HAPS deployment. Are looking at proposed methods to satisfy the

agenda 1.14, administrations have as a preliminary view method D and option B1 and B2. Thank you.

>> KEER ZHU: Okay. Thank you. And CEPT, please.

>> ALEXANDER KUHN: Thank you very much. Just a general introduce of that one. We believe that the HAPS technology can be one complimentary technology which can be implemented to the study of broad band connection areas that we don't see them right now and that's the important sector where we see it -- seeking for global solutions. Therefore we also are of the view that we need protect the existing services including their future development not only in the bands but in the adjacent bands. Downlink in 6440 and 6520 megahertz. And we are also looking for identifications for uplink and downlink in the bands 30.0 to 31.-- -- 31.3 and 38.5. And we also seeking for some renewal of some of the footnotes already in the 6 gigahertz range and 27.9 and 28.2 and so on up to 47 gigahertz range. We would like to see some renewal of existing footnotes including appropriate modifications. And having said that we would like to point out also one viewpoint from our understanding to seek for a global solution and that's with regards to the considerations under this agenda item to region 2. There are some certain issues, maybe with possible interference to some of the services in the adjacent bands to be considered bands 21.4 to 22.2 gigahertz. There we would like to seek also that we have compatibility and your supportive of the studies necessary to ensure the protection of the existing services in these bands and also in the adjacent bands that encompasses the U.S. exploration services as well as the intersatellite service. We don't -- we would like to see that we do not have any limitation coming from agenda item to agenda item 1.13 on the gigahertz band. That's my brief introduction.

>> KEER ZHU: Thank you. And CITELE, please.

>> JOSE COSTA: In CITELE we have two draft Inter-American proposal and one preliminary proposal. Remember that drafting Inter-American is one that supported between two and five countries. It needs six to become an inter-American proposal. The two draft inter-American proposals are supported by Bahamas, Brazil and Ecuador. The first one is regarding the band 24.25 to 27.5 gigahertz which is for region 2 only. The proposal is to add a fixed service allocation and identification for HAPS. This is accompanied by comprehensive draft new Resolution to protect the services in neighboring countries. The other draft inter-American proposal is for the band from 38 to 39.5 gigahertz. This is proposed global identification for HAPS and it already has a fixed service identification. And the countries proposing the same for Bahamas, Brazil and Ecuador. No need for a Resolution in this case. And finally there is a

permanent proposal from Mexico for the band from 21.4 to 22 gigahertz for region 2 which is to add the HAPS identification since it already has a fixed service allocation. And also draft Resolution for the protection of the services in neighboring countries. That's about it for region 2 at this time. Thank you.

>> KEER ZHU: RCC please.

>> ALEXEY SHURAKHOV: Thank you, Chair. (Translation overlap).

(Talking at the same time).

>> ALEXEY SHURAKHOV: New frequency bands. (Talking at same time).

>> KEER ZHU: Thank you and now I would open the floor for the comments and questions. Yes. Iran, please.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you and good morning, to all Distinguished Colleagues. Let me first address the issue of RCC. Is that agreed which no more (inaudible) to what. What is the -- we don't have that purpose. This issue came in the radio regulation by some colleagues that exist here in this room in '95, '97. No more with to what? Do we have any reference to compare? So let's be practical. Let's be practical. Second. I think the issue of region 2 could be dealt with separately. And global -- Alexander Kuhn mentioned that we have this important agenda item of 1.13 and we should make every effort to satisfy that. Look at now worldwide and so on and so forth. Remove any difficulty that put and questions the advancement of that agenda item, although it has some problem still with the (inaudible) but not (inaudible) with that. Pave the way for that agenda item. Thank you.

>> KEER ZHU: Thank you for the comments. And is there any further comments or questions or would anybody want to respond? Yeah.

>> Thank you very much for your comments. We will definitely take this comment in to account. And maybe in developing our position we will clarify this. Thank you.

>> KEER ZHU: We can receive some more comments or questions on this agenda. APT have something?

>> JOHN LEWIS: Just to add one more thing, working party 5C on higher bands and the objective is to complete that material at their meeting next May so to have it ready for Study Group 5 potentially for approval before the conference. Thank you.

>> KEER ZHU: Thank you, John for your additional information. Yes, I think then we still have a lot to do at the CPM-19-2 meeting. There is still several open issues of the draft CPM report. It mentioned that needs to be further improved at the 19-2 meeting. So if there is no further

comments then maybe we finished the discussion on this agenda item.

Okay. So let's move to agenda 1.15. This is to consider identification of the bands for use by administrations for the land mobile and fixed service locations, operating in the frequency range 275 to 450 gigahertz band in accordance with Resolution 767 at the WRC-15. And currently that they are responsible for good working party 1A is still conducting the sharing studies for these introduction of these applications. And working party 5C and 5A respectively produced two reports which is ITU M.2417 and F.2416 which provides the technical and operational characteristics and spectrum needs of land mobile service and fixed service applications operating in these frequency range.

And regarding the methods that currently there are five methods proposed to satisfy this agenda item. So the method A is no change to the radio regulations. And the method B is modifying the existing footnote 5.565 and for the fixed service and the land mobile service applications, portions of these. And the method is C is just to modify there 5.565 for use by FS and land mobile service applications in portion of this range while considering the evolving guidance of ITU-R recommendations and the reports. And as a method D it is adding a new footnote 5.5155 and 5.B155. There are different options provided under these two footnotes for the FS and land Mobile Applications in portion of this frequency range. And method E is to adding a new footnote on N.5.C115 and modifying the existing footnote number 5.65 and for this introduction of applications in portion of these bands. I think that for different methods there are some slightly different introduction of these applications. So certain -- they are quite similar frequency bands proposed. I think due to the different understanding of the sharing issues and -- so there are some slight difference. And this is their proposed regulatory action according to their method A. And this is for the method C as you can see that conditions for introduction of these applications for fixed service and land mobile service are different. And the method D is to add new footnote which introduced their land mobile service and fixed service applications in this specific bands and no change to the existing 5.565.

And then option 2 of the method is different. But adding a new footnote 5.115 but different conditions for the introduction of these applications in these portions of bands. And then the method E is adding a new footnote plus the modifications to the existing footnotes. Actually that -- these are very detailed regulatory action examples. So I will keep this slide here and for further discussion on this agenda item. So let's start

maybe from RCC.

>> ALEXEY SHURAKHOV: Thank you Madam Chair. (Talking at same time, translation overlap). For development and introduction of land mobile and fixed service applications both 275 gigahertz. We believe that identifying frequency bands and 275 to 415 gigahertz range. Very active and passive. In the frequency bands already identified 5.65 of the RR. To identify the 396 gigahertz. And 313 perhaps. 356 to 450 gigahertz to identify applications in the land mobile and fixed services. Thank you.

>> KEER ZHU: Thank you. And CITELE, please.

>> JOSE COSTA: Thank you. In CITELE we have two preliminary proposals. These are by United States and by Mexico. In both cases they propose certain parts of the band from 275 to 450 gigahertz for identification for use by administrations for land, mobile and fixed service applications. The reason because there are two separate preliminary proposals is because the bands do not correspond. There are some differences between the bands.

So that will continue to be discussed at the meeting in a couple of weeks in Brazil and hopefully some convergence and discuss it further.

>> KEER ZHU: Thank you CEPT.

>> ALEXANDER KUHN: Thank you very much. We start here as well but we are supportive of this agenda item in general. This future oriented agenda item in a very high frequency range and we need to find the right balance, as also said by my colleague from the RCC between the protection of the services which are essential in these bands and also this new active services. So CEPT supports the inclusion of a new footnote to Article 5, identifying the number of frequency ranges and we with like to maintain the protection of services in 5.565. These frequency bands we are looking at are the similar ones as the RCC275 to -- 318 to 333 gigahertz and 356 to 450 gigahertz with a total bandwidth of this of 137 gigahertz we would like to stress this is already exceeding the spectrum requirements of the land mobile and fixed services but this ensures, of course, the long term availability and they do not have to come back to this issue in the future in any case. There is in addition to 23 gigahertz in the lower adjacent band of 252 to 275. There a continuous band of 40 gigahertz available for this services which is quite a bit of spectrum. Then we are not supportive land mobile and fixed services identifications in the ESS passive bands. That's 296 to 306 gigahertz and 313 to 318 and 333 to 356 gigahertz as identified 5.565. As already recompatibility studies show there is no compatibility feasible. And finally, active services other than land mobile and fixed

services are not subject to this WRC-19 agenda item and CEPT is of the view of the other active services have to remain unchanged and to put it under these CPM methods are more aligned with method E in that case and we are definitely considering this position further at our meeting next week and also then providing to CPM. Thank you very much.

>> KEER ZHU: Thank you. And ATU.

>> ABRAHAM OSHADAMI: Thank you. The decisions of ATU are in favor of identification of -- for use more land, mobile and fixed services from 275 to 450. The fact that the activity in this section of the frequency range is not as easy. We propose that method to be considered should be under the guidance of ITU-R recommendations or reports. Methods that have been proposed for satisfying this agenda item, we have the preliminary view of method C, we suggest the modification of RR5 plus 565 and that evolving guidance of reports.

>> KEER ZHU: Thank you.

>> (Speaking in a non-English language).

>> KEER ZHU: I think there no English interpretation.

>> I will shift to English. The Arab group in last meeting the network has been supporting these studies that were going on to consider the modification of the designation of these frequency bands to be used by administrations for the land mobile and fixed services applications which are creating in these frequency bands 275 to 450 gigahertz. With a condition that to ensure the protection of the existing services in particular passive services which are identified in the footnote as 5.65 and not adding any constraints on these services with a possibility to support one of these methods as specified. Currently we don't have support for one of these methods but we would be studying the -- these methods in our upcoming meeting in December and we will be identifying one of these. Thank you madam.

>> KEER ZHU: Thank you. APT, John, please.

>> JOHN LEWIS: Thank you Madam Chair. Once again views come from March and in a sense superceded by the additional work that's happened. But we were supporting the studies on this agenda item and again like our regional groups were important to the protection of passive services identified in 5.565 and the protection is ensured. In terms of making identification for this new applications, our initial thoughts were to support a method providing a new footnote to the relevant part of the radio regulations and things have moved on in development of the CPM text. So whether it is method D or method E I think we would be having to discuss next January. Thank you Madam Chair.

>> KEER ZHU: Thank you, John. After the introduction is there any comments or questions on this agenda? Okay. Iran,

please. Mr. Arasteh.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you madam. I think no change is not forward looking. This technology (inaudible) No. 1. I think it is management of agenda item. No. 3 perhaps we should perhaps look more in to the method B and C to see to what extent -- having a new footnote for this element and see what changes we have to make with respect to existing footnote while we are protecting the services which are a long, long time ago of this. No allocation of 27 gigahertz. I think it is very helpful solution for that. Personally I don't think it is a complex agenda item.

>> KEER ZHU: Thank you for your comments. Any further request for comments? APT.

>> JOHN LEWIS: Just to make a similar comment to the one I made on the previous agenda item, what's going on, you mentioned the report F.24.16. It would be considered in working party 5C. It is still of interest and we will see how that develops. Thank you.

>> KEER ZHU: Okay. Yes, I think that we have actually some common understanding of this agenda item. Supportive introduction of new applications. Yeah, as Mr. Arasteh commented that we need to further consider which might be the better regulatory approach to satisfy this agenda and we may need to have to do some further at the CPM-19-2, try to have some efforts to harmonize or reduce the number of the methods so that we will easily resolve this issue at WRC-19. So if there is no further comments, I think that my session can conclude earlier ahead of schedule. So Philippe, do you have any --

>> PHILIPPE AUBINEAU: Thank you Ms. Keer and thank you to all the panelists for this session of the morning, a bit shorter than expected but never mind. I would like to applaud all of you.

(Applause.)

>> PHILIPPE AUBINEAU: And now dear colleagues, we have two options in front of us. Either we have a longer break of one hour or we have only half an hour and we start earlier the next session. So I see some head nodding but I have an request for the floor. Please go ahead.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Philippe. I am not in favor of long range. Shorter is better. We have a lot -- we have the complex agenda we have to discuss agenda item 7 which one of issues is much more complex. I don't know if you are so generous giving 30 minutes. Usually it is 20 minutes but I have no problem to give 30 minutes. But in the 20 Swiss minutes is good. Thank you.

>> PHILIPPE AUBINEAU: Thank you very much Mr. Kavouss Arasteh for the good advice. This workshop has been planned

with flexible timing for the sessions and also to give time for discussion outside this formal session. So if the meeting agrees and we will resume in half an hour, so we will continue with the next session dealing with some terrestrial services and I have a request for the floor. Please go ahead.

>> I just want to inform everyone that CI is hosting a lunch for all the Delegates. You are welcome to join us at midday once you finish with the second session.

>> PHILIPPE AUBINEAU: Thank you for this announcement. You all hear it and therefore we will break now for a half hour and we will resume at a quarter passed 10 for the next session. I see another request for the floor. Please go ahead.

>> Just to say that the lunch will be in the ground floor of Montebriant building. So everyone is welcome to join us.

>> PHILIPPE AUBINEAU: Thank you for the clarification. So we break now for half hour and resume at a quarter passed. Thank you.

(Break).

>> PHILIPPE AUBINEAU: Dear colleagues, if you could please come back and take your seats. We will resume our workshop. And continue this morning with the next session, session 5 that is dealing with some other terrestrial aspects regarding maritime, regarding aeronautical and other amateur issues of. We will start with amateur issues. The Rapporteur on the podium of chapter 5 draft CPM report. So welcome Mr. Wael Sayed from Egypt is our Rapporteur for chapter 5 and also I would like to welcome the panelists, new panelists on this new session representing the six regions. So with that short introduction, Mr. Wael Sayed, if you are ready, the floor is yours. And -- so I put your presentation on the screen. And then you can go ahead with this information on chapter 5. Please go ahead.

>> WAEL SAYED: Good morning. My name is Wael Sayed from the Egyptian administration. So my name is Wael Sayed from the Egyptian administration. I am the Rapporteur of chapter 5 of the CPM report. This chapter is about maritime, aeronautical as well as amateur services. Let me first thank the representatives of the reef ones that are present with us on the podium. I would like to say that I have will a very brief overview and will go through the different items on agenda as well as the different matters that have been suggested to me the requirements of these items. As we did yesterday we will give the floor to the regional representatives so that they give us the opinions of the different regions and after that we will give the floor to the audience to ask questions. Allow me first to start with item 1.1, which is about the new allocation in region 1 in regarding the band 48 to 54 megahertz. This was the responsibility of working party 5A.

Regarding the matters are suggested we start with method A which is the preliminary allocation of the part of the band or all the bands and then we move to the second matter, B1 which is again the allocation on the part of the band or all the bands. And then B2 which can be summarized by second allocation on the band 50, 51.75 megahertz. And method C suggests secondary allocation on the part of the methods and the secondary allocation on the remaining segments of the bands. All those methods at the end suggested to add the subsequent footnote about radio broadcasting as well as mobile services.

At the end I would like to stop at the no change method which is the most method in this chapter. Allow me now to go back to the regional representatives so I get opinions of the different regions. I will start from the right side APT.

>> BUI HA LONG: Good morning. My name is Bui Ha Long. I'm now working as a working party 5 Chairman of APT-19. So as mentioned before APT, tried to regroup and last met in March this year. So responsible to finalize a draft CPM text. So a lot of information we have now is not available at this time. So APT views for some agenda items do not pertain to any method. And concerning to this agenda item, APT country believes this region is (inaudible). So APT members agree that any change to the radio regulation under WRC-19 agenda 1.1 shall not adversely impact to the incumbent matter broadcasting, fixed and mobile service in 50 to 54 megahertz band. And, of course, APT members support ongoing ITU-R study relevant to the agenda item 1.1. You can see that this view while in -- B in -- in this method, in CPM text. So I believe that we will have easy session on this agenda item in our next APT meeting in January next year. Thank you.

>> WAEL SAYED: Thank you. I thank APT. I give the floor to ASMG.

>> Regarding 1.1 the allocation of frequencies on the 50 to 54 megahertz for region 1, the position of the Arab group in general is the following, a number of Arab countries are supporting this allocation of frequencies on this frequency band while following up the different studies that are ongoing regarding this item. We would like to say that we support the lack of imposition of new restrictions. We haven't reached a final position. But some Arab administrations say that we have remain cautious and take our time before giving you our final position. And we don't support the allocation of frequencies for the MT services. This item will be discussed in the upcoming meeting of the Arab group that would be held next December. In light of all the changes that have been made to the CPM text, we will reach a decision. Thank you.

>> WAEL SAYED: I thank the Arab group. I now give the

floor to the African Group.

>> ABDOURAMANE EL HALJAR: My name is Abdouramane El Haljar. Within the African Group I am the Chairman of Working Group 5 which deals with the issue relate to WRC-19 agenda items on maritime and aeronautical and amateur services. The African Group met last time in September and during our meeting we developed some preliminary position. And regarding the agenda item 1.1, the African Group supports an allocation to the amateur service on a primary basis in all the band 50 to 54 megahertz but with appropriate footnotes to provide protection to services which have allocation in the band.

This really my position is in principle and is subject to studies with the income band services. The aim here is to reach a global harmonization, the use of this band for the amateur service. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> WAEL SAYED: I thank the ATU representative. I give the floor now to the CEPT.

>> MARTIN WEBER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning everyone. I'm pleased to present you the CEPT position for agenda item 1.1. In fact, we have been forwarding all the invites and conducting studies for both sessions of spectrum requirements for the amateur services band 50-54 megahertz and conducting sharing studies between the amateur and maritime services on the basis of these two studies, two directions, we concluded that the amateur service could benefit of two megahertz allocation is a band 50 to 52 megahertz. On secondary basis. However they are still discussing the possibility to allocation part of that two megahertz range to the amateur service on a primary basis. The discussion is still ongoing and we are going to discuss it at our next CEPT meeting next week. CEPT puts forward the important condition that the amateur service should not claim protection and should not cause interference to incoming services operated in the band of frequency allocations. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> WAEL SAYED: I thank the CEPT. And I give now the floor to CITELE.

>> MIKE RAZI: Thank you. Good morning, all. My name is Mike Razi. I am representative of Canadian Government. And I also represent the CITELE on issues in regard to amateur services in inter-American issues. In relation to agenda item 1.1, I am glad to report that the -- at CITELE they have an IAT, given that this agenda item is region 1 on the issue, the proposed position from CITELE is that no change should be proposed for region 2 as well as the fact that any modification, allocations vis-a-vi region 1 should not be impacting region 2 operation in the band 50-54 megahertz. And no subject to any change procedures or relevant provisions. And this is not too far away from region 3

position and we are harmonious in that fashion. Thank you.

>> WAEL SAYED: I thank CITELE representative and I give the floor to RCC.

>> VLADISLAV SOROKIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am Vladislav Sorokin and I represent the Russian Federation and RCC on -- (talking at the same time). (Translation overlap) we know that draft -- to protect broadcasting service. Clear understanding concerning the needs and spectrum 4, the amateur service and next will consider this issue and determine this position. Thank you.

>> WAEL SAYED: (Speaking in a non-English language). Do you have any questions? I give the floor to the room in case there are any comments or questions. Iran has the floor.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chair. I think this is also a manageable. This discussion we have at many, many conferences, primary, secondary, footnote, not footnote. All of them is manageable. No doubt we have footnote. A footnote provides condition of use. And condition of use we talk about (inaudible) services and so on and so forth. One issue provided by our colleagues that such allocation should not cause (inaudible) frequency bands. If you give this new allocation, and have that condition it causes a second. Longer decision, not to double, no great position. 29, 28 -- think you manage it. And the other issues are very allocated on the table or allocated in the footnote. As far as we are concerned, put in the footnote and we have -- I think that it would be good to have this allocations in this table with the condition of use whatever condition you want to put for the use in the footnote. So once again this is not difficult with (inaudible). I think it would be managed quite quickly. Thank you.

>> WAEL SAYED: I would like to thank Iran for the comments. Any other questions or comments from the floor? I see there are not any further. (Talking over each other). I would like to have the Delegates to change their places on the podium and thank everyone for their information.

Thank you very much. So following on with that agenda moving on to agenda item 1.6, (talking over each other). The adoption of a (translation overlap). That we have two issues with regard to this agenda item. (Talking over each other). Meant to change. Radio regulations. (Talking over each other). Provide any international (inaudible) by requesting the restrictions. 450 to 495 megahertz. And (talking over each other). For maritime mobile service. With regard to the NAVDAT, at national level. With regard to (inaudible), needed to subtract (inaudible) in order to use the (inaudible) 2058. VHF NAVDAT system. Regulations should be adopted to ensure capacity -- compatibility. Operating within existing frequency

bands. WRC will update on level maritime. After (inaudible) has completed its (inaudible). Once again I give the floor to the different regional representatives in order to hear their position. Thank you.

>> BUI HA LONG: In regard to this agenda 1.6, we support ITU-R study on possible regulatory action for modernization, capability and study on compatibility with other services in the frequency bands and other frequency bands. Although a study end to end are possible modification to radio regulation to protection services to which frequency bands are currently unallocated by additional satellite system in accordance with the services. Regarding to the issue from region 1, APT members support in cooperation of NAVDAT system MF as required in the recommendation M.2010 and 2058 in to consideration for addressing this agenda item. And the second is the recommendation of these MF number and HF number frequencies for inclusion in to average -- we consider at future WRC after concluded this work on the modernization of GMS and I think this is used for NAVDAT should be retained and protected. So you can see that from mass meeting APT views in to supporting A2 and in my meeting of the 5B, some member submit -- continue to support ITU as well. And regarding to the No. B, I support possible modification to the provision of the radio regulation to provide for additional satellite system in the GM method taking in to consideration the activities and considering no impact of existing services. Within the frequency band and the environment understudy. So with this issue we can see APT will meet in March and it is quite general and APT will discuss in detail on method in our meeting in January of next year. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> WAEL SAYED: (Speaking in a non-English language).

>> (Speaking in a non-English language). I turn to agenda item 1.8. (Talking over each other).

>> WAEL SAYED: And now -- I would like to thank the representative from the Arab group and I would like to give the floor to the --

>> ABDOURAMANE EL HALJAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On issue A, modernization of GMDSS the African Group is in favor of the modification of the provision of the radio regulation to include regulatory provision for the frequencies to be used for MF and HF and have that system in support of the GMDSS modernization following related activities in the IMO which correspond to method A in the draft CPM text.

Regarding the issue B, which is related to the introduction of additional GM -- sorry, (inaudible).

>> WAEL SAYED: We didn't present it. Thank you.

>> I am working for the German Government. And in CEPT I

am sharing the project in C which is about the maritime and aeronautical issues. On agenda item 1.8, issue A, our position is similar as it was outlined before. We support the modernization of GMDSS by proposing provisions to the radio regulations allowing both in the medium frequency range as well as in the high frequency range MF and HF. Introduction of NAVDAT, data exchange system for the maritime world and since the decision where I know it is still outstanding we at this moment we know what reason or justification to add the frequencies of this system as well in to the appendix. And our position is very close to what is in the CPM text as method A2.

>> WAEL SAYED: I would like to thank the CEPT and I now give the floor to CITELE.

>> MIKE RAZI: On issue A of agenda item 1.8 on modernization of the GMDSS I should report that at this point in time we have no proposal at CITELE yet. And perhaps I should note also that the recent working party 5B that we had last week most of the work has been completed in relation with reports and recommendations dealing with the issue A with navigation of data and we expect to see proposals to the upcoming CITELE meeting on this matter. Thank you.

>> WAEL SAYED: I thank CITELE and I give the floor to RCC.

>> VLADISLAV SOROKIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We had a -- to allocating the spectrum to NAVDAT system working in mid range and high range systems. With regard to the issue we have a general position in some regions. With regard to issue B, we support the allocation of frequencies for the satellite GMDSS. However for the time being we do not have agree on this item.

>> WAEL SAYED: (Speaking in a non-English language). We would ask you to post presentation of your views. Thank you very much.

(Talking over each other).

>> Adding new suspect systems or not in the GMDSS. We had a number of methods in order to address this issue. So we will begin with method B1. Determination of 116 to 125 megahertz for the use in the GMDSS with the amendment 5364 and 5368 in radio regulations. In order to avoid any ambiguity by making the necessary changes to appendix 15 and other provisions within Article 33. With regard to B2, to method B1 and B5, the allocation to (inaudible), for GMDSS and add a footnote in order to claim protection for mobile earth stations. In the mobile earth stations because these are transmitting in the adjacent band, from 165 to 166.05 megahertz. Method B3 is similar to method B1 and identifying only the MSS allocation from earth to space. Turning to method B4, no change in the radio regulations. Turning to method B5, this is divided in to two different methods which consists of the services 1621 to 1625.5

megahertz. Allocation to primary within the framework of GMDSS system by making the necessary changes to the regulations 533 as well as regulation 739 while pressing (inaudible) 359 with regards to method 5B. We are proposing here these same provisions by allocating GMDSS in the same frequency basis. Before giving the floor to regional representatives I would like to say that these methods have not yet been assessed within the working party. We therefore are awaiting service (inaudible) on this issue. I hope this will be (inaudible) within the fixed time of being allocated to it.

>> BUI HA LONG: Yes. Thank you. I will give APT view on this. And yeah, we can see that this is quite complex issues that we have summary method here. And I believe that APT members will have much more discussion in our next -- in our next APT meeting on this matter. But at this time we have now very general view on that matter. Thank you.

>> WAEL SAYED: I want to thank the representative from APT and I would to give the representative from ASMG.

>> Our position regarding method B to review the regulations in order to introduce new satellite systems plus ensuring the compatibility of this these services with the proposed frequency band and the adjacent (inaudible). We do not support in principle any changes to the frequency allocation tables.

>> WAEL SAYED: I would like to thank the Arab group and give the floor to the African Group.

>> ABDOURAMANE EL HALJAR: Thank you. According to the position developed by the African Group the African Group supports the introduction of additional supply operator in GMDSS as approved by IMO in order to achieve redundancy and global coverage in maritime safety services. And as position we are in favor of method B1 of the draft CPM text. Thank you.

>> WAEL SAYED: Thank you. Now I would like to give the floor to the representative from CEPT.

>> MARTIN WEBER: In CEPT we have seen the decision by the International Maritime Organization that concluded that it should be part of the GMDSS system and based on that we developed a position which is close to that, what is in method B5. So we aim for primary allocation in frequency band 1621.35 to 1625 megahertz. And we -- in order to have a better basis for protection of (inaudible) primary service in adjacent frequency bands we -- we develop a proposal in our ECP for modification, our No. 5.372 to have here directly in the radio regulations the protection limits for the radio service.

Yeah, I think this is where we are at this point in time in CEPT. Thank you.

>> WAEL SAYED: Thank you. CITEL.

>> MIKE RAZI: Thank you. On issue B of agenda 1.8, what we are considering is updating the radio regs to reflect changes and developments in relation the global maritime discrepancy. This is -- and dealing with introduction of service provider, at CITELE we have an inter-American proposal. And six administrations support and simply the issue has been identify the appropriate the regulatory approach to identify the additional system as was mentioned by my colleague, to provide GMDSS for enhancement of maritime communities safety which is (inaudible). And especially noting that the new GMDSS satellite system provider is recognized just here in May 2018 after five years of assessment and evaluation done by various groups within the IMO. But CITELE inter-American proposal is based on method B1, which provides the most straightforward regulatory approach. Insisting allocations of bands 1625.5 unchanged. And identifying availability of the band for (inaudible) GMDSS and used by satellite in Article 5 and 15. And consequential changes to Article 33. And to once again from CITELE perspective, the -- this is a more suitable solution going forward ensuring adequate protection of GMDSS and minimal change to the radio regs consistent with the recently satellite system IMO and require changes to existing allocations and service and facilitates introduction of new GMDSS provider for maritime safety introducing diversity without search and improving search and rescue and especially (inaudible). Thank you very much.

>> WAEL SAYED: I thank the representative for CITELE and now RCC.

>> VLADISLAV SOROKIN: Thank you. The position is quite general and we support the introduction of additional non(inaudible). Provided that it is approved by IMO. At the present we don't have a position concerning specific method on B. We plan to determine our position next year. Thank you.

>> WAEL SAYED: We thank the representative from RCC. Give the floor to anyone in the room who has questions or comments? Iran. France.

>> FRANCE: Thank you very much Chair. We would like to make two comments on the discussions. The first comment is what you just said, that the working party 4C has not discussed the methods. I actually -- we really discussed this at length in 4C. True that the CPM will ask -- we have seen a number of contributions from Iran on this issue. However think that the methods have been largely invested in WRC-14 and my second question, (inaudible) which is very important for the community. Because it identifying any new allocation from earth to space. GMDSS and this is bidirectional systems. It is not only -- it is not in to using the stress but also able to receive stress signals. So method B3 is not acceptable because it causes

problems. So this is what I would like to make. Thank you.

>> WAEL SAYED: I would like to thank France for their comments and I would like to also thank (inaudible) of this -- this raises in the WRC-14. This text comes within CPO text, mainly the (talking over each other). In order to address agenda item 1.8. I would like to thank you very much for your question.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, sir. I wish to provide Distinguished Colleagues a professional view. Neutral and professional. Chairman, no one is against safety like aspects at sea. This is an important issue for everyone. For humanity. We have -- it happens to many countries and it happens in all countries, months as they go. And they suffer from that. Then what to do on this part dealing with issue B. What to do. To provide a reliable communication and reliable communication is currently suffering. Point 3, at this moment of time there is no satellite which cover the entire world. Satellite covering almost several parts of the world but not entire part of the world. Remote area, so on and so forth. Yeah, I'm talking of GSA here. But there one non(inaudible) that by chance have this lucky positions. They have the same lucky position in global tracking. Who knows that in 1992 where we ask for allocation in order some time difference super star of communications.

This satellite without naming has an uplink and downlink. Uplink is primary and downlink is secondary. Normally in principle safety of life aspects must be dealt with by the primary service because secondary is subject to noninterference and protection at least in theory. What to do with that? In order to use this satellite for safety of life aspects at sea we should have a (inaudible). And also should be included in appendix 15 because all of the safety of that aspect of that. So we need to do something. Contrary to previous agenda item this one is complex. I would not say very complex. But it is complex. If you look in to the CPM, you see view 1, view 2, view 1, view 2. There many, many many views. But Chair, this views at CPM first of all should be minimized to the minimum, absolute minimum and at WRC we have to be concise. Do we want to take the aspect at sea or we don't want. Forgetting about the satellite (inaudible). Who will be. Once again this is a professional view. It is not positions. In order to do it we have to update to primary and you have to do it properly. The existing satellite, non-GSO, the downlink of that was on secondary basis. That means that it was not required to do any coordination with any services. This issue came immediately after '92 and '95. And we are saying that we have to look whenever there is 911A which is a series of presentations under

which this was created. And this group of procedures applies in that. Because it is not mentioned in that procedures. Therefore we need not do any coordination. So this network downlink of that has not been coordinated. That doesn't mean that we could not take it to be used for this. We have to take it but we have to prepare the situation. Fortunately radio regulation board are quite wise. They had the rules of procedures under paragraph 5 for No. 1150 which instructs the group, if and only if the conference change status of allocation, certain things to be done. That means this network needs to look at the previous network with which has not coordinated to see whether there is a need for coordination. That is already in the CPM text. Now I come from professional to country positions. We have the session of Iran for both the document to do ITU-R Study Groups and in order to do it properly we need to include the essence of the rules in the provisions which upgrade the states. But unfortunately due to circumstances it was not possible to do that. But the issue is before the CPM. Hopefully, hopefully it will have proposal, not -- a contribution to the CPM does not propose this contribution. Proposal is just for the CT conference. So mention that they have noted problems and this is a fact and figure, irrespective who is satellite, (inaudible). We are looking to design, not (inaudible). And design is safety of life aspects at sea. So we have to do it properly. So our positions should the conference decide to use this satellite to address the problem of the safety of life aspect at sea. There is a need to upgrade. And the need to apply or comply with the rules of procedures but not in the rules of procedures but in the regulation itself. Rules of procedures I refer to one Delegate, I don't name them. In 1988 it mentions rules of regulations is not procedures. There to help. If one day somebody objected to that, not applicable. Does not have the same status of the provisions of the radio regulations. So in order to have safety of life aspect at sea, in full-fledged manner they have to do everything in order to bring this status to the assignment to comply with that, to be subject to inclusion in appendix 15 and to be used for this services. We have to explain that today. CPM colleagues, I hope the chapter Rapporteur of this CPM organize a small meeting at beginning of CPM. Some people with regulatory views, sitting together and see what we can do. Do we have any other non-GSO session satellite that provide these activities? The answer is no. Is there any possibility that the -- in the next three years some group, a non-GSO to comply with that the answer is very improbable. That you remain with facts and figures but in the proper regulatory manner. Chairman, 80%, 90% of my view was

professional view. The only thing that including rules in to the body of the regulations when applying for this was a position of the country. The remaining was helping and assisting other countries. This is not saying that change your position for this one and this one. Everyone is free to do that. But if and only if we decide to do that they have to do it properly and correctly.

>> WAEL SAYED: Thank you to the representative Iran for your comment. Are there any other comments or questions? Thank you to you all. Please allow me to move on then to --

>> Thank you. Perhaps if I could address some of the comments that were provided by the floor. First of all I like to thanks France and Iran for their comments and in regard to French comment, I concur with the example that method B1 had been circulated with working party 4C and 5B. I hesitate to give the exact time but at least for two years that method was pressing in the various contributions back and forth from one meeting to another. So saving or hiding statement saying that that method was not discussed is not accurate. Now going to the comments provided and I do thank France for clarifying that point, now going to the comments that are provided by Iran and yes, Iran had a contribution to the working party 4C of June 2018. Unfortunately at the time we had completed the task with CPM. So we could not discuss nor take that in to account. And it would be looking forward to see something of that nature or maybe an improved version or as it would be contributed to the CPM and inform the opportunity to further evolve and progress this issue. Now on the matter of the secondary allocation, I should note that there are no explicit regulations that require safety service to be provided in a particular class of allocation. At ITU or IMO. And since we have already mentioned the name of the satellite system, already -- (inaudible). However, on the same network, the -- under AMSRS allocation, on the same network and same frequencies. And the AMSRS has been granted primary service both in uplink and downlink. And they have completed coordination of this service with almost all Member States of the ITU. And it is in process of modifying it. I should also say that the -- the protection and provided through the AMSRS on the same frequencies with benefit condition of GMDSS and it will be frequencies which are on secondary allocation. Because we should not forget the fact that the most important thing is the protection of the service in a sense that it would not be subject to powerful influential. And that can be accommodated in this network because of its special design and using the same frequency poster for uplink and downlink and the fact that further the uplink is coordinated, then -- and the nature of MSS satellite systems terminals, equipment it will

again provide protection for the downlink from potential interference that could be in the neighborhood. So it has been discussed at length with working party 4C and yes, we can be safety associated with primary allocation but it is not a must. So I just wanted to address that. Thank you.

>> WAEL SAYED: Thank you to the presenter of CITEL and before we move on to the next item, let me listen to a comment by the Delegation of Iran.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. This explanation was absolutely unnecessary. And beyond the responsibility of the regional group. Not everything is written. Radio regulation has two aspects. Letter, and spirit. Secondary allocation which is subject not to cause half interference nor claim protection, means that the subject to interference. Something with the subject to interference cannot be used to adopt aspects. This is customary law. Much more stronger than any other law. So this explanation was unnecessary and I totally and fully disagree with that. This is not constructive. And this did not help. I gave objectives and provide some overview and I didn't expect this -- I hope that they will not do it. I request the distinguished Canadian organizations to provide some guidance that let us work together to further the work. We are not defending positions of each other. We are contributing to the success of the WRC-19. So if there is anyone putting something for the success, take it. But not defending and not attacking and not accuracy and not offending that person. Thank you.

>> WAEL SAYED: Thank you to the Honorable Delegate of Iran. And please allow me now to move on to item 1.9.1. Which is the regulatory actions within the frequency band 150 to 162.05 megahertz. All the (inaudible) maritime radio devices (inaudible) (talking over each other). Identification systems AIS. And as far as the Working Group on (inaudible) was in charge of this topic, and certain methods have been proposed to deal with this and can be summarized in method A to support this, to give -- (talking over each other). AIS1 and AIS2. With regard to the (inaudible) proposed to operate these (talking over each other). AIS technology and then propose to view the channel (talking over each other).

Latest version of the recommendation. Method B2, has to do with views of group B non-AIS on the frequency channel (talking over each other). And to amend the appendix 13. This introduces the (inaudible) with the latest version of recommendation (inaudible). As for method B3, which has to do with the non-AIS technology and proposals to amend the radio regulations so they can use the frequency bands 161 to 161.4875 megahertz. Subject to (inaudible) to existing services coded

with the latest version AMRD. Allow me to give the floor to the regional representatives and we will start with APT.

>> BUI HA LONG: Concerning to this agenda item 1.9.1, ITU-R study on characteristics in -- identification of AM and this application as well as the study in relation to the radio regulatory action within the frequency band 1.6 to 1.32 megahertz and the AIS in accordance with Resolution C2. Are also of the view that the term of maritime, AME and ten applications should be hopefully defined further study in relation to the radio regulatory action support the definition of AME to be deplored in ITU-R recommendations. AMR group, should regulated for the use of identity of maritime mobile service. Regarding the AME group B regulation of the use of the frequency M and operation of characteristics would benefit both, the use of device as well as the code and with the maritime device and applications.

And identification of additional spectrum within the frequency band 156 to 162, should be considered. And identification of additional spectrum for AME group should not cause harmful (inaudible) or any impact on the existing services within the frequency band and the allocation bands. In this regard maritime technique of instructions such as communication of output of AME should be considered. And any regulation action of AME group with frequency band should also already the limit, number of resources of NMS and also consider the implementation chances in period when operation of autonomous is in to view. And search and rescue system of maritime frequencies should not be protected. With those views some IT member already submit contribution to address this issue in both maritime and AME. So thank you.

>> WAEL SAYED: Thank you. (Inaudible).

>> (Talking over each other). Is to emphasize the protection of GMDSS and AIS systems. (Talking over each other). Not to add any new frequencies. Regulate the maritime equipment. Thank you very much.

>> WAEL SAYED: Thank you. And the floor goes to ATU.

>> ABDOURAMANE EL HALJAR: Thank you. Regarding the maritime device group B the African Group is in favor of the method which is proposed in the draft CPM text. This method that would not add the major regulation appendix 18, be amended to allow the MRI group to operate under frequency channel 70. And the frequency channels which are dedicated for IS1 and IS2. On issue B, which is related to the autonomous maritime digital devices group B, but not enhance the safety of notification, but operate in maritime environment, the African Group supports as a matter of principle but these devices should not be permitted to use the frequencies which cause any constraint on the existing

mobile services. Thank you, sir.

>> WAEL SAYED: Thank you to the representative of ATU and I give the floor to CEPT.

>> MARTIN WEBER: Thank you. We noticed that a number of new applications are coming in to the market and are introduced. And we saw the need that we need to harmonize the frequency used by these devices because we saw some difficulties and major -- it is not harmonized and regulated, that we not be in trouble with maritime communication. So what are autonomous maritime radio devices of these devices are independent from the normal maritime auto communication that are used for communication alongside ships with marking and obstacles and those things. And in developing positions we have found the definition which is now exact in IMO and ITU as well. And was mentioned already distinction is the group of devices which enhanced the safety of navigations or operation of ships and those who don't enhance safety of notification. And for those who enhance the safety of navigation, so-called group A, we in CEPT are of the opinion that those should use appropriate channels of the appendix 17. So it is channel 17 and both AIS as mentioned in method A. For group B we first were looking in to frequency ranges where no maritime applications are introduced. So in this so-called, yes, in appendix 18. There we got some difficulties with the terrestrial -- sorry, the land mobile use of these bands. And as a result of that we now working on an ECP proposing the -- yeah. Changes to the radio regulations according to the method B2 of the CPM text. So a number of channels for the group B devices and yes, some regulations we think about limitations of output power, for instance, mitigation training between these new devices and other applications in maritime. Thank you.

>> WAEL SAYED: Thank you for that. I give the floor now to CITELE.

>> MIKE RAZI: Thank you. In relation to agenda item 1.9.1 for support of the maritime, other colleagues tell us they have do a very good explanation of the autonomous maritime radio devices, the two groups AMP on being for enhancement of safety and navigation and the other being for general operation which not necessarily apply to the safety situation. But coming to CITELE, the -- at present we have a draft inter-American proposal, meaning less than six countries support. In relation to group A, method A, I should say, as introduction of three frequencies which are present in use in appendix 18 and to confirm those for enhancement of navigation and for use by group A. Vis-a-vi group B we have not chosen between methods B1, B2 and B3. Either we have a draft IAP or draft inter-American proposal which supports identifying frequencies in appendix 18

for group B AMRDs. So I perhaps a little bit away from method B3 but this is a pendency because of. It is not completely framed up. I would leave it at that and upcoming meeting of CITELE we will be hopeful that would be further confirmed as to which exact method you approve. Thank you.

>> VLADISLAV SOROKIN: Thank you. We had a very clear position at RCC on this. And see the identification of category types, devices. And support the group A and group B. We have the position we support, method A as presented on the screen now. On devices of group B, using AIS devices we support B1 for devices that did not use AI as devices. We support method B2. And, of course, we resupport the use of these devices has to be in mind with ITU-R conditions, ITU-R conditions. Thank you.

>> WAEL SAYED: Thank you to representative of RCC. And I give the floor to the participants if they have any questions or comments. No comments. Yes, the United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning to you all. Just a comment. I mean it is very clear for method A what these AMRD devices are. They essentially support safety of navigation complement that aspect which is a very important thing to do for the maritime applications. AIS. And channel 70 that is the DSC.

The comment I have those is this group B, it seems like if you are in a group A just get tossed in to group B and it could be anything and group B as we now understand that they don't support the safety of navigation. We don't complement the AIS. There are other things. So noting that appendix 18 is a very congested group of channels for the maritime use that are also shared the services such as the fixed and land mobile. We need to be very careful that we just say we are going to toss everything that's not group A in to group B and just put them in to certain frequencies in appendix 18. For us the U.S. as a regulator the FCC has to take in to consideration the sharing aspects as well as those maritime applications that may be present in appendix 18. So I think we need to be very careful when we look at this group B. I know that in the recent working party 5B we sort of kind of went around and trying to decide what is group B. Is it everything else? What is it? So I think it is just a comment, that we need to take very careful consideration noting that these devices can operate mostly in the -- what we call the channel water ways near land. Not in the blue water or the open ocean type of scenarios. Something that we need to consider. Thank you.

>> WAEL SAYED: I thank the United States. Are there any other comments or questions? Thank you, everyone. We are done now with the schedule plan that we have put for this session. My question is would you like to continue or would you like us

to take a break? If we finish our plan to this session could we continue or should we -- we should break right now?

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have up to 12 o'clock today to continue this first session for chapter 5 and we will be able to continue from 2 p.m. today. If you are not finish we will continue with chapter 5.

>> WAEL SAYED: Only I finish the -- from the first session. So we can continue.

>> PHILIPPE AUBINEAU: You can continue the next session as well.

>> WAEL SAYED: Thank you. So I think some of my panelists may want to change to 1.9.2 or something. Thank you. Coming back. Okay. Now allow me to move to item 1.9.2. This item is about introducing modifications to radio regulations including a new spectrum allocation to the maritime satellite service. Within the two frequency bands, 156.125 to 157.4375 megahertz and the other frequency band 166 to 125 to 162.0375 megahertz of appendix 18. All this to enable a new DHS data exchange system DCES satellite component. The current satellite DBE components applications specific messages ASM as AIS thematic system operation and provide this does not impose any additional constraints on existing and adjustment services band. Allow me now to go through the document that suggested and satisfy this item of the agenda. We have method A, no change to the radio regulations except this oppression of -- the second method is method B which is about a new primary allocation for the maritime mobile satellite service earth to space and space to earth. And also the navigation of footnote 5 in order to take in to account the studies that have been reached in the previous study period while protecting the radio astronomy in the other bands.

The method C is based also on the same frequency band adopted by method B but having a third method and again the allocation space earth, earth to space, taking in to account that the sharing of DDES. There is no need to have a specific mask. This new method D is also similar to method C, but with adding a certain limit to the density flow by putting some protection to land services. This step will be explained in the CPM text, DDMS. As for the method E it is alternative method to method B but it is being used with a mask ma is different than the mask used in M2292 and it is being discussed and detailed in footnote 2 with the MSVDS extract and finally method F which is similar to method B with new regulatory action, which consists of choosing new frequency for service and satellite band component. Allow me to give the floor to the regional representatives to take their opinions of the regions. First APT.

>> BUI HA LONG: Regarding to agenda item 1.9.2, from mass 2018 meeting, members support the ITU-R study and according with the Resolution to identify possible new allocation to maritime mobile satellite service for DS satellite component. Possible modification to the radio regulation under this agenda item, APT members are of the view the first one is allocation and system in the same introducing band should be protected and not any additional concerning problems. And the satellite component should be deplored with appropriate methods and assumptions contained in ITU-R recommendations. There are -- they have been widely used in service conducted by ITU-R Study Group. Search and rescue system, VDS satellite component transmissions, should not be -- ASM and AIS operation. And the AIS should be protected and modification to existing AIS. The UF satellite component should not be -- to cost by station of land mobiles which frequencies are already assigned and the last one is where appropriately justified this allocation should be clarify to the maritime mobile service, earth to space and space to earth. Primary basis. In the same agency frequency band. And we see that the Study Group 5 last Monday adopted new report on technical study on the satellite of the DAF up to VHF that changed from observation with warning and also see that in CPM text. We -- conduct this by (inaudible) and ITU member we have a lot of work in the next meeting.

>> WAEL SAYED: Thank you APT and I give the floor to ASMG.

>> Thank you. Regarding item 1.9.2 the opinion of Arab group. Based on the meeting we had in April in Marrakech we support the current existing service in the R sector while ensuring the protection of current incumbent services in the candidate bank and we don't want to put any restrictions on the frequencies in the current band as well as the adjust ones. We will discuss this item in the upcoming meeting of the group in light of the new modifications that have been adopted in the CPM text. Our next meeting is next December. Thank you very much.

>> WAEL SAYED: I thank ASMG. Give the floor now to ATU.

>> Thank you, sir. Regarding agenda item 1.9.2, the African group supports as matter of principle the spectrum allocation to the maritime satellite services earth to space and space to earth. Preferably within the frequency bands of the radio regulation appendix 18. So enable a new VHF satellite component while ensuring that this incumbent will not degrade the terrestrial components, ASM and AIS operation are not impose any additional constraints on existing services in this frequency band and in (inaudible) frequency band. Thank you, sir.

>> WAEL SAYED: I thank the African union. And I give the floor now to CEPT.

>> MARTIN WEBER: Thank you. I would like to, yeah, give a more explanation, background, what this agenda item is about. At the last conference in -- we had under the agenda item 116 at that time a similar agenda item which were looking for VDS system with two components, the terrestrial and satellite, could not agree on provisions for this satellite component but terrestrial component. Having said that I heard in some of your comments that you would like to make sure that the satellite component would not cause trouble for the terrestrial component since both are designed together that will not happen. The reason -- yeah. The benefit of these satellite component is to have a better communications scheme for to reach ships. Especially in the polar route which is another -- more and more of importance to give ships an easier way from Asia to Europe. When they pass the Russian borders there, it is very helpful if this satellite communication could be used to compare like to these ships. And what is the position of CEPT on this? We are very supportive of this system and we would like to introduce it. Our position and we are developing a European common proposal on that, is similar to method B. We go for allocation that appropriate allocations. We foresee the protection of the terrestrial services based on the recommendation of ITU-R M2092. And coordinate. This should be a coordination for M. In principle this needs to be very stable and I think -- work on some editorial things. But this is -- this is the status at this point in time. And I think that is all I am going to say. Thank you.

>> WAEL SAYED: I thank the CEPT. I give the floor now to CITELE.

>> MIKE RAZI: Thank you. Agenda 1.9.2, at CITELE we have two proposals submitted to last meeting and member countries and both of these proposals are very much based on methods C, and D. And at the last CITELE meeting we did not have the opportunity to align these two proposals in to a draft inter-American proposal under -- and we are looking forward to do that at the upcoming meeting. And as you noted the effort methods C and D both deal with the secondary allocation for maritime mobile service in relation to VHF, data exchange survey component. And that's all I have to say. Perhaps I should add for benefit of the group that working party 5B completed its report on VD sat at its recent meeting and the meeting and the report was also in Study Group 4 and 5 that we had on Monday. So that's a piece of information that you can use as you develop your future considerations on this agenda item. Thank you.

>> WAEL SAYED: I thank CITELE. I give the floor to Russia.

>> VLADISLAV SOROKIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. RCC at the suggestion of the (inaudible), shall not result in (inaudible)

existing system of services. With this -- which have allocations in common. On the basis of studies, that the complications and complexities, compatibility between the radio system and the mobile services. RCC does not consider any of these new allocations to the -- on a primary basis. We are discussing allocation on a secondary basis and we have specific methods and we -- it has not been formed yet. This is a task for the next meeting. Thank you.

>> WAEL SAYED: I thank RCC. I can take now some comments or questions from the floor. No comments. Thank you all. I think that we still have ten minutes and ten minutes are not sufficient or enough to complete the different items that we have. This is why I think that it is better to take a break. Before that, I would like to thank the panelists and I ask you to applaud them. Thank you everyone.

(Applause.)

>> WAEL SAYED: And see you after the lunch break. Thank you.

(Session concluded at 11:52 a.m. CET)

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

RAW COPY

2ND ITU INTER-REGIONAL WORKSHOP ON WRC-19 PREPARATION
GENEVA, SWITZERLAND
21 NOVEMBER 2018
1400

Services Provided By:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
1 877 825 5234
+001 719 481 9835
Www.captionfirst.com

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

>> PHILIPPE AUBINEAU: So ladies and gentlemen, good afternoon. Welcome back to this afternoon of the second day of the workshop. We will now continue with the session on chapter 5 where we left it this morning. So and since all of our panelists and the Rapporteur Mr. Sayed is already on the podium, I invite you to take your seat and we can start this afternoon session.

What I mentioned this morning about the scheduling for this afternoon is that depending on the timing of this remaining part of chapter 5, for sure after that we will have the chapter 4, the Rapporteur is already with us and ready to take this next session, so chapter 4, the science services, and depending on the time remaining this afternoon, we may also address chapter 6 which was planned for tomorrow afternoon, but be ready that we also address chapter 69 of the CPM this afternoon, the one dealing with other issues.

With that, Mr. Chairman, the floor is yours, thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr. Aubineau, and welcome to you all once again. The remaining items, we will have item 110 and 194.

(Audio technical issues.)

Item 110 there is several items the other is ITT member support. The last one is any study on regulatory provided by ICANN. And with this view we can see that in this group five there is enough consent on that. So I remember we now take into consideration when we start this.

(Audio technical issues.)

>> AFRICAN GROUP: The African Group is of the opinion that there is no need for change to Article 5 on the radio regulation, but the African Group supports the modification of the recommendation to include appropriate regulatory provision that will facilitate the implementation of the GADSS in accordance with requirements while protecting services. Thank you, sir.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you to the representative and we go now to the PPT.

>> Thank you. At CPT we analyze the concept of operation which has established by the international aviation organisation. There is a safety system called GATTS, and given that it was established in IKO, it's no surprise that we see that all of the systems should be standardized in IKO. What we found out as well, what we found from previous speakers is that there is no change of the allocation so (?) it will be changed. We discussed how and which way chapter 7 of the radio regulations where we find the global maritime statuses needs to be adapted one way or other the other to introduce the (?) there, but here we have not such a firm position. We just received contributions for our meeting next week which aimed to some further discussions, so this is one of the items where we still have to do some work in CPT. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, CPT representative. We go now to the representative of CITELE.

>> CITELE: Thank you, my name is Sandra Wright. I work for the U.S. Federal Aviation Administration. I'm honored to represent CITELE. I'm the alternate Rapporteur for this Agenda Item X and I bring warm greetings from Louis Fernando. We have a draft proposal on this Agenda Item 3 CITELE administrations supporting. While we created this back in July at our Guadalajara meeting in Mexico, prior to the CPM, it very closely aligned with method A noted here and closely aligns with the colleagues from the ORC Regions. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you to the representative.

(Audio technical issues. Captioner cannot hear translation).

Islamic Republic of Iran.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you. Similar to, we believe that this the last part is operation of EASS number 440. EASS could not operate under 440. Similar to the secondary. But (?) it's more than we determine. It's a fact.

(Audio technical issues.)

Second, under the current version of the radiocommunication spectrum, it could be required. I think we should become conscious and mindful not to create a new gained item for next WRC. Let the issue continue to be discussed at the ITU-R activities and so on. If it comes to the point that really requires to have a spectrum, then -- Chairman, we should not substitute ITU by WRC. ITU-R, more than 100 activities. And we have to continue. Study Groups are active, there are contributions by sector members and everything. So on so forth. We should have the issue when we really reach the level that we need to decide in the WRC as a treaty but not bring everything to WRC. I think that is that I have some doubt, again, that we need to create Agenda Item. There are so many emerging important issues and we can operate under the existing allocation. We should not be.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you to the representative for his comments. Any other questions or comments? Europe Council.

>> EUROPE COUNCIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and my greetings to all. Indeed, as Mr. Arasteh said, we do not need the change in Article 5 for this Conference. And we will not seek another Agenda Item for the item.

So we found that we can fulfill those requirements with all allocated spectrum, and this is an efficient way of using the spectrum allocated. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, sir. Any other questions or comments? Thank you. We still have a lot of remaining topics. Topic 9.1.4, and the work that has been carried out does not make changes on the radio regulations Conference.

(Audio technical issues.)

>> The support the ITU-R study in Resolution 753 which is the definition it operates on as well as spectrum requirement, as we see the result from Working Group 5B it requires no changes to regulation and I think that this is an easy item in ITP. So thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you to ATP. Thank you. To the African Group.

>> AFRICAN GROUP: Thank you, sir. Regarding the Agenda Item 914, the African Group is of the opinion that no change to the radio regulation at WSMI is needed, and it considers that this matter as a possible Agenda Item for WRC-23. Accordingly, the African Group supports as a matter of principle the ongoing studies on encouraging positive participation in order to positively affect outcomes of the studies. Thank you, sir.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you.

>> Thank you. On issue 914, we are touching the limit between the terrestrial and satellite services in a way, and at

this point in time in CPT, we as well seek any justification and need to change the radio regulations based on this issue. Certainly further study is needed. There is still to be decided whether that should be under a new Agenda Item of next Conference or continued as ITU-R studies and then maybe leading to Agenda Item for further Conference. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you.

>> CITELE: For CITELE we agree that we have a proposal from one nation right now, and it's a no change as well. It also includes a suppression for Resolution 763. I should note that we also have a preliminary view from two different nations that are discussing potential future Agenda Items stated by some of my other colleagues for WRC23, there are some input papers to our meeting the first week in December in Brazil where we will be discussing this further.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you. (Technical difficulties. Captioner cannot hear translation of the Chair).

>> Now, I give the floor to the participants that have come in late. Islamic Republic of Iran.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Chairman, the resources of many countries are very limited life becomes more difficult and difficult from all aspects. Unless something is really necessary, creating Agenda Item of WRC after four years, still we don't think that is it, so we have to be cautious of this issue. Another point I wanted to make at the end of this and I will make it now, we should avoid Agenda Item trading. What is that?

Region X comes with Agenda Item and Region Y with another Agenda Item, so these two trades, you accept mine, I accept yours and put everything. We should avoid that. One head of delegation in a particular Conference very recently mentioned we don't need to trade all of these things so this is quite important issue, Chairman. Let us be cautious. We are not dictating anything to anybody. We are not even advising anybody, but we just be mindful and cautious.

Let us study the matter until the time we reach an area that now we need to decide on the regulatory issue, Chairman. I think we should be more cautious in next WRC with issues possibly would not have any more issues which is hidden Agenda Items and should limit Agenda Items to the number manageable Chairman.

In Study Group ITU-R now becomes Agenda Item Study Groups only. They don't do the traditional, very little traditional. This is another thing that we should be cautious and mindful and voice. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, Islamic Republic of Iran. Any other questions or comments? Thank you to you all, and, therefore, we have ended revising all of the items that have to do with chapter 5 of the CPM text. I would like to thank you

profusely, and I would like to thank our colleagues on the podium, and I would like to ask you to give them applaud, a round of applause.

(Applause)

>> PHILIPPE AUBINEAU: Thank you for this excellent session this morning and this afternoon, and now I think we have time to start the next session, the session on science issues, so I will just maybe we need five to ten minutes to rearrange the podium, and invite the next Rapporteurs, Rapporteur for chapter 4 and the panelist for this next session and we will resume this workshop shortly in five minutes let's say. Thank you very much again.

(Break).

>> PHILIPPE AUBINEAU: So while the colleagues participating in this next panel on chapter 4 are joining us on the podium, I was told by the Rapporteur that we may do this session before the coffee break this afternoon and after the break this afternoon, we will have the session on chapter 6 that I already coordinated with Rapporteur for chapter 6 who would be ready to follow this new schedule for this afternoon and then we will have tomorrow the whole morning and at least the whole morning on the chapter 3 dealing with the satellite issues.

Thank you very much again for your patience, we welcome on the podium at Rapporteur for chapter four, Mr. Vincent Meens and the new representatives from the original groups, and on the screen you see the presentation on chapter 4, so Mr. Mints, the floor is it yours thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr. Aubineau. Welcome to all of you on this session on chapter 4 which is dedicated to science services. In this chapter, there are three Agenda Items which are one, two, which addresses the power limits in two particular frequency bands 400 and 399.9 to 400.05. So these are frequently bands which are used by low power systems and 13 addresses these systems, but here we are talking about the down link on these radio beacons on 460 to 470 megahertz. Where there is a question about having a primary location for met sat from space to earth and then the last Agenda Item addresses the spectrum requirements for the short duration emissions.

These are small satellite missions which are ten centimeters in length and new allegations if the current bands are not deemed sufficient. So we are going to begin with Agenda Item 1, 2.

As I have said previously, this Agenda Item is to allow the low power systems, the DCP, the Data Collection Platforms to exist in bands which might eventually be used by stronger output powers in telecommand stations. So there are two frequency bands under consideration here, and for each of these bands, there are a number of methods, three methods for the first frequency band and two methods for the band 401 to 403 megahertz. Turning to

the lower frequency band, there is a first method, which does include the relevant EIP limits.

By here we are going to focus on this band on 400.03 megahertz which will allow us to use the rest of the bands band for other telecommand systems. There might be a transition period, a grandfathering period until November 2024. So method two which resembles closely method one, but here we address all of the frequency band, so we don't have this famous 20 kilohertz and we have the grandfathering period up to November, 2024.

So I have logos here on the presentation which to my moth these are the different regional positions by certain grouped and entities whether three are regional or international organisations, CPT, RCC and other groups such as SFCG, WMO and MetSat and CRAF. The last method, similar to method one, except that the transition period, the grandfathering period doesn't end at 2024 but goes to 2029. So this is an overview of the band 399.94.05. So moving onto the next frequency band 401 to 403 megahertz. So here to include. To include the relevant limits from 401 to 403 megahertz with a grandfathering period, a transitioning period up to November 2029 this is the method which might seem to have the most number of votes and here we have the regular vent EIRP methods, but we divide the band in two to have EIRP limits for telecommand systems, so this, these are the methods which are being proposed for one, two. Now, I would like to turn to the different regional groups so that they can give us their perspectives on Agenda Item 1.2, and I would like to begin with APT. APT, please, can you give us your position. Thank you very much.

>> APT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Sorry, my voice is bad today. So I appreciate you already classified what the APT position is to be in the submission. We agree that providing the transitional arrangement, but we haven't discussed what the date would be the best for. But we will meet in the January and we will discuss based on this method. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you very much, APT. Now, we will move onto ASMG's position, please.

>> AS MG: Thank you very much, Chair. I will give you a brief overview on the different methods you have mentioned to us to address this Agenda Item. In terms of the ASMG position following the different, the outcome from our different meetings, we have not yet established a clear position, however, we feel that that it is necessary to protect the existing services without imposing any additional constraints and new measures. We must be assured that the EIRP power limits and to ensure their protection. Thank you very much.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you very much for that position. ATU, you have the floor, please.

>> ATU: Thank you very much, Rapporteur. I will just be very brief as well. In terms of ITU, there hasn't been a consensual position as yet, but there are a number of positions from West Africa and East Africa. There is the countries focused on method A and Egypt should prefer method B, and SEDAC is still considering this issue, so perhaps the next meeting we will be able to bring you more information. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you very much, now, CEPT, please.

>> CEPT: I'm more than happen to provide you with the science position on CEPT perspective. I would like to highlight that all documents talking about the draft CEPT brief as well as draft ECP are available on our is where, so if you want to have more information, that's freely available. It needs to be noted that the designated working parties had their meeting after our last CEPT PTA meeting where we discussed the science issues, so the latest information has not been discussed and as well we have our next CPT meeting the following week. So for further issues will be discussed and agreed over there.

Considering Agenda Item 1.2, our coordinator for this Agenda Item is Ms. Jean Ple from France. She highlighted this is all to do to determine the potential impacts, and to determine the power and limitations if they are appropriate.

The current positions that we have is that CEPT supports the invent EIRP, limits as appropriate for the earth stations between the 401 and 403 megahertz, and the 409 to 400.05 gigahertz.

Different sets of limits have to be established for GSO and non-GSO systems. A little bit more detail when going into the ECPs that are currently available, we are more or less in line with method C which is method 2 on the slides provided by the Chairman on page 4, and those on the lower bands and for the higher bands we are more aligned with method E, which is method 1 on the Power Point presentation on page 5.

Concerning the 309.9 to 405 megahertz, the EIRP limits for mobile earth stations shall not exceed 5DB Watt, and we like to see a grandfather period up to the 22nd November of 2024. Concerning the high band 401 to 403, DRP limits shall have a maximum not exceeding 22 gigabyte for GSO networks and for 70 for the non-stationary systems.

For this band we like to see a grandfathering period up to 22 November of 2024. With that, I will give it back to you, Mr. Chairman.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you very much. Now, I would like to give the floor to CITELE, please.

>> CITELE: Thank you, and good afternoon all.

As reporting on the CITELE status, obviously see tell administrations are quite interested to protect future development of data collection systems in the bands 399.9 to

400.05 megahertz, and 41403 megahertz. Now, in CITELE membership are of the view to keep 20 kilohertz of spectrum in the lower band, the 399.9 to 400.05 not to be restricted to the new EIRP limit being proposed to be imposed to this band, and allowing access for space service operation associated with MSS systems in this band.

In relation that 401, 403 megahertz band, one administration is of the view that sharing between non-GSO space operation and GSO data collection systems would be possible using mitigation techniques as has been shown in the working party 7B report. At CITELE at the time being, we have a preliminary proposal based on method D which is similar to method 3 on the band 399.9 to 400.05 proposing putting aside 20 kilohertz at the upper edge of the band for use by both MSS data collection systems and space operation of the silo while applying the implement to the balance of the band, also the proposal has a grandfathering provision to go up to years 2029, to ensure operation and protection of the existing planned and non-GSO satellite systems. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you very much for those comments. So now moving onto the last regional group, RCC, please.

>> RCC: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. The RCC countries support establishing EIRP power limits for earth stations in a mobile satellite service in the frequency band 399.9 to 400.05 megahertz as well as for earth stations in the meteorological service in the frequency band 4001 to 403 megahertz, in order to avoid interference to data collection systems based on the results of studies provided in the report, ITU-R on this issue.

The RCC countries believe that specified limits shall not cover the frequency assignments to satellite systems registered in MIFR before the beginning of the Conference or the end of the Conference. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you for all of those positions from the regional organisations. Now, I would like to know if there are requests for the floor on Agenda Item 1.2. Seeing none, therefore, we will move onto Agenda Item 1.3 this addresses the frequency band 460 to 470 megahertz. It is proposed to look at an allocation to primary status for the earth exploration satellite services and to assure that the secondary allocation for the MetSat could be allocated to primary status in addition to have a power flux density mask to be no less restrictive than minus 152DBW. So this is this Agenda Item. There is only one method which has been offered to you today, which proposes a primary allocation and to move Met sat from secondary to primary status to introduce this PFD limits to protect terrestrial services and also a Resolution to provide transitional measures for the existing MetSat or the EESS services.

I have noted in the proposals the organisations who are relatively in favor of this method except ASMG. Perhaps, you can elucidate more on this because now I would like to move on to the positions set out by the regional groups. I would like to begin the same way as before the APT. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank.

>> APT: APT shares the view with this one, but we will meet in January next year so through the January discussions we finally confirmed our positions, but I believe that we must share this idea. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you very much. Moving onto ASMG, please.

>> ASMG: Thank you very much, Chair. As you have just indicated, the ASMG position is different from the positions of other groups. Since previous meeting and in principle, we do not want to support this allocation with regards to the heavy use of this frequency band for fixed and mobile services in the Arab countries, this is linked to the need to follow up the studies to ensure that the PFD limits are adequate in order to protect terrestrial services.

Therefore, the ASMG would like to review its position and to establish a position during the next meeting. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you very much. ATU, please.

>> ATU: Thank you very much, Chair. ATU following its last meeting in September has considered, has not fully flushed out a position, but at the moment, we would like no change because this is a band which is used for the mobile services. Thank you so much.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you very much. CIPT, please.

>> CEPT: Thank you very much, Chairman. For this Agenda Item introduced by the Chairman, there is one method. We are more in line with that the text that we are using in contact the same, we are using different wording and the footnote at the Resolution is different. It's method B, but in the method there are two options dealing with option one and option two concerning different PFD limits and CPT is supporting the option one of the two.

And first we are in line with the method proposed on the screen. Thank you very much.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you very much, CITELE, please.

>> CITELE: Thank you. This Agenda Item is, I guess, pretty straight forward like others, however, at CITELE, we have received two preliminary proposals to date, and there are slightly different in terms of the choice of language and both are pretty much have the same basis as far as upgrading the Met sat and adding allocation for ESS and the PFD and other, they are not aligned completely, and we are looking forward to align them at

the upcoming CITELE meeting in December. And it will draft the Inter-American proposal and maybe an Inter-American proposal by the end of the meeting. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, CITELE. And to finish, RCC, please.

>> RCC: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. RCC supports upgrading the secondary allocation to the meteorological service to a primary status as well as a primary allocation to the earth exploration satellite service. We believe that upgrading the status of allocations of the frequency bands to MetSat and the earth exploration satellite service should be applied both for future systems as well as existing systems of these radio services.

In order to protect terrestrial services in their frequency band 460 to 470 megahertz on the primary basis, limits should be established, EIRP limits, PFT should be established for the specified satellite services which ensure acceptable level of interference in case these limits are not complied with by satellite systems that continue to be used now, they should be allowed to be used on a secondary basis.

We also believe that it should be, priority should be given to MetSat before other applications of other Earth Exploration Satellite Services. In conclusion, I would like to say that we are encountering difficulties with segmenting the frequency band 460, 470 megahertz for geostationary and non-geostationary satellite systems. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you very much.

I would like to thank all of those representing the regional organisations for introducing your positions. Are there any requests for the floor? Are there any organisations or delegates who would like to add something to the discussion? Seeing none, we will, therefore, move onto the last Agenda Item, which is Agenda Item 17.

So Agenda Item 17 concerns the spectrum needs for the non-GSO short duration, let me talk about short duration, what we mean is missions which are less than three years, and also to carry out sharing studies with systems who perform below 1 gigahertz and if there might be a need to have new allocations in the space operation service, the SOS, or might be impossible to continue to use the existing bands.

So a large number of bands have been reviewed under this Agenda Item, so fourth methods have been proposed which are all explained here. The first of these, which is no change to the radio regulations. So this method is a defacto point for all Agenda Items because it stems from the fact that the studies have shown difficulties with sharing across perhaps all of the services.

The second method proposes an allocation earth to space for the short duration systems in the frequency range 403 to 404 megahertz method three, which is also quite similar, but in the frequency band 404 to 405 megahertz, and method 4 using allocations which already exist in the band 137, 138 for the down link and in the band 148, 149.9 for the uplink. But adding into these bands a certain number of regulatory provisions, for example, in terms of PFD or EIRP. So these are the four different methods which have been put forward following the literature which currently exists. There is no real method which has gained popularity above another. Just to note that ASMG method one, but with regard to other regional positions, what we will hear from them in a moment, APT, perhaps you could give us your position on this Agenda Item. Thank you.

>> APT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As to allow me to say what the APT position would be because we haven't discussed which method. So but one of our view include we have some bands which should be excluded for the consideration of this Agenda Items. So those bands are available in our Document, but that is what I can say now, and I believe that the January meeting we will decide which method, we will support. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you very much. ASMG, please.

>> ASMG: Thank you very much, Chair. The ASMG position. Would like to see no change to the radio regulations, and this is following the studies within the framework of the Study Group in charge of these questions because it was seen that it was very difficult to have coexisting services between the satellite services and the services proposed by this frequency band. Thank you very much.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you very much. ATU, please.

>> ATU: Thank you very much, Chair.

Following our previous meeting as ASMG has said, it was decided to consider method A, no change given the studies are still ongoing.

I would like to note that some East Africa countries are still considering this Agenda Item. Thank you very much.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you very much. CEPT, please.

>> CEPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This Agenda Item we have to coordinate here, this is an Agenda Item that was proposed by CEPT, and basically a growing of non-GSO stations, satellites. As you mentioned it had to do with mission lifetime on these services and the lounges consist of over 100 at the same time. Some issues that we see on this Agenda Item is existing allocations as the space operations service may not be able to absorb the influx of the satellites without any problems.

The point that we came across is that due to long

coordination time line, bands are subject to 9.21 are not suitable to develop these short duration satellites. There are currently as you mentioned four methods. Apart from method A, which is no change, we have all methods under review within the ECP. We currently have two different sets of ECP. To get another view of our position, we support obviously the additional allocations to the upgrade with a number of positions and in total the studies of the spectrum are based on real plans for satellite constellations developments.

CEPT supports the primary allocation to the space separation service in direction 137 to 138 megahertz. As associated with the relevant technical conditions the PFD limits on this. We furthermore support the possible modifications to the current regulatory situation including the removal of Article 9.21 in the earth to space direction, in the band 148 to 149.9. As an alternative, we have two ECPs currently.

An alternative to this method, we are investigating the possibility of having one megahertz allocation between the 403 to the 405 megahertz. The normal bands that we have titled as no change, due to different reasons, the 150, 150.05 to the 173 megahertz due to the difficulties in the sharing with the incumbent services like astronomy relocation service and 145, 156.

Band 400.15 to 403 megahertz, we have no change for that as well as for the band 405 to 420 among the astronomy as well as the cost basis asset. As band mentioned, band 272 to 273, and we have the view that it does not provide a solution to satisfy this Agenda Item and we have no change for this band as well. We further more recognize that there is a link with Agenda Item 1.2 from this perspective. And with that, Mr. Chairman, I give it back to you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you very much. CITELE, please.

>> CITELE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

At present at CITELE, we do not have any preliminary proposal in relation that this Agenda Item, and considering that the results of the September working party 7B and the recent working party 5B studies have not been taken into account in the current CITELE preliminary views.

I give them to you as they are. The preliminary views expressed for the time being are based on past compatibility and sharing studies vis-a-vis operation of short duration, non-GSO systems. And the only thing that so far it has been made clear is that certain bands are not feasible, and these are some of them that have been identified are 156 to 162 megahertz range because of GMBSS concerns, 406, 406.1 because of sat concerns and 401, 403 as was mentioned by my CEPT colleague because of the data collection systems concern as well as 406.1 to 420 megahertz

because the incumbent fixed and mobile service.

So these are the places that we would not be going, but we are not sure where we would be going at this point in time on this Agenda Item. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you very much. The last panelist, RCC, please.

>> RCC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

In general when we look at new allegations or the use of existing allocations, we look at the fact that protection of existing services should be ensured in adjacent bands. If we talk about specific frequency bands, then because of the specific nature of the use, we are unfortunately against frequency bands 148, 174 megahertz, and for 05.9 to 410 megahertz. There are different reasons, some of them have been named or most have been named by previous participants of our discussion.

I will not repeat what has been said. I would like to also point out that we are encountering great difficulties in changing Annex 52018. This change is related to exclusion of item 921 from band 148, 149 and 9 megahertz for space exploration service.

We believe that these proposals go outside the framework of Resolution 659 and, therefore, we cannot agree for them to be considered within the framework of this Agenda Item. This is our position. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> MODERATOR: Very well. I would like to thank you. Are there any requests for the floor on item 1..? If this is not the case, I invite you to thank all of the panelists on this chapter 4 because I guess we could even do 4 chapters by the end if we continue at this pace. Anyway, thank you to all of the participants. I guess we will now have a brief break and move to the next chapter. I would like to ask you to applaud all of the panelists here.

Thank you, everyone.

(Applause)

>> PHILIPPE AUBINEAU: Thank you very much, Mr. Meens and thank you to the panelists. I propose we have a break of 30 minutes now, and so let's give us a bit more, so we can resume at 20 to 4:00 with the next sessions which will deal with chapter 6. So 20 to 4:00. Thank you very much.

(Break).

>> PHILIPPE AUBINEAU: May I invite panelists session on chapter 6 to join us on the podium.

So good afternoon, again, ladies and gentlemen. If you could please take your seat, I see that all of our distinguished panelists and the Rapporteur for chapter 6 are now with us on the podium. So I would like to welcome Mr. Pete peer and the representative of the regional groups for this session other than chapter 6 which I would like to thank you for your flexibility

accepting to do this session already this afternoon so that we can have more time tomorrow for reviewing the issues on the satellite services.

So Mr. Peter NGIGE who is our Rapporteur for chapter 6, the floor is yours, thank you.

>> PETER NGIGE: My name is Peter. I come from the Canada administration, and I'm the Rapporteur for chapter 6. S which deals with general issues, CPM. Just like my predecessors have already done, I will take you through the Agenda Items with regard to chapter 6, and also as discussed what the CPM text is all about with regard to these Agenda Items, and after that, I give the floor to regional Rapporteurs to give us the views of their Regions and finally I welcome the other delegates to make comments on each of the Agenda Items.

So without wasting too much time, I would like to say that chapter 6 deals with Agenda Item 2, Agenda Item 4, Agenda Item 9.1, issue 9.16, Agenda Item 9.1, issue 9.17, Agenda Item 10, and, of course, Agenda Item 8 which is not part of this CPM, however, we normally as ITU practice, we have to keep focus on foot note issues. So it is always good to mentioning this about Agenda Item 8 as we keep focus on the studies that are ongoing with regard to different Agenda Items.

So I want to start with Agenda Item 2 which is basically to discuss the revised ITU-R recommendations incorporated by reference in the radio regulations communicated by the Radio Assembly in accordance with Resolution 28, rev WRC15 and decide whether or not to update the corresponding references in the radio regulations in accordance with the principles contained in Annex 1 of the Resolution 27 rev WRC12.

Now, Resolution 28 rev WRC15 deal deals with the references of the text of ITU-R recommendation that I incorporated by reference in the radio regulations and Resolution 27, rev WRC12, regards the use of use of incorporation by reference in the radio regulation. And with regard to these two, these particular Agenda Item and these two resolutions, the Director of the Bureau is preparing a report which will be submitted to CPM19. So for us now, we just note as we wait for the report of the Radiocommunications Bureau as it will be presented during CPM19.2.

Then moving onto Agenda Item 4, this Agenda Item is in accordance with 95, rev WRC07. And it deals with the review, review the Resolution and recommendation of the previous conferences with a view to possible revision, replacement or even abrogation. Resolution 95 deals with a general review of the Resolutions and recommendation of the world radio administrative conferences and World Radio Conferences, and the same treatment is given to these particular Agenda Item just like Agenda Item 2

where the Director of the Bureau is preparing a report that shall be submitted to CPM19.2 in the near future.

Now, moving on to Agenda Item 8, which is for country foot notes. As we note this particular Agenda Item is not within the scope of CPM, however, we encourage administrations to keep reviewing the footnote that they might want to review or delete during the Conference and also appreciate and keep on reminding themselves of the provisions and the principles that the ITU will use, during the Conference in adding or deleting any footnote because it always becomes a controversial issue.

So we need to keep reviewing and looking at those principles for additional modification so that during the Conference it makes our work much easier to deal with different issues regarding the footnotes. So I would like now to move on to the next Agenda Item, which is 9.1, issue 9.16, Agenda Item 9.1.6 deals with the Resolution the 958 of WRC15 and it requires for studies in preparation to WRC2019 with regard to wireless power transfer for electric vehicles and there are two issues in this particular Agenda Item, and one is to assess the impact of wireless par transmission of wireless vehicles on radiocommunication services and to study the frequency ranges which would minimize impact on radio communication services from the wireless power transmission for electric vehicles.

This study should also take into account the international electrotechnical commission, the international organisation for standardization and the society for automotive engineering given that they are in the process of trying to approve standards for global and regional harmonization of WPT technologies for electric vehicles. With regard to this matter, I would like now to invite our regional Rapporteurs to give us their views with regard to their related work in their Regions and I would like to start with APT. Rapporteur for 9.1.6.

>> APT: Okay. My name is Kobayashi I'm the drafting group Chair in this matter in the APG. A PT. The last time they met in March almost more than half a year ago, and, therefore, the preliminary views Developed were a little out of date. Because after March, there was a meeting of, the meeting of Study Group 1 which made some progress in the work and also working party 1B which was responsible group for this matter met until yesterday.

So the work is progress, but any way, at the March meeting, we agreed on three points of the preliminary view. The first one is the APT members support the studies of cost. I think it is same to the other regions. The second one is that APT members are of the view that all radiocommunication services must be adequately protected and probably this is also same to the other Regions.

Third one was APT members support consideration of the

inclusion of one or more frequency ranges for WPT for EVs, and then ITU-R recommendation based on the completion of the ITU-R studies, those three points were agreed at the March meeting.

Concerning the second one, about the protection, the Study Group working parties progress work and impact studies are now being prepared as a report, but we still need to do some more things at the next meeting of the working party 1B scheduled in June next year. Concerning the recommendations, we approved the June meeting of one, working party 1A agreed on preliminary draft revision of the recommendation to include three frequency ranges for WPT for EVs, and, therefore, we are waiting for the comments from concerned Study Groups and hopefully we would like to see the results and see the situation that preliminary draft can be upgraded to draft recommendations for PSAA approval procedure.

Since that is the situation, we still need to work on the impact study and also wait for the approval, agreement on the preliminary draft recommendation to be held in the discussion to be held in coming June meeting of Study Group 1 block meeting.

That is the situation, but in addition to that, in the meeting, March meeting of APG, we had some different views from APT members and we need to consider those differences in the views at the next meeting to be held in January next year. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, APT.

ASMG.

>> ASMG: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The position of the Arab Group with regard to items 916 is to agree on the current studies in order to know the effects of the wireless power transmission for electric vehicles and its impact on the radio services and also to study the appropriate radio frequencies and frequency bands to reduce the impact on the wireless power transmission. In addition to emphasizing the need to protect radio services and not to impose any restrictions, while emphasizing the importance that you have Region, globally coordinated unified frequencies, and we will meet in December and we will update this topic. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, ASMG.

ATU.

>> ATU: Thank you. Good afternoon. I'm Mouhamad Awallou from the Cameroon administration, and also the Vice Chair of chapter 6 on behalf of the African Group, which addresses general issues, and within this we address Agenda Item 916. With regard to this Agenda Item, the African Group following its last meeting which is its third meeting which took place in Cairo in Egypt has one position which I would like to convey to you.

The African Group for the first part of the question supports the ongoing sharing and compatibility studies between

wireless power transfer systems and existing services. In terms of the second point concerning the appropriate frequency bands, the African Group has focused on four bands 19 to 25 kilohertz and 55 to 65 kilohertz and 79 to 90 kilohertz, and 90.3 and 90 kilohertz.

And the African Group is still awaiting the ongoing studies to fully understand the impact in order to fully determine its position. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, ATU. CEPT.

>> CEPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This issue 6 on the Agenda Item number 9.1, CEPT is of the view that we will not need any change to the radio regulations in order to resolve this Agenda Item 9.1.6. We are of the opinion that reports and recommendations are appropriate and considered enough to deal with this Agenda Item.

Concerning the bands, we have identified following Kennedy bands suitable for wireless power transmission for electric vehicles which can minimize the impact of WPTEV on radiocommunication service, and these bands are 19021 for the power category, high duty electrical vehicles, and the other band is 79 to 19 kilohertz for the medium power category, and that includes all types of electrical vehicles.

Furthermore, CEPT is of the view that the bands, frequency band 60 kilohertz and 77.5 kilohertz used by application of the standard frequency and time signal service are not suitable for this service. And they require specific protection. In addition, no bands above the 90 kilohertz should be considered for the use of the wireless powered transmission electrical vehicles and that includes the current situation as we have. Next week we have the meeting to further confirm. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you CEPT. CITES.

>> CITES: Thank you very much, Chair. I'm from the Mexican administration. I am standing in for my colleague from Colombia as she wasn't able to attend this session and she sends her greetings to you. I'll give you information on the CITES Region. Within CITES we do not have a regional position however, we do have a preliminary proposal from the Mexican administration which considers a no change to the radio regulations. It also mentions in favor of the standardization of operations in the particular frequency bands which are listed on the screen. We have a session in two weeks' time, and we hope to then receive contributions and we also hope to then have a regional position in place following this meeting., which will take place in the first week in December in Brazil. Thank you very much, Chairman.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you CITES, RCC.

>> RCC: thank you, Mr. Chair. The first thing I would like to say that RCC considers that any modification to the radio

regulations pertaining to this issue are not necessary. We are in favor of harmonizing frequency bands to be used for this type of activities, wireless power transmission which could be implemented by the development of relevant recommendations of ITU-R, such recommendation is being Developed and we hope it will be adopted and that WRC will be informed about it by the time it takes place.

The conclusion of studies to prepare for WRC-19 does not mean that the recommendations will be completed, but we do hope that this recommendation will be accessible and that it will be usable. With regard to the frequency band, we support the use of frequency band 79 to 90 kilohertz for the above mentioned reasons. I will not spend any time on this. For this reason, we believe, and this is one of our guiding principles, that any issues related to the use of frequency bands should ensure the protection from various interferences for the existing systems and stations. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, RCC. Now, I would like to invite any views from the floor. Yes, please.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is Turkey. I'm speaking as the Chairman of Working Group dealing with this issue within working party 1B. There was a little bit misinterpretation maybe because of the translation maybe, I don't know, but just to inform the audience that in this issue we have two tasks. The first task is very clear, to examine the impact of service which is wireless power transmission systems on the radiocommunication services, that's the number one task.

Number two task is to identify if possible some frequency bands to be harmonized worldwide to be used by WPT applications. Of course, it is electrical vehicle applications, charging applications. However, the purpose of this second study is also to protect the existing services by means of identifying some harmonized bands so that the other bands, the wireless power transmission will not operate by this way. The radiocommunications services will be protected in those bands. Otherwise, we are not really examining the impact of services on the WPT. Thank you very much.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, Turkey, for that. Any other intervention from the floor? Yes, Mr. Arasteh.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, sir. I head Tate to comment on this, but since it is the issue of 9.1, I understand that the purpose of that is a result of the ITU-R studies that will be included in the report of the Director to the Conference. And the CPM with the advanced copy if it so wishes. I think all of these things have been mentioned including harmonization, recommendations and what our distinguished colleagues from Turkey mentioned will be taken by

the Director and put in proper context and wording for the consideration of the Conference.

That was the purpose of that. I would like to say that only those frequency are subject to harmonization to be used in order to protect radiocommunication service or anything else, so we put it in the hand of the Director and his advisors, the department, division, working with him to prepare the proper text for the report because this will be included under 9.1, result of the ITU-R studies. And I think you put in a way that is understandable to the conference that will not create discussions, difficulties. We could not want to go back and repeat the same things we have done over the last three years and we have a clear cut concise report of that indicating what Conference decide the matter.

It will continue to be discussed in ITU-R in necessary in regards to the recommendation because the technology is evolving and there is nothing to put some obstacle to the rigidity of the situation and so on, so forth, and fully stop to the end of this activity and does not come back to any CRC. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr. Arasteh for that. Any other intervention from the floor?

I see none, so I will recommend that we move to the next Agenda Item, which is 9.1, issue 9.1.7, and mention that this particular Agenda Item regards Resolution 958 of WRC15 which requires that studies be carried out to determine whether there is need for additional measures in order to limit up link transmissions of terminals to those authorized terminals in accordance to number 18.1 and the other issue is to look for possible method that will assist administrations in managing the unauthorized operations of add stations, terminals deployed in their territories as a too many to guide their national spectrum management programmes in accordance with ITU-R 64 of the Radio Assembly 2015.

Now, with regard to this Agenda Item, we have two issues. Issue 2A and with regard to issue 2A, we have option 1 and option 2. Option 1 recommends for no change to the radio regulations as current measures are sufficient. And option 2 recommends that there be Developed a new WRC Resolution to assist administration in the application of the RR number 18.1.

Then the second issue is to provide necessary guidelines to satellite monitoring capabilities along with possible revision and further development of the ITU-R reports and handbooks to assist administrations with managing unauthorized operations of add station terminals deployed within their territories as a tool to guide national spectrum management.

So regarding to that matter, I would like to invite APT to give us their views with regard to 9.1.

>> APT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm sorry, my voice is getting worse. We haven't considered which option would be best for the APT, but at our previous meeting end of March, we have a preliminary view that the current Article 18 authorized regulatory measures, so that's the current situation of the APT. And also we support the development of any necessary Document to support the initial spectrum management. So we have two kinds of such views at the moment. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, APT.

ASMG.

>> ASMG: Thank you, Mr. Chair. With regard to 9.1.7, we support introducing additional measures in order to limit up link transmission terminals so that operations only concern authorized terminals. We also support preparation of Draft New Resolution to support states in this field, namely the uplink transmission of terminals.

Our position will be determined during the next meeting. We will take into consideration the latest developments in the draft report of CPM. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, .

>> ATU: With regard to the ATU group on item 9.17 on the agenda, it is option 2 which is taken as the preliminary position of the African Group. This option calls for the drafting of a new WRC Resolution to introduce additional measures in order to address the issue of unauthorized uplink transmissions of earth station terminals. Furthermore, as a matter of principle, the African Group supports the need to adopt additional measures in order to limit this type of transmissions and in line with number 18.1 of RR, it urges ITU-R to carry out studies on best practices in training and monitoring capabilities along with ITU Developed reports and handbooks and capacity building to assist national administrations in inhibiting the use of unauthorized uplink earth terminals and to enable national administration to locate and terminate unauthorized transmissions.

These are the comment that's the African Group would like to add with regard to its preliminary position. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, ATU. CEPT.

>> CEPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Issue 7 on Agenda Item 9.1, based on the outcome of the circulation sent out by the BR to demonstrations regarding this issue, CEPT has taken the position that it's an issue of the national enforcement and is not requiring any action by WRC-19 as it's addressed in Article 18. Concerning the issue referred to in study 2B, possible ITU-R reports and studies and best practices related to the national management of unauthorized operation of earth stations, terminals deployed within the territory of the administrations are considered sufficient.

Therefore, we don't see the need to change the radio regulations on this matter. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you CEPT. CITELE.

>> CITELE: Thank you very much, Chair.

For Agenda Item 9.17, CITELE has not taken a regional position. We hope to be able to do this following our next meeting as I mentioned in Agenda Item 1.6. However, in this case, there is a preliminary proposal which has been put forward by the United States of America which considers a position of no change to radio regulations given that it considers that this theme is something that could be reviewed at a national level and in this vein, the current provisions in Article 18 are sufficient to manage these type of national requirements.

In Agenda Item 9.16, we hope to receive contributions following the next CITELE meeting. In order to try to reach a regional position and to bring this to the next meetings of the ITU. Thank you very much, Chair.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, CITELE. RCC.

>> RCC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. At the outset, I would like to say that this issue is also part of the Director's report and strictly speaking it doesn't require the Conference to adopt a decision. Nonetheless, we are conducting studies on this issue. We are in the process of completing these studies at the next session of the working party. We will probably come to the final decision, but at present the first thing I would like to say is that the transmission stations on the territory of any state must obtain licenses, authorizations from the relevant state authority.

This is number one. Secondly, this item or this issue should also be linked to Agenda Item 1.5 related to ESIM, earth stations in motion. With regard to the development of additional provisions, at present this is very difficult to say. Maybe at the second session there will be proposals on these additional provisions, and then maybe together we can make a decision for the inclusion in the report in the CPM report of specific proposal.

At present we are completing our work on this issue and so we fully support the wish to monitor stations that work on the territory of other states, not on the territory of their own states. Thank you very much.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you RCC. Any inputs from the floor? Mr. Arasteh.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, sir. We are grateful to all colleagues in ITU-R that now come to some sort of conclusion that they do not request the modification to Article 18, which is among the very sensitive Articles. In particular, 18.1 is a good conclusion. However, with respect to the need for

a Resolution, first of all, these two options are not mutually exclusive. They should be complimentary. First, you don't change the RR. Second, anything to assist administrations is welcome in particular Developing Countries, in Constitution in Article 1 there are several areas asking providing, or rendering assistance to the countries or Developing Countries. So in what way should be that, should be Resolution, something we discuss. Generally speaking under the current provision of radio regulation any administration could does the board or Bureau to provide assistance and I'm sure Bureau does not spare any effort to assist administrations, no doubt within its limited resources and availabilities so on, so forth.

They have done already many, many times and will do that. So the issue is good that we don't change RR and assistance whether we need to have a Resolution, that is something that could be discussed and if that is the case, they should be more or less a prepared draft of that Resolution because people should not see the WRC have a Resolution and I hope it is ready, I hope. Whether there is Resolution or there might be some other way, Chairman, and that some other way, this is an approach we have taken in previous conferences and recently in Plenipotentiary Conference.

In order to discharge the workload of the Conference sometimes something in the minute of the Plenary of the Conference dealing with the issue text providing instruction to the Director of the BR to do some specific agenda. That is another possibility, Chairman. So all of them is possible.

So it is up to the Conference to decide and perhaps discuss at CPM to see what way would be better and once we receive a preliminary or advanced copy of the Director report in this report. So I think issue is substantive and thanks to the people and person that dealt with this issue.

At the beginning, it was very, very complex, and now not. Last thing, Chairman, I am not opposing to views of any distinguished colleagues to associate this Agenda Item with 1.5, but, Chair, Agenda Item 1.51 already super complex. Let us not add any other additional complexity to that Agenda Item. So let's see whether we could get rid of that Agenda Item, not to repeat that, but not adding another issue. So I suggest that perhaps if possible colleagues have the issue of this unauthorized transmission from earth stations should not be associated Agenda Item 1.5. It's been discussed deliberately and extensively and finally that was at least the sense of the meeting, not -- although there might be some association, but not together.

Whether it should have a solution or not, I don't know. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, Islamic Republic of Iran. Any other comments from the floor. So I see none. Now, we will proceed to the last Agenda Item, yes, APT.

>> APT: Thank you. I think you are moving to the Agenda Item 10, but if you allow me, I would like to share what APT is doing regarding the Agenda Item 2 and Agenda Item 4 and also Agenda Item 8. I want to share that information with you right now. Number 1, Agenda Item 2 as you mentioned, there is, there are two resolutions, 27 and Resolution 28. Regarding the incorporation by reference.

What APT is doing currently, we are trying to merge two Resolutions into one. So that could be proposed, I'm not sure whether CPM or after CPM, but that's the information I want to share. And any regional group who is interested to work on it together with the APT, then we will welcome any views to merging Resolution 27 and 28.

Second point, Agenda Item 4, the Agenda Item 4 is the review the existing Resolutions or recommendations in the volume 3. What we are, we want to share is sometimes even inside the APT, sometimes we do not recognize the importance of the ranking under the invite ITU-R and instruct the BR. So what we are doing right now, APT, we are reviewing Agenda Item 4 and after we elaborate our idea further, then I'm sure we will share with you, Mr. Chairman.

Number 3 regarding Agenda Item 8, we are thinking the current WRC Resolution 26 always the current practice is during the WRC, in the very beginning, the Com 6 Chair Developed one note and informed the members and the other Committees how they manage the addition of the country note. Even the Resolution 26 does not cover that area. So current practice is the Chairman's note, Com 6 Chairman's note to the other groups and also the WRC participating members.

So we are thinking how we are improve this kind of situations in future. So we have several considerations that the other point is the current practice note of the Committee 6 Chair always cutoff date is the first week of the Friday. So regarding the, depending on the discussions or how to reserve the agenda, then the member may think we need to put something, our name in the foot note or delete, but the current practice the cutoff date is first week of the Friday.

So I'm wondering personally whether the current practice cutoff date of the first week Friday is right guideline for the WRC. So anyhow, APG will consider the Agenda Item 8 related issues which is Resolution 26. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's what we are currently thinking, and I want to share that with you and any regional organisations are interested, then we are very much welcome to exchange the view and improve our proposals.

Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, APT for that intervention on Agenda Item 2. And Agenda Item 8. Any comments from the floor or other regional Rapporteurs on this issue, 3. Yes, Mr. Arasteh.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, I think any proposal which simplify the task of Conference is most welcome. However, it depends the development of this common proposal at APT or APG first and the other Regions and good invitation of Mr. Wee, if that path is followed, perhaps would be good to put all of these things instead of note from Chairman to other Chairman or deadline, all of them should be put into the Resolution itself, clear cut, that people know the situations from the very beginning, not starting to have that fund.

And there is a precedence on that in the plenipotentiary activities under the rules the deadliness to do this and to do that is already in the rules. So it is possible there is a precedence to that. Mut thank you very much, Mr. Wee although we have not consulted each other, it doesn't matter. I always consult.

But in any case, it's good to look at that one. Something, Chairman, very important, this footnote sometimes are troublesome. You even add footnote at last minute so own, so forth, it's difficult to decide always we are asking all colleagues who are frequency managers, does it have any problem for us, and it's difficult to say yes or no. So we should just strictly follow that not adding any name to the country footnote, objective work to delete the name but not add the name, but it has been in the past sometimes added, the name and so on, so form, so we start to see whether we should follow some discipline in this regard because it will be extremely difficult to analyze the consequence of adding a name of a country to a footnote in the limited time available, because it is sometimes very, very difficult. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you. CEPT.

>> CEPT: Thank you Mr. Chairman. In line with what was said, we look forward to the proposals that were revealed here. Interesting to see them merge into Resolutions and Agenda Item 2, and indeed what has been said, Agenda Item 8 is you always an issue of issue of discussions so if you could help improve the that we could use following in WSE, that's money welcome.

>> RCC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Distinguished Mr. Chair of APG raised interesting issue. We cannot go around them with item 8. I'm a bit surprised by the concerns expressed. Agenda Item 8 is part of the Conference agenda and it's very clear that the proposals and contributions from administrations should be related to specific provisions and I think that by the beginning

of the Conference, this information should be available to all participants of the Conference. So that we know what is being proposed and by whom.

And, of course, when other Agenda Items or issues in general are discussed, a situation could arise whereby specific provisions need to be reconsidered with regard to the elimination of certain proposals by certain countries, but this is another issue, but now administrations who wish to include certain foot notes, they are ready to send these documents rather than deciding during the Conference itself during the first week and second week of the Conference the proposals of whether to eliminate these foot notes.

This is with regard to item 8. Of course, this work is necessary. It leads to international, to the harmonization of spectrum use. This is very clear, but I do have a concern in this regard. With regard to item 4, item 4 again there could be just one problem everybody knows about it, but I will repeat. The consideration, only those Resolutions and recommendations can be considered which are not on Agenda Items, and we have many issues which include references to Resolutions and these Resolutions independently from Agenda Item 4, they can change.

But here I think everything is clear. Now, Agenda Item 2, these are recommendations which through references are included in the radio regulations. This is a very serious instrument and it needs to be used very carefully.

What is being proposed by the Chair of the APG to think whether it's possible and if possible, how to combine Resolutions 28 and 27. This is just one issue, but there is another issue. We need to be very careful in proposing or changing or revising recommendations that are already included in the radio regulations through references. In other words, this is volume 4.

We need to be very careful. Yesterday we discussed this indirectly and one of the issues discussed yesterday and so the work which is being proposed, we need to discuss this. I think that's a positive proposal. We need to prepare for these three items, 2, 4 and 8. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, RCC. Any other intervention from the floor. Yes, APT.

>> APT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As I said, I invite all regional groups if you have the idea on how to reduce the work of the Conference, that's what we are doing, 26, 27, and 28 Resolutions. And then regarding the review the Resolution and the recommendation Agenda Item 4, APT is a unique organisation that we have provided Chairman of the Agenda Item 2 and 4 more than eight WRC cycles, which means APT from the very beginning, we prepared and we carefully looked at all

Resolutions and the recommendations even line by line.

It's a time consuming job, but we have a very nice expert and one country provided continuously more than eight cycles. So we just and with these leaderships, we are working on it. So whenever you find something, then we are welcome to discuss whenever. My kind comment is please look at the previous WRC Document, Document 142, 142, 142 is in Chairman's note, no, no, Committee Chairman note 142, and which is a guideline how to manage the addition of the footnote. So please look at that and study that one previous WRC15142 and then you may find something how we improve the situations. That's what I want to say right now. And let's talk.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, APT. Any other intervention? Yes, Islamic Republic of Iran, please.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, sir. It is not a secret to mention that country is Japan. They have done graciously since many, many, many years this very tedious job. And it is highly appreciated by APT and then by the Conference. And we perhaps encourage and request that they continue to do that. However, Radiocommunication Bureau also provide substantial documents given the reasons for this situation, so on, so forth. It has been done, many, many cycles and so on so forth usually by the department in collaboration with others. I'm sure they also would do that.

So putting hand to hand administrations and the Bureau, pursuing the task of the Conference, but it is a very tedious job, and we appreciate both the Bureau and the decision of Japan, and we request or encourage or invite to do so in particular Japan, which is an administration. BR usually do according to the mandate given to us, but administration putting efforts on that and these days everybody has problem with staff and resources is highly appreciated. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, Islamic Republic of Iran. CEPT.

>> CEPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree what Mr. Arasteh is saying.

It's a lot of work. It's line by line, and but they are not doing them by themselves. As you have Japan, we have the Czech Republic have done that for a number of cycles, he they go Resolution by Resolution line by line, but they cannot do that alone. They are dependent on the experts so it could be even you in the room, so please take that on board by the preparation of this Agenda Item, not just fully dependent on the persons who are into this almost day by day. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you CEPT. Any other interventions from the floor? Well, I see none of the interventions, so I would like to proceed to Agenda Item 10, which is the, it deals with the next WRC agenda for 2023. With regard to this Agenda Item,

the Bureau has received several input proposals from different administrations and currently we have the first one is 2.1 to consider possible spectrum needs and regulatory action to support GMDSS modernization and implementation of e-Navigation in accordance with Resolution 361 of WRC15.

Resolution 361 of WRC15 states that consideration of regulatory provisions of modernization of GMDSS and related implementation of e-Navigation. The second Agenda Item for 2023WRC is to conduct and complete in time for WRC23, studies for possible new allocation of the earth exploration satellite active service for space band radar sound within the range of frequencies around 45 megahertz, taking into consideration the protection of incumbent services in accordance with Resolution 656 of WRC15.

So this Resolution considers possible location of Earth Exploration Satellite Services active for space band radar sounders in the range of frequencies around 45 megahertz. The third Agenda Item regards Resolution 657 of WRC15 that deals with the review and results of studies relating to the technical and operational characteristics spectrum requirements and appropriate radio service designation for space weather sensors with a view of providing appropriate recognition and protection of radio regulations without protection in the radio regulation without placing additional constraints on the incumbent services. So basically Resolution 657 deals with spectrum needs and protection of space weather sensors.

The fourth Agenda Item propose the for 2023WRC is to study the spectrum needs and possible new allegation to the fixed satellite service in the frequency range 37.5 to 39.5 gigahertz to space in accordance with Resolution 161 of WRC15. The fifth Agenda Item proposed for WRC2023 is to review the spectrum use and spectrum needs of existing services in the frequency range for 70 to 960 megahertz in Region one and consider possible regulatory action in the frequency band 470 to 694 in Region one on the basis of the review in accordance to Resolution, in accordance with Resolution 235 from WRC2015.

So basically these, the proposed Agenda Items for 2023 and the principles of, for establishing these agendas is contained in Resolution 810 rev WRC15 and includes a template for submission for this proposed Agenda Items. So contributions to this particular Agenda Item will be next in the CPM report just for information. So without much ado, I would like to invite regional Rapporteurs to give us views with regard to these five Agenda Items and I would like to start with APT.

>> APT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Unfortunately, we haven't had a chance to look in detail in this Resolutions, so we will do that in the January meeting.

However, Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of things to share with you that we have views on Agenda Item 9.1 issue 9.1. So currently our view is if it's related to the change of the possible change of the radio regulations, then it's addressed under the issue of 9.1.

Under another point is the standing Agenda Item 7, the working party has to have some deadline how they finished study and providing the example of the regulatory examples to the CPM. So we are thinking how we make sure that including the revision of the WRC Resolution 86. So at this stage, we don't have the clear idea, but I want to share that information with other regional groups and also we are, we invite any regional group to discuss further. Thank you very much.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you APT. ASMG.

>> ASMG: Thank you, Chairman. So far we do not have a concrete agreed-upon proposal by our group regarding Agenda Item 10. Our group has called upon Arab administrations to discuss this item and submit its proposals for the 2023 Conference. The group will discuss this item in the next meeting to be held in December. Thank you very much.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you ASMG. ATU.

>> ATU: Thank you, Chair.

Agenda Item 10 which addresses the future agenda of the WRC23, the African Group felt it was important to discuss all of the issues which might come up under this Agenda Item in order to avoid any possible issues arising at an early stage. In order to identify all of the Agenda Items. A second point, the African Group would like to pay particular attention to the studies surrounding 470 to 694 megahertz band. As for the African countries, this is a frequency band. Associated with broadcasting and broadcasting for DTT.

It remains a key service for the majority of African countries. Therefore, the preservation of this part of the frequency band is essential for unconstrained use of the DTT services, the digital terrestrial television. Thank you very much.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, ATU. CEPT.

>> CEPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is a typical agenda that starts to develop from now on wards. We have done some work for this Agenda Item, and we started to do, to go through the proposed Agenda Items that are on Resolution 810, and CEPT supports now inclusion of the 2.1 so that -- the 2.2ESS, space other than, 2.3, and 2.5 which is to deal with review spectrum use under 470 to 960. And possible regulatory action in the frequency band 470 to 694.

Concerning the issue 2.4 which has to do with the fixed satellite service, we still have it under consideration and we

would like to come back to that later. Furthermore, CEPT is considering to propose modifications to Resolution 804 focusing on Agenda Item 9.1. We are of the view that this Agenda Item 9.1 shall not include issues that are intended to address through modifications to the radio regulations.

So we currently are in that process and we have further discussion at the upcoming CPG meeting next week. Thank you very much.

>> MODERATOR: CITELE.

>> CITELE: Thank you very much, Chair. In this Agenda Item, there were informal discussions which took place within the CITELE Region with the aim of continuing to work upon items before the next meeting. There isn't a consensual proposal on behalf of the Region, however, currently there are three preliminary proposals at the moment., which will be addressed at our next meeting. I would just like to give you a brief overview of the three proposals, they can be found in Document 14, which is available on the ITU-R website, Document Number 14 and the proposals are two proposals put forward by Brazil and one from Canada.

The first proposal addresses the point of suppressing Resolution 810 from WRC15 given that it was felt necessary to develop a new Resolution for the agenda for the WRC23. So this is the first proposal received, and this is proposal which was undertaken by Brazil.

The second proposal is a proposal from sent by the Canadian administration where it proposes to consider the use of the frequency bands 17.7 to 20.2 gigahertz and 27.5 to 29.1 gigahertz and 29.5 and 30 gigahertz by our stations on mobile platforms communicating with non-geostationary Space Stations in the fixed satellite service. So this is a proposal put forward by Canada. You can find further details in Document 14, and also further proposal from Brazil, which addresses the space weather to enable the adequate protection of RF-based sensors which are used for detection of solar activity. And the impact of solar activity on the earth.

So this is the third proposal, and this has been articulated by the Brazilian administration. I hope that for the next meeting which will take place in two weeks, you will be able to have further discussions on this Agenda Item. Thank you, Chair.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, CITELE. RCC.

>> RCC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

With regard to item 10, at the outset, I would like to say that these five items are included in Resolution 810 and detailed altitude in each of these items is now being worked on. I will report on the second session on this. With regard to the current situation, we consider it reasonable to consider the issue on including in WRC23 agenda the item upgrading the allocation of

the frequency band 14.8 to 15.35 gigahertz for the space born radar sounders.

If we look at this Agenda Item 10 from the general point of view, then we have concerns because we have now many unauthorized issues which in many cases exceed in complexity and number the agenda. So item 111, 116 and we support the improvement of the wording of standing Agenda Items so Agenda Item 7 which everybody knows. So this is a bit of a mini Conference on this item. And there are no restrictions.

We are trying to propose restrictions at least at the first stage so that the items that are not included on, in the final CPM report should not be considered. And the issues which AP and item 7 during the Conference should not be considered. As far as item 9 is concerned, we also have some concerns, and we will prepare one or two contributions on this issue at the CPM. In order to consider in detail this possibility with all participants, but already at present there are positive signals whereby other regional organisations also consider the possibility of improving these two Agenda Items.

And we have been supporting this for a long time already, and there are already new aspects. As a gentlemen's agreement and so on. So I think there is work to be done in this area. In conclusion, the final proposals will be formulated by the second session, and as far as the improvement of the organisation of work on agenda, standing Agenda Item 7 and 9.1, so the Director's report mainly. Well consider these at the next session of the CPM.

So I guess this is all I wanted to say. Thank you very much.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you RCC. I can see we are already at 5:00 p.m. So I would like to request our interpreters for just five minutes to get views from the floor.

>> INTERPRETER: Yes, of course, Chair.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you. Islamic Republic of Iran, please.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, sir. It is very important issue. Five minutes to start, but I request we devote another ten minutes at the beginning tomorrow. This is important issue. Agenda Item 10 lays down the activities for the next 3.5 years of the ITU. We should learn lesson from the past.

So we can't have all of these issues in five minutes. There are many issues taken and all of them are very, very delicate. The first thing in five minutes I fully support CEPT. Any change to radio regulation is not subject to 9.1. 9.1 has not been properly used in the past.

It is just reported to the record on the activity of the Study Group. That's all, but not radio regulations, Chairman. Unless radio regulations is an Agenda Item, yes, they should do

that part. Resolution 86 would take in care, we have to see how far we can go. So that is something Mr. Nalbandia mentioned we have gentlemen agreement or gentlewoman or gender person agreement, equality of gender, that we should have some limits, Chairman.

With respect to Agenda Item 5, I think WRC-19 should take necessary measures in the CPM923.1 we should establish a task group. This task group deal with the criteria of the protection of other services. With respect to the Agenda Item 5, you have numbered 5, you have the wording are not proper. There is no more spectrum requirements. We change it to spectrum needs and there is no recognition of any particular service. You have protection of the service but not recognition. So we need to change some of these issues, Chairman, to see how we can do the situation.

Chairman, but very important point, we should make every effort not to create any more issue. This issue is troublesome. It's problem, creating problem for everybody. Some more than depend item itself. Sorry, I remain within three minutes not to waste time of distinguished interpreters. They have been gracious to us, but I think when you discuss this issue it's very, very important. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, Islamic Republic of Iran. I would just want to request for another ten minutes.

>> INTERPRETER: Yes, of course, Chair.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you very much. U.E.

>> Good afternoon colleagues, probably just comment on some of the aspects here. I think one example is number 5 and I would like to thank Mr. Arasteh for the comment. Probably the issue here when we talk about review of the spectrum use and needs, it does not necessarily mean we are going to ignore the protection. This is something that goes without saying. We have to consider protection of any existing services if we are going to consider any further allocation or new allocation within an existing band. If we recall what happened in WRC15 when we had some different interests for some of the events, at that time, an agreement was to look at this by WRC23 since we had recently agreed on some of the bands below gigahertz. So I think we need to keep this in mind. Probably whatever bands we need to look at, we need to consider protection of existing services, further consider studies and definitely look at the results after we conclude the studies in the ITU-R. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you U.A.E. Any other comment from the floor. Okay. I see none, so we are within our first five minutes that was allocated to us by the interpreters. And I thanks them for that. So without much ado, I would like to thank all of the delegates and regional Rapporteurs for the lively and

comprehensive participation that you have accorded me during this session, session 10, which was dealing with chapter 6, and to thank you for the contributions and to encourage everyone to keep focus so that by the time we get to CPM2, most of these issues will be will have been sorted out, and now I want to hand it over to Mr. Philippe Aubineau to take us to the next session. Thank you very much.

>> PHILIPPE AUBINEAU: Thank you very much, Mr. Ngige and thank you to the panelists, which I would like to applaud you all.

(Applause)

This session very interesting this afternoon, and, again, for you flexibility to do it today instead of tomorrow. So for tomorrow, we will resume the workshop at 9:00, and we will be dealing with issues related to satellite services so they are in chapter 3 of the draft CPM report. We have a presentation ready also for introducing the conclusion that you can see also in the CPM report, in the draft CPM report. So we have planned two sessions in the morning for addressing both the, if I may say the allocation aspect of regulatory services and the regulatory aspect in the second session, but we are flexible as you noted today, so we will be making sure that all Agenda Items and issues included in chapter 3 are covered tomorrow morning.

And you would note also that we are still planning to keep for the time being the first period of the afternoon if necessary to conclude the discussion on this chapter 3. And then we have the final, the closing session as initially planned. However, if we are fast enough in the morning to deal with all of the issues in chapter 3, then we will have the closing earlier in the afternoon.

So these are the plans for tomorrow. And, again, I thank you very much for today, and I look forward to see you at 9:00 tomorrow morning here in this room. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

(Adjourned at 1710).

RAW FILE
ITU-R INTER-REGIONAL WORKSHOP
NOVEMBER 22, 2018
9:00 A.M. CST

Services Provided By:

Caption First, Inc.
P.O Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
1-877-825-5234
+001-719-481-9835
Www.captionfirst.com

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

>> PHILIPPE AUBINEAU: So Ladies and Gentlemen, good morning. We will start this last day of the workshop in one minute. If you could please take your seats.

Before we start I would like to check the interpretation. So if we could please good morning, to English channel.

>> Good morning, sir.

>> PHILIPPE AUBINEAU: And then to the French. Spanish. No. 4 was confused. So this time is Russian channel, please. Good morning. No. 5, we have the Chinese. No. 6, Arabic.

So good morning, again. I think we are now ready to start this session on the remaining part of chapter 3 of the draft CPM report dealing with satellite services which this is a largest part. We only address two days ago issue 9.1.2 and now we have the remaining part. With us we have Mr. Nikolay Varlamov who is the Rapporteur for chapter 3 of the draft CPM report. And as previously we have representatives of the main six regional groups. So welcome to all of you. And without further announcement for today Mr. Nikolay Varlamov, the floor is yours.

Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much, Philippe. And good morning, Distinguished Colleagues. Today our session is dedicated to part to chapter 3 of the WRC report. We have looked at one of the agenda items already and today we will look at all the other items. We will not start in order. We will miss items 1.5 and 1.7. We will look at them during the second part of our session. We will start now with the -- actually with the overview of chapter 3. Chapter 3 includes items 1.4, which considers changes and addition to annex 7 to appendix 3, item 1.5, dedicated to earth stations in motion, working in a specific band. And item 1.6, regulatory issues for GSO and non-GSO satellite systems. Item 7, dedicated to regulatory procedures, publication, coordination, and recording of satellite systems. Item 7 is a separate agenda item. In fact, which considers many different issues. And finally two items under 9, on the agenda. This is 9.1.3, studies on possibility of working -- work by non-G geostationary at lite systems and item 9.1.9, studies relating to spectrum needs and possible allocations of the frequency band 50 gigahertz. Let's start with item 1.4. Item 1.4 is dedicated to consideration of limitations established in annex 7 to appendix 30 of the RR. And these limitations and possibilities of establishing a satellite networks seek to ensure the protection of networks in the broadcasting satellite service between regions, 1, 3, and 2. And accordingly, a fixed satellite services. You can find all these limits in a table which is now on -- up on the screen. I will not stop on each of the limitations and tell you about them. I will rather move immediately to the methods that were identified during the studies.

Method A proposes no change. And this oppression of Resolution 557 in accordance of which studies are carried out. The next method, method B is the deletion of some limit actions of annex 7 and addition of draft new Resolution which will regulate limit A3A and at the same time the adoption of a new Resolution to ensure priority of national assignments in the region -- in regions 1, 3 in order to ensure the best possible conditions for them. And, of course, the elimination of Resolution 557 is proposed in all three methods.

Now method C is the deletion of some limitations of annex 7 and addition of draft new Resolutions related to the specific features of limitations and also Resolution linked to ensuring priority. You can see this in more detail on the screen which limitations are being suppressed. And what we are left with. So these are the three methods under item 1.4. Now I would like to ask the representatives of regional organizations to share with us their positions and views on this agenda item. I will

start on my right with APT. You have the floor.

>> MUNEO ABE: Good morning, everyone. My name is Abe from Japan. I'm chairing -- in APT I'm chairing a Working Group for satellite matters. As the previous panelist from APG mentioned our preliminary views were developed at our meeting in March of this year.

Actually satellite related agenda items and issues concerning those issues and agenda items our preliminary views are based on the result of working party 4A which was convened in October 2017. That is two meetings before the last working party 4A. So we are expecting a significant update at the meeting. Concerning agenda item 1.4, we developed the following preliminary views. No. 1, APT supports ITU-R studies. No. 2, APT members are of the view that any possible revision of annex 7 to appendix 30 should not impose undue constraints on the current and future FSS and DSS usage in the 11.7 to 12.7 gigahertz frequency band for region 3. As Mr. Arasteh explained on the first day we recognized some ambiguity in using the term undue constraint. And we are using this term provisionally with expecting to find more comprehensive alternatives by the end of APG meeting.

At our next meeting APG will look at draft CPM text from the viewpoint of whether or not the proposed method impose restrictions on BSS and FSS usage in region 3. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. I would like to give the floor now to the representative of ASMG. You have the floor.

>> Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is Mr. Adeli. I am from the ASMG and I will be presenting the ASMG positions with regard to chapter 3 with regard to space stations. With regarding to the ASMG positions generally and probably as mentioned by my previous colleagues our last meeting was in April. So more or less we are in the same situation as our colleagues from the APT and these positions represented the positions of the ASMG during that meeting and there were some developments and updates with regards to all the agenda items but at least working party 4A met at least once after our meeting. So there will be some modifications to our positions. So to our positions with regards to the agenda items.

Now with regards to agenda item 1.4 our preliminary position was not to support any changes. We think that the limitations are required as they are in annex 7. And this is so far just to protect the plans that we have and based on the developments that are there, that happened in the studies, we might reconsider this Plenary position during our next meeting, which is going to be next month. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. I think that yes, during the meetings that will take place in ASMG and APT you will look at and specify your position by beginning of the second session there will be a comprehensive picture in the regional organizations. I would like to give the floor to my colleague from the ATU. You have the floor.

>> ADDMORE MATARE: Thank you very much. Representing ATU, I'm Addmore Matare from the administration of Zimbabwe. I hope I find you well and very good morning to you all. ATU followed the studies when this agenda item closely, those are going on in a working party 4A. ATU also submitted to working party 4A July meeting a multi-country proposal, the proposal advocated for countries in the region 1 and 3 with EPMs below minus 10bd to be given priority allocation of resources that would be freed from the lifting or limitations in annex 7 or appendix 30. The proposal is draft new Resolution and priority which is included in methods B and C of the proposed methods to certify this agenda item.

ATU the position of ATU, ATU supports the removal of losing annex 7 if countries with big reference situation are given first priority to improve their satellite networks in appendix 30. ATU supports the study of each of the limitations under appendix 30 in these studies which he seek to improve the utilization of the OPD resources. ATU in going forward in to CPM-2 will consider a possible extension of the 90-day period that is -- that is proposed in the draft -- in the draft priority Resolution. ATU supports method C which includes the removal for -- which includes the Resolution with the priority and the -- it gives priority to administrations and to very bad references in the appendix 30 and gives the administration a 30-day period to submit their findings. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. I would like to now give the floor to the CEPT. You have the floor.

>> STEPHEN LIMB: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. And good morning, everyone. My name is Stephen Limb. I'm from the UK administration. I'm Chairman of the CEPT project that deals with the satellite issues and that's project B. We had a meeting back in March. We have two more meetings left in this cycle. So we will be taking our output to the Paru group which is the CPG meeting that meets next week. Agenda item 1.4 we have a fairly well developed position here. CEPT does not support method A of the CPM text. We don't support no change. We are still discussing methods B and C. The only difference between those two methods is essentially between protection and -- additional protection of future FSS networks, or lack of constraints on future FSS networks. That's the only difference between B and C. Limitation by invitation, we support deletion

of limitation A1, that's the westerly limit for region 1. A2A which is the Easterly for region 2, BSS and as I said we are still considering whether that can be done without additional regulatory measures. A2B we support deletion of. A3B, A3C, and A3A. On A3A we feel that there is a need to protect systems implemented with antennas, smaller than 60 centimeters. We propose Resolution to be able to do that. That's also contained in methods B and C. We propose to keep limitation A2C and A1B, that's the area between regions 2 and regions 1 and 3, due to the small separation of the land masses there. And we also support the introduction of the Resolution giving 90 days priority for those administrations with national assignments in 1 and 3 plan with equivalent downlink protection margin of equal or below 10db. Having to propose the delete the westerly limit and Easterly limit we are going to thinking if there is some kind of westerly limit for region 1 and region 2. We are going to look at something like the edge of the region with a 20 degree elevation to specify a limit in both directions. So that summarizes where we got to on 1.4. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. CITELE, you have the floor.

>> CHANTAL BEAUMIER: Thank you, Chairman. So I'm Chantal Beaumier from Canada. I'm also the Vice-Chair of the Working Group within CITELE that's responsible for satellite and regulatory issues. So on 1.4, well, before I say that actually I should mention like other regional groups CITELE had its meeting just after the end of the last working party 4A meeting. So as a result we were not able to take in to account the latest version of the draft CPM text that was developed by the July working 4A meeting. So coming back to 1.4, we are considering a limit on method C. We propose to use or the region 1 and 2 BSS test points instead of the service area definition for the coordination with the FSS through a new Resolution. A Resolution will also protect BSS networks with internal diameter that are less than 60 centimeters with a PFD mass. There is no changes or proposed to section B of annex 7 in order to protect the region 2 plan which original assignments were based on the cluster concepts. For those reasons we don't want to see any changes there. So that's it for CITELE. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. And in conclusion I will give the floor to the representative of the RCC.

>> OLGA DASHKEVICH: Thank you very much. Good morning, my name is Olga Dashkevich. I represent the administration of Belarus. I am a member of the RCC on WRC-19 preparation. I represent the position of the RCC countries on 1.4 of the report.

The RCC position is quite broad. Our last meeting was held in October of this year. The whole version of the position you can find in document 12 and 13 for today's meeting. At present the RCC countries do not specify in their position specific methods that we have chosen. We are still choosing between methods B and C. RCC countries do not oppose the deletion of limitations A1A, A2A, A2B for the Atlantic region. The RCC countries do not oppose maintaining limitations A1B for the Pacific region. RCC countries do not oppose the deletion of the limitations A3A, A3B, A3C. Furthermore, we support maintaining limitation A2C for the Pacific region. We do not oppose maintaining limitation B associated with the concept of the space stations grouping which the region 2 plan is based on. And in case of deletion of appropriate limitations the RCC supports the application of the specific procedure described in draft CPM report. So during a limited period of time the priority right to submit applications for new orbital position will be provided to the administrations of region 1 and 3, national assignments of which have a negative equivalent protection margin on the downlink. Furthermore, we consider that the proposals on revisions of criterion provisions of appendix 3 to the RCC other than of annex 7 are beyond the scope of this studies in accordance with Resolution 557. Thank you very much.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much for presenting this information on the regional organization. I would like to ask the room whether there are any questions, comments. And this doesn't seem to be the case. So we will now move to our next item. We will skip 1.5 and we will look at it as I have already said after the coffee break. Now we will look at item 1.6. Item 1.6 on the agenda considers the development of technical and operational and regulatory provisions related to frequency bands 50 and 40 gigahertz. This is required in order to facilitate sharing of bands by non-GSO and GSO FSS satellite systems broadcasting as satellite service and mobile satellite service. At present the regulatory provision on the use of -- in this band is lacking. The regulation also lacks mechanisms that would establish procedures for coordinating that are applicable to these systems within the FSS and BSS allocations in frequency bands. The ones that are being considered now. Within MSS and BSS studies were carried out on use of the systems on the basis of these results conclusions were drawn that setting the limits of the -- of PDF leads to inefficient use of the systems. On the other hand, an result of these studies methods for more efficient sharing of 50, 40 gigahertz bands was used and measures were taken to protect these bands from several GSO networks with different

configurations for the orbit. Under item 1.6 we also look at the protection of earth exploration service and the astronomical radio service and the adjacent bands. And this has an effect on the provisions of Resolution 650. Under this agenda item we are proposing four methods, method A is the first method. We are proposing to add a new footnote in order to allocate this band and to introduce provision 9.1.2 for coordination. This method also proposes to modify Article 22 and to develop a new Resolution which will describe the procedure for ensuring maintenance of aggregate limits.

Also propose to add a new footnote which will deal with issues of coordination between PSS systems in line with 9.1.1 and is proposed to modify Resolution 750 in order to resolve the issues with interference and other radio astronomical and other space exploration passive service. One more aspect which is not related directly to the radio regulations but to general activities and the recommendations that are being developed is to incorporate in to the recommendation a specific characteristics of the system so that we can calculate unit and aggregated interference.

Method B, also provides for an addition to the regulation in order to allocate these bands and to allow for the use of point 9.1.2. Modification of Article 22 in order to include a single entry and time allowance and aggregate interference and we propose to add footnote in order to activate 9.1.1A and to modify Resolution 750. And to have characteristics of the GSO reference links that should be reflected in order to carry out calculations.

Method C also proposes a note in order to allocate bands and to ensure coordination, modify Article 22, adopt Resolution, providing the protection in these frequency bands to include references to carry out calculations and to modify Resolution 750.

Finally, method D is practically identical to method A with exception of modifications to Resolution 750. So these are the four methods that we have and I would now like to give the floor to the representatives of the regional organizations. We will start with the APT. You have the floor.

>> MUNEO ABE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Concerning agenda item 1.6, APT's preliminary views stays in the general description. APT members support further studies on technical and operational issues and regulatory provisions on -- of non-GSO FSS satellite system in the -- in these 40, 50 gigahertz frequency band. While ensuring protection of GSO satellite networks and other existing services in the same band, as well as protection of ASS passive and radio astronomy frequency bands. This is our current views.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. Mr. Adeli you have the floor.

>> Thank you very much. For us as well with regards to agenda item 1.6 the preliminary views are also to follow up studies. However to consider also the following, protection of the FSS GSO networks according to Article 22 and the review of procedures for coordination trigger with respect to defining APFDs. And also protection of current services and subject frequency bands and initial protection of nearby allocations. This is again the preliminary positions of the ASMG and it is subject to review in our next meeting. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. Mr. Addmore Matare you have the floor.

>> ADDMORE MATARE: Thank you very much, Chairman. On behalf of ATU I have the following to say that ATU follows in the studies of 40, 50 gigahertz systems, and that is for the ATU sector meeting. We currently support method A, although we acknowledge that methods A, B and C look fairly -- very similar. So as ATU we are taking this position but we still need to examine further the three methods in order for us to come up with a more concrete and solid position in our 2019 meeting. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. Mr. Stephen Limb you have the floor.

>> STEPHEN LIMB: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. So on 1.6 CEPT's preliminary position in a general sense we say we support the development of regulatory provisions, technical and operational conditions that would enable spectrally efficient operation of non-GSO satellite systems in the frequency bands 37.5 to 42, 50.4 to 51.4. While ensuring protection for GSO satellite networks and stations of other existing services including passive services in the adjacent frequency bands.

We consider the limits that are currently in Resolution 750 are not sufficient for the prosecute text of earth exploration passive in the adjacent frequency band 50.2 to 50.4 gigahertz in the bands under consideration. We think appropriate on one mission limits for the protection of earth exploration, minus 61.9db watts in 200 megahertz. And minus 63 db watts in 200 megahertz. When the aggregate effect is not taken in to account.

But we are also of the view the effective aggregate FSS interference from both types of orbits should be taken in to account and to ensure protection of earth exploration. And then we support the development of the new recommendation that's currently a preliminary draft new recommendation staged in working party 4A that's called 50/40 gigahertz methodology. From non-GSO satellite systems specify a single entry and

aggregate limits. It is not based on equivalent path. Degradation of GSO networks short of performance objectives and maximum reduction of the average throughput or spectral efficiency for GSO networks using adaptive coding and modulation. We also support the development of a recommendation on reference links which contains characteristics of representative FSS GSO links. Within the FSS. We have developed a proposal on this. At the moment I can't tell you which method it corresponds to. It is a fairly well developed method. Thank you very much.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. Chantal, please.

>> CHANTAL BEAUMIER: Thank you. So for at CITELE with respect to the -- we only have preliminary views so far to begin with. But with respect to the compatibility with ESS passive systems in adjacent bands, in particular for the band 50.2 to 50.4 gigahertz, we believe that mitigation techniques in all regulatory measures such as revising the current and wider emission limits are required to ensure compatibility between ESS and non-GSO FSS systems. We also are of the view that the use of these bands are subject of 1.6 should be subject to the coordination procedure of 9.12. For the protection of GSO assistance we support the approach of determining the maximum single entry in aggregate increase in GSO unavailability caused by non-GSO systems. Noting that the implementation of this method will require a set of GSO reference links. There is also some countries within CITELE that have -- that support no change to the Resolution 750 limits for GSO networks.

Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. And madam Olga Dashkevich you have the floor.

>> OLGA DASHKEVICH: Thank you very much Mr. Chair. On 1.6, the RCC countries consider that regulatory provisions to ensure operation of satellite systems GSO FSS in the considered frequency bands shall ensure protection for GSO satellite networks. In FSS, MSS and BSS and also stations in the same or adjacent frequency bands. RCC countries believe that technical conditions and regulatory provisions shall be adopted to ensure sharing of the considered frequency bands in these frequency bands.

We support the revision of Resolution 750 and the establishment of appropriate and wanted emission limits for non-GSO FSS earth stations operated in these frequency bands 49.7 to 50.2 gigahertz. And 50.4 to 50.9 gigahertz. To protect ESS passive in the frequency band 50.2 to 50.4 gigahertz. Taking in to account aggregate interference effect caused by existing radio services in adjacent frequency band. We believe

that in order to ensure adequate protection of non-GSO FSS systems and GSO BSS systems in these bands for GSO -- for non-GSO FSS systems, in Article 22, limitations should be set. To identify these limitations we support the development of a new recommendation of ITU-R. Thank you very much Mr. Chair.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. Are there any questions or comments in the room on agenda item 1.6? This is not the case. We will now move to the next agenda item. As I promised we will skip item 7 and we will come back to it in the second half of our morning sessions.

We will now look at item 9.1.3. As part of this agenda item we will look at the possibility of using C-band by non-GSO systems of FSS. As part of the studies made it has been shown that the non-GSO FSS operations in the orbit, circular orbit could result in large exceedances up to 40 decibels of the GSO protection criteria required on the -- for the non-GSO circular orbit system. As a result of this system it has been concluded that the exploitation of non-GSO system with a circular orbit within the C-band will be very difficult. For this reason there is no need to review the current existing limitations presented in Article 22. This is EPFT and Article 21, PFD for the C-band frequency bands. Another study was carried out which suggested to establish a coordination procedure for the non-GSO FSS systems under RR number 9.12. This study finds that there is no need to review the values of the existing limits in Articles 22 and 21. So these are the results that were obtained for the study in to this issue. There are no specific proposed methods or regulatory texts.

I will now give the floor to the APT. Mr. Abe you have floor the.

>> MUNEO ABE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. APT's view is very simple. APT members support no change to the radio regulations based on the study progress in ITU-R for a new non-GSO systems in C-band. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. Mr. Adeli you have the floor.

>> Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. The ASMG acknowledges the studies John made with regard to this issue which concluded that it would be -- concluded on the difficulties of introducing the non-GSO systems in the C-band. Hence it supports the conclusion of the studies of no requirements to introduce any changes or modifications to the radio regulations. So supporting no change as well. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. Mr. Addmore Matare you have the floor.

>> ADDMORE MATARE: Thank you very much, Chairman. As a precursor to this agenda item the African continent utilizes

this band for the fixed service in the fixed satellite services and also looking at the ITU-R studies which ATU supports one these studies indicated that the orbit of the non-GSO of operation in these bands could result in larger, up to 40db of the GSO protection criteria and concluded that it would be very difficult for non-GSO to operate in this band. So as a result for these two points ATU supports a no change position. And we also -- ITU-R studies conducted so far show it would be difficult to cooperate the non-GSO orbit within this band. So we very much support the no change position like our other two subregions. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. Mr. Stephen Limb you have the floor.

>> STEPHEN LIMB: Thank you very much. CEPT's position is that we support no changes to Articles 21 and 22 in the bands 3.7 to 4.2, 4.5 to 4.8, 5.92 to 6.425 and 7.25 to 7.025. That's consistent with what we have heard already but we are considering the introduction of coordination service to address coordination between non-GSO in bands 3700 to 4200 megahertz. So I think that corresponds to the second study that's shown on the screen. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. Chantal you have the floor.

>> CHANTAL BEAUMIER: Thank you. So CITELE has developed an inter-American proposal already on this issue and like the previous speakers we support no change. But to Articles 21 and 22 for the same reasons that have been expressed by APT, ATU and the ASMG we are not considering introducing coordination procedures. That's to be clear. So we have a position of or proposal for no change. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. Madam Olga Dashkevich you have the floor to present the position of the RCC.

>> OLGA DASHKEVICH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. On item 9.1.3, the position of the RCC I countries is similar. We oppose adopting new regulatory provisions for new nongeostationary orbit satellite systems in the considered frequency bands allocated to the fixed satellite service. Because the studies carried out by ITU-R have concluded that the compatibility of these systems with stations of the incumbent services is unachievable. At the same time we are in favor of adopting the conditions ensuring that compatibility for new nongeostationary satellite orbit systems in 3700 to 4200 megahertz and 5925 to 6425 megahertz frequency bands by applying the coordination procedure under No. 9.12 of the radio regulations between non-GSO systems. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you. Are there any questions

or comments in the -- by the participants of our workshop? I don't see any requests for the floor. We will now move to the next agenda item. 9.1.9, related to studies on the spectrum needs and possible allocation of the frequency band 51.4 to 52.4 gigahertz to the fixed satellite service uplink. On the basis of the studies carried out two examples are proposed for regulatory decisions. So the first regulatory decision a new primary allocation to the FSS in the frequency band 51.4 to 52.4 gigahertz earth to space are limited to FSS gateway links for geostationary orbit use. This example provides for modifications to Article 5 in order to allocate to the FSS in the frequency band subject to the Resolution 750 in order to ensure the protection from unwanted emissions of passive service station. It is also proposed to add a footnote to Article 5 in order to limit the new allocation to gateway's operating FSS GSO networks with a limited antenna diameter of 4.5 meters which is proposed to modify Article 21 in order to include frequency band proposed for the new allocation to FSS. The changes linked to the new allocation are also reflected in appendix 7 to the RR, include parameters for earth stations in order to ensure coordinations with earth systems and finally modification is made to Resolution 750 with a view to limiting the unwanted emissions from the FSS earth stations and to protect the EESS passive according to the elevation angle. And second example which was developed as part of this item states that no change should be made to the radio regulations.

So this is the situation under this agenda item. I would like to start with the APT. You have floor.

>> MUNEO ABE: Thank you. Current views on this issue is as follows: APT members support further studies of ITU-R relating to sharing and compatibility between FSS in 51.4 to 52.4 gigahertz and other cofrequency and adjacent band services. APT members are of the view that consideration of allocation of FSS in 51.4 to 52.4 gigahertz limited to feeder links for GSO use is subject to satisfactory outcomes of ITU-R studies related to spectrum needs and compatibility with existing services allocated to the same and adjacent band.

At our next meeting we will evaluate the study result of working party 4A, spectrum needs. And compatibility with existing services and update our preliminary views. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. ASMG please, you have the floor. The mic is on.

>> Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Regarding issue 9.1.9 the ASMG's initial position is to support the FSS allocation and the 51.4 to 52.4 gigahertz which is limited to GSO FSS feeder links. Upon the same time we need to have consideration of the results of the studies and also align the proposals with the

results of the studies in agenda item 1.13 as it is going to have an effect on the studies in the agenda item 1.13. So based on the studies that were conducted since our meeting we are going to review the position based on the latest draft CPM. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. The ATU has the floor.

>> ADDMORE MATARE: Thank you very much, Chairman. ATU supports the spectrum needs and analysis which was done in and concluded that additional conclusion is to make broadband connection. ATU is in favor of results of technical studies. Studies conducted between FSS and incumbent services in 51.4 to 52.4, sharing compatibility by means of separation distances between the stations as well as limiting unwanted emissions falling in the passive band that is 52.6 to 54.25 giga. And on that ATU's preliminary position is to support the band 5.14 to 5.24 to the fixed service limited to FSS gateway links for geostationary orbit use while protecting current allocated services in this band. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. CEPT please, you have the floor.

>> STEPHEN LIMB: Thank you very much. CEPT's preliminary position is based on the results of studies on the spectrum needs and development for the fixed satellite, CEPT does support 5.14 to 5.24. Passive operating in 52.6 to 54.25 gigahertz, CEPT proposes unwanted emission limit of minus 37 or minus 39db watts in 100 megahertz associated to maximum elevation angles 74 or 78 degrees operating in the 51.4 to 52.4 to gigahertz. 78 degrees the proposed unwanted emission limit is minus 52db watts in 100 megahertz. This is the 3db apportionment to take in to account aggregate interferences. We support studies regarding the impact on radio astronomy observations from 51.4 to 54.25. We consider gate which earth stations should be limited to 4.5 meters. We do have a proposal that we generated which I think corresponds almost exactly to example 1 as you see on the screen. Thank you very much.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. I will now give the floor to CITELE to present their position.

>> CHANTAL BEAUMIER: Thank you. So within CITELE the preliminary views expressed so far is to support new primary FSS allocation limited to GSO networks and gateway earth stations with appropriate measures to protect incumbent services. This would include a footnote introducing specific regulatory measure to prevent deployment of earth stations. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you. And conclusion, I will give the floor to colleagues from the RCC to present their position.

>> OLGA DASHKEVICH: Thank you very much. On agenda item 9.1.9 the RCC countries do not oppose new allocation on primary basis of the frequency band 51.4 to 52.4 gigahertz to GSO FSS earth to space limited to gateway earth stations. Using a minimum antenna diameter of 4.5 meters provided the mandatory protection is granted to EESS passive which is in line with example 1. In draft CPM report. Of course, the protection of existing services and systems must be ensured in this and adjacent frequency bands and regulatory provisions and review of 750 must be ensured on the basis for protection of earth exploration satellite service in the frequency band 52.6 to 54.25 gigahertz.

We would like to also draw your attention that permissible aggregate out of band interference level from all active services stated in recommendation ITU-R RS2017 should be distributed between the active services which could be the potential interferers to EESS passive senses in the frequency band 52.6 to 54.25 gigahertz. Including taking in to account the potential impact of IMT system second Harmonic considered under WRC-19 agenda item 1.13. Thank you very much.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. Are there any questions in the room? Any comments? This doesn't seem to be the case. In principle we have come -- we have considered what we have planned and we still have ten minutes before the break. I would like to give the floor to Philippe Aubineau to fill us about how much time we will have for rest and what our further plans are. Philippe, you have the floor.

>> PHILIPPE AUBINEAU: Thank you very much, Nikolay and congratulations to the first part of this consideration of this morning's session on chapter 3. Regarding the -- think we could have a break now before we continue with the next item. The initial plan was to have a break between 10:15 to 10:45. So maybe we deserve a bit more time unless you would like to resume earlier. So my suggestion is to come back at a quarter to 11. Is that acceptable? Other suggestions? Please Mr. Arasteh.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you very much. But we have some really complex issues here. Therefore do we really need 45 minutes for this coffee break? Perhaps about 30 Swiss minutes might be sufficient.

>> PHILIPPE AUBINEAU: Thank you. So if the meeting agrees with that, we will adjourn now and resume at looking at the clock, I hope it is Swiss clock, let's say 10:40? Is that okay? 10:40. Thank you very much. 20 to 11 we meet again. Thank you.

(Coffee break).

>> PHILIPPE AUBINEAU: So Ladies and Gentlemen, if you could please take your seats we will resume the discussion on

chapter 3. We are on agenda item 7 already, 1.5? Okay. So here we are. So welcome again. Before giving the floor to Mr. Nikolay Varlamov, I would just like to announce that there is here a plug and charger left from room Popov yesterday evening. If anybody has lost his or her, then it is here. Thank you. It is a good one, yes.

(Laughter).

>> PHILIPPE AUBINEAU: You have even a plug adapter to the Swiss system in case. Thank you. So please Mr. Nikolay Varlamov.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much, Philippe. I think that the owner of this device will soon be found. And we will now continue our session.

We will start looking at the issues which we postponed during the previous session. So agenda item 1.5 and agenda item 7.

Agenda item 1.5 is linked to considering the use of the earth stations in motion, communicating with the geostationary space stations in the fixed satellite service and all this is happening in the frequency band 17.7 to 19.7 gigahertz, space to earth and 27.5 to 29.5 gigahertz earth to space. As part of this agenda item a wide range of studies are being carried out. ESIM stations, aircraft and ship are being considered.

These three types of ESIM stations can be used to provide a broadband communications including Internet connectivity. On the basis of the studies we have two methods, method A, no change. And suppression of Resolution 158 and method B which provides for the addition of a new footnote to chapter 5 with a reference to draft new Resolution. And the draft new Resolution itself on the use of such stations.

It is also proposed to make certain modifications to appendix 4 and to suppress Resolution 105.8. There is a small error on the slide. Despite the fact that it seems that there is only one method available here, in fact, within this method there are many options and at present I would like to point out that research in to this issue in terms of regulatory and procedural aspects have not been completed and additional work required during the second session of the CPM and during the preparation for the conference itself. It would be very difficult to present all the options available within the draft Resolution. So I took the courage to just to limit myself to a few words that studies need to be continued. So this is the situation at present under this agenda item and I would like now like to give the floor to the APT to tell us about their view of this agenda item and what their position is. APT, you have the floor.

>> MUNEO ABE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Our preliminary

views on this agenda item 1.5 is as follows: APT members support ITU-R studies for regulatory issues and conditions on sharing and compatibility between ESIM and existing services.

To ensure protection of and not impose undue constraints the and the existing services allocated in this band and their future development. Although this preliminary views does not include other views, there are some other views expressed at the last APG meeting. Some members are of the view that there is no need for additional compatibility studies between downing of ESIM and other existing services. Because downlinks of ESIMs are the same as down links of FSS networks. Some members are of the views that for protecting terrestrial services PFD limits could be considered for aeronautical ESIMs and minimum distance from the coast could be defined for maritime ESIMs. Some other members consider operation of ESIM should be on the noninterference and nonprotection basis. Fortunately or unfortunately those aspects are included in the method as options. So we will have a fund to select those options and -- I'm joking. We have a difficulty in discussing.

(Laughter).

>> MUNEO ABE: I hope we will come up with some kind of conclusion as to which options we prefer and which option we do not prefer. Thank you very much Mr. Chairman.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. I will now give the floor to the ASMG. Thank you.

>> Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. From the ASMG's perspective initially we do not oppose the use of the frequency bands 17.7, 19.7 gigahertz and 27.5 to 29.5 gigahertz for the ESIMs. However, initially we have to follow up the potential effects of ESIMs with respect to other services allocated in the frequency bands indicated, basically following up the studies and making sure that we ensure the protection of the existing services in these frequency bands. Also we need to specifically further study interference mitigation techniques to protect fixed services which are used extensively in the band 27.5 to 29.5 gigahertz. That's the position Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. I give the floor to the ATU.

>> ADDMORE MATARE: Thank you very much, Chair. Three technical studies on the FSS versus ESIM compatibility with them in the -- in ATU and these studies show that long and short term interference criteria is not exceeded. These were done in EACO and in Senegal. ATU supports main method B which includes addition of a new footnote in Article 5 of radio regulations with a reference to new Resolution which will define operational interregulatory provisions for ESIM including EFD mass in band

27.5 to 29.5 gigahertz from aircraft ESIM and offshore supporting distance to protect terrestrial services to maritime ESIM. After to contribute to the new Resolution at CPM-2 in order to have the additional concerns that we have addressed. ATU supports progress on agenda item 5 in technical studies in working party 5A in 2019 working party 4A meeting. And the studies will show the possible scenarios, particularly the land ESIM. In fact, as ATU we be more lack of progress on technical studies on agenda item 1.5. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. CEPT.

>> STEPHEN LIMB: Thank you very much. CEPT's position on this is that we very much support a regulatory framework for the operation of ESIM in 17.7 to 19.7 and 27.5 to 29.5. While ensuring protection of and not imposing undue constraints on services allocated in those frequency bands. We see this as an exciting new development in connectivity. So due to the foreseen growing demand for ESIM and because ESIM terminals are in motion and used worldwide we feel the regulatory framework for these terminals needs to be as simple and practical as possible. So considering each of the types of ESIM we think this could be a way forward. For maritime ESIM we think a minimum distance of 70 millimeters of low watermark is a way forward unless prior agreement of the concerned administrations is being given. That's similar to the method that was adopted in Resolution 902 which is earth stations on vessels. So we think a similar method here would work. For aircraft ESIM, we think a PFD limit on the earth's surface as specified in ECC decision 1301 should be used to ensure protection of the mobile and the fixed services.

And ESIM needs to comply with these PFD limits again unless prior agreement of the concerned administration has been obtained. And for land ESIM, when operating within national boundaries we think no specific regulatory actions or amendments to the radio regulations are needed because it is a national issue but we need to consider methods for identifying which countries and administrations intending to authorize land ESIM to seek agreement with or coordinate with and how to do that.

So that in a nutshell -- there is a little bit more. So we think in 17.7 to 19.7 we are of the view that ESIMs shall not claim protection from the fixed and mobile services in that band. And in 27.5 to 29.5 that's the opening band, we support studying appropriate sharing techniques including EIRP or powerful density values for ESIMs in order to protect the fixed and mobile services allocated in the bands. Roadmap on 5G has been developed. In that document it states that Europe is harmonized 27.5 to 29.5 gigahertz for broadband satellite and this band is not available for 5G. So that summarizes CEPT's

position on 1.5. Thank you very much.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. CITELE you have the floor.

>> CHANTAL BEAUMIER: Thank you very much. Within CITELE there is general support for method B which is addition of a new footnote in Article 5 which is subject ESIM use to application of new Resolution and this new Resolution would contain a specific conditions of operation for ESIM. That would ensure the protection of services in the bands and I would include services such as the FSS for both geostationary and nongeostationary -- nongeostationary satellite systems and non-GSO and FSS feeder links as well as terrestrial services and it would also contain Guidelines to assist administrations to authorize ESIMs. We have yet to discuss the specific details of what that would mean exactly. We expect to receive preliminary proposals on this topic at our next meeting in just a week or so. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. RCC, you have the floor.

>> OLGA DASHKEVICH: Thank you very much Mr. Chair. RCC countries also at this stage support method B of the draft CPM report. We support a draft new Resolution which shall contain technical conditions -- provisions with regard to operation of ESIM submitting with geostationary stations in considered frequency bands in order to ensure on the basis of existing criteria the protection of services having allocations in these and adjacent radiofrequency bands including existing and future use of EESS. As well as the use of terrestrial services.

We consider that with regard to satellite networks assistance of other administrations in these frequency bands shall comply with the following conditions. Using ESIM with an earlier registered frequency assignment to typical earth station of GSO FSS satellite network the appropriate information on such a use shall be recorded in MIFR. If frequency assignment to typical earth station was made, of GSO FSS it is necessary for the administration to submit to the bureau information concerning appendix 42RR.

In order for the bureau to check the results of the -- in the briefing section, the administration which authorizes the use of ESIM on its territory must be entitled to request ESIM to use only those frequency assignments to a GSO FSS network which have successfully coordinated, implemented and recorded in the MIFR. With regard to terrestrial services transmitting ESIMs in the frequency band 27.5 to 29.5 gigahertz shall not cause unacceptable interferences to stations of terrestrial services. Receiving ESIMs in the radiofrequency band 17.7 to 19.7 gigahertz shall not claim protection from stations of terrestrial services. And the notifying administration

responsible for the GSO FSS satellite network with which ESIMs communicate shall submit in case of unacceptable interference will take appropriate action to seize or reduce the interference to the acceptable level. We consider that in the draft new Resolution special measures shall be envisaged to exclude unauthorized use of ESIM in the territory of states that have not granted relevant authorizations. Thank you very much.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. Are there any additional information, comments, questions? Iran you have the floor.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning, to all, to everybody. First thing is a very complex issue. Now Mr. Adeli Chairman of the CEPT need to have a victim to deal with this at CPM and another victim to deal with at the WRC. ESIM is a combination of ESOS mobile platform which is a WRC-15 came by European country on an unrude manner turning around the way and bringing on 9.2 which fortunately today is forbidden. No more 9.2. Chair, there is three types of ESIM. ESIM on board aircraft, ESIM on board land vehicle, and ESIM on board vessel. The main issue is coordination because all of them are mobile. And mobile stations wants to communicate with a fixed satellite service. Very complex. We had this issue in 2003 after 2097 either stations on board vessels coming from colleagues. There was no coordination procedure for that. What the people did they tried to have a new coordination procedure and that is distance that our distinguished colleagues from CEPT refer to because there was no coordinations method in the ITU-R or in the radio regulations.

Consequently as far as the ESIM maritime is concerned, the matter is not complex. As our colleague from UK or CEPT mentioned there is a possibility to use similar approach, whether with 70 kilometers or 70 plus or 70 minus, there might be some other additional things, telometers. That is almost manageable in my humble view with little experience in ITU. It is manageable.

You come to the ESIM aircraft. ESIM aircraft is similar to unmanned aircraft. Similar. Not identical. Everything is the same except that ESIM could not be used for the safety of (inaudible) aspects. That is clearly mentioned in the Resolutions proposed by Russian at WRC-15 agreed by everyone. But the whole thing is the same. We have spent four and a half years and continue to spend years how to deal with the unmanned aircraft or CNPC on Resolution 155 and we are not yet any agreement.

There is a Resolution with considerable number of results but still difficult. We try to have a guideline to do the step by steps. Coordination Chairman has three aspects -- no two

main aspects. One coordination of terrestrial and coordination of space services. Terrestrial no doubt includes fixed and mobile. Don't forget mobile is fix fixed but it is mobile as well. When you go to space services then you have to look at all type of space services. You have FSS and others. In FSS you have two categories, GSO and non-GSO. Non-GSO is important. So we have to deal with them separately. Currently for the protection of service area from the FSS, we have power flexibility, Article 21. So far so good. For protection of the assignments and the station we have complimentary provisions Article 9, 9.17 and 9.18. These are not replaceable. One is complimentary to the other. If you apply or comply with power flex density you are not excluded to do the coordination under Article 9. So this should be really clear for everybody. Unfortunately currently as I mentioned in respect of earth board vessel there is no coordination for the assignment and station vis-a-vi the mobile station on board aircraft. Aircraft going from one country to another country, so on and so forth there is none. If you say PFD to some extent but not all extent. We do have something to do PFD. When it comes to the land, it is much more difficult. People mention that who has the responsibility, the problem is not somebody responsibility. There are many players. Notifying administrations of ESIM, satellite operator of ESIM. Administration licensing of the ESIM. Distributing inside the country and third countries administrations. Who is responsible for coordinations? The administration on the territory of which the earth station is located. Authorize ESIM on his country, he is responsible for the coordination vis-a-vi other countries of inside his other country we don't touch that because national matter. If he licenses he is responsible to do it with other terrestrial service in country. In the hand of administrations responsible of satellite or satellite operators and it is mentioned he has a facility to stop, to reduce, and start again. So if administration A authorize ESIM and does not have any control when he is to start and stop, how that administration could deal with the coordination. If at this session C, maybe what administration B suggests may complain, how administration A with earth decision on that could resolve the matter. Has no controls. Moreover there are many other issues. You have accumulative interference. Hundreds of tracks of trains all of them might have this. This interference added one to the other. When it goes third countries it says coordination required. Administration says no. Which track, which country, which stations and so on and so forth has this interference or might be from ESIM of 2 or 3 countries at the same time to the third country. Who is responsible? So the issue Chairman of CPM is for us to find who is responsible for

what. If you can't find that, at least we are a little bit going forward. That is something that the Chair have the -- this theme today that mentioned there are many issues not yet resolved and we have to resolve this issue clearly. I think it is possible, but under something, the RCC and also to some extent others mentioned there are considers for terrestrial and from the ESIM and also from unmanned aircraft shall not cause and RCC mentioned unacceptable interference. One is a step forward to peoples. RCC did not say that shall not cause interference. Unacceptable interference. That means that room for maneuver that's good. What defined interference is acceptable or not acceptable PFD. So PFD is a guidance for administration. If the PFD is met you could tell to the other part, look this is that one. Okay. I could agree with that. Now the other side shall not claim protection. That's very important issue. Is in unmanned aircraft and is in this issue. So that's important for terrestrial. For space you have to divide FSS, GSO, non-GSO and there is some procedures how to do that. So Chairman I don't want to take the time of your meeting. There is a long journey to go. It is not easy. I hope we could settle that. Now with the apology to the administration of Canada they want to bring similar issue of WRC-19 to agenda of WRC23. Unless we have a clear idea how to deal with this complex issue you we should not bring a new agenda item similar to that. Step by step to see how far we can go. Chairman it is a very, very complex issue and we need time and we need efforts and understanding each other to see the matter. Because FSS is FSS. Now we want to use FSS for MS. That's not impossible but it requires some sort of procedures and we have to do. Apologize for taking the floor of your time but I have worked on that for many, many years and most of this text here I have been working with other colleagues, collectively to introduce, produce that and we have to be careful how to deal with that. There are many unclear ideas and issues yet to be settled. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. Mr. Arasteh has highlighted correctly that there are many issues which we still need to work on and resolve. I said this at the beginning of the presentation on this item. It is a very complicated topic. It originates in the 2000-2003 when the Resolution on earth stations on maritime on ships was adopted. Now there have been new developments and possibly the next conference will consider the issues of ESIM with regard to using them in in GSO satellite systems. This means that we need to work on these issues more efficiently at this conference and try to take in to account the interests of all services and all countries including in terms of licensing and issuance of the necessary documents for the

operation of such stations.

Are there any other comments or questions? If this is not the case, we will move to agenda item 7. And maybe some of the representatives will need to change. We will just take a break for one minute so that other colleagues can replace their representatives and in one minute we will continue working on item 7.

(Pause).

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: I see that all the panelists are here and we can move to agenda item 7. Under this agenda item we are considering a wide range of issues related to the procedures for preliminary advanced publication coordination, notification of frequency assignments pertaining to satellite networks.

And the first issue which is on our agenda is issue A, bringing in to use of frequency assignments to all non-GSO systems and consideration of a milestone based approach for the deployment of non-GSO systems and specific frequency bands and for specific services.

Under issue A we are considering two aspects. First one, bringing in to use of frequency assignments to non-GSO systems. This issue is related to all systems and second part is the establishment of a milestone based approach for alignment of non-GSO system deployment with in specific frequency bands and specific services.

With regard to the first subitem, we have identified three options and they differ by the number of days required for the -- bringing in to use of non-GSO systems. We plan to take rules of procedure as a basis under No. 11.44 with regard to fixed satellite and mobile satellite systems.

Option A, the period is at least 90 days in order for the satellite -- for the space -- for the notified (inaudible) of satellite can be established and for it to be able to transmit or receive the necessary signals. Option B, the period is one day to 90 days and option C is no fixed period. As is the case now with regard to our MSS systems no fixed period is required. So these are the three options under issue -- the first subitem.

Now the second part is the procedure, milestone based deployment of the satellite groupings. Despite that one method is proposed for the implementation it contains quite a lot of options. These options differ in terms of the length of the periods and the number of devices that need to be deployed in order to satisfy one of the periods. In addition to the procedure for the deployment itself, and the stages we also studying the issue of the consequences that will be for the administration if these are not complied with and another issue which were actively -- which we actively discussed is that related to the transitional period in order for the systems that

were developed prior to the introduction of new rules, can also exist and be actively developed and so that their rights can be implemented.

It is important to note that the title of the issue itself indicates specific frequency bands and specific services now as part of this studies two options were developed in terms of which frequency bands should include which services, should fall under the procedure for the bringing in to use. And frequency bands were identified which were not -- did not receive wide support but are still contained in the CPM report as an aspect of this subissue. I guess this is all in terms of presentation of this subissue but I would like to draw your attention, also remind you that in our room we have representatives of working party 4A who dedicated a lot of time to studying these issues. He headed the Plenary group meeting which considered almost 24 hours a day, all these issues. If anyone has any comments or wishes, if we don't cover everything I will be happy to give him the floor if he wishes to take the floor. I would like to give the floor to the representative of the APT. Please you have the floor.

>> MUNEO ABE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Our view stays at the general level. APT members support further studies related to the regulatory provisions and procedures for VIU of the frequency assignments of non-GSO systems. And establishment of a milestone based approach for alignment of non-GSO system development in MIFR. APT members support the course of actions which has taken by working party 4A to separate the studies of VIU of frequency assignment to non-GSO satellite system in all bands and services and milestone based development approach for non-GSO satellite system in specific bands and services. That's all. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. ASMG, you have the floor.

>> Thank you very much. The preliminary ASMG position with regards to this issue is that we do not understand the requirement to have a clear regulatory framework for these kinds of systems. As we understand that this sort of systems are developing and there is quite a large number of initial projects and existing projects which would require a clear regulations or regulatory framework that would cover their operations. So we do have the support to develop clear provisions in the radio regulations with respect to non-GSOs and similar treatment with respect to the GSO networks. Also our initial position is not to support the first option which is option A. We are fine with the other two possibilities but for the time being for option A we should have or which would which might include the modification to 1144 we do not support that as well. However we

are open to looking to the other two possibilities as B or C.

We also have the initial position of following up the studies results of the studies with emphasis on the milestones approach and its ability to meet the following objectives. The first one is balancing the equitable access and spectrum efficiency with respect to radio spectrum and orbital resources. Follow up with the BR regarding software tools that might be required to query and ensure notifications and VIU of non-GSO constellations. Thank you very much.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. You have the floor.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman and good morning, to everyone. My name is Mandaar. I am here representing ATU on agenda item 7. On issue A, the method identified in the CPM report is two elements. The first element says that bringing to use frequency assignments to non-GSO system should continue to be achieved by deployment of one satellite within seven years of date of receipt of API or a request for coordination as applicable.

The second element is a new WRC Resolution to implement a milestone based approach for the development of non-GSO systems in specific frequency bands and services. We are in favor of a minimum period of 90 days during which a satellite has to be maintained in a notified orbital plane to confirm VIU. This is reflected as option A in draft CPM. When it comes to the options for proposed milestone approach we would like to have an option that's a best balance between avoiding people satellite and providing some flexibility to non-GSO operators for deployment of their systems. We are open to engagement with other regions to find a solution that addresses this principle.

And also discussions around these specific frequency bands and services to which this method will apply. This is a summary of our preliminary views. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. CEPT you have the floor.

>> STEPHEN LIMB: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Well, I think this is widely acknowledged as one of the most complex issues of the conference. There are many, many facets to this particular issue. It is entirely possible that I will not succeed in covering them all in sufficient detail. So if I do fail in any way, then I apologize. What I can say within CEPT there is broad agreement on the principles that we should use to try to approach this issue. We are still discussing the detail of many of those facets of this issue. But in general I think we agree that we should follow the principles that were established by working party 4A. As far as the particular aspects that our Moderator has outlined on the definition of bringing in to use we think that one satellite is enough to do

that as is the current practice but we are still discussing what the appropriate minimum period of time that should be -- that a satellite should be maintained and its orbit should be. We haven't yet concluded on that.

We agree that there should be a milestone approach to the rest of the deployment of the system. And the maintenance of the assignments in the master register and that there should be a deployment factor associated with those milestones. Again we have not yet come to a single view on what those milestones should be and what those deployment factors should be within CEPT. But the principle of preventing spectrum warehousing allowing coordination mechanisms to function properly and meeting the operation requirements in relation to deployment of non-GSO systems are extremely important factors to consider here. We think the milestone based approach should be applicable to fixed satellite service broadcasting satellite service, mobile satellite service and primary satellite services in the same direction as these at least in a set of frequency bands, 17.3 to 21.2, 27 to 31, 37.5 to 47 and 47.2 to 50.2 and 50.4 to 51.4 gigahertz. That's where we stand at the moment. It is possible that that list of bands will change as we continue our discussions within CEPT.

We think that it is best to adopt a unique method that encompasses all types of constellations to try to keep this as simple as possible. Think within CEPT we have agreed there should be three milestones within the process. That was a positive step that we agree to that. As I say it is associated with a set of milestones and deployment factor with each. We think that it is possible to not apply No. 1143B if modifications to the notified orbital premises following a failure to immediate a milestone, if they are limited to a certain set of parameters. Modification of the right -- ascending node of each plane and modification of the initial phase angle of each satellite. So it is changing the orbital configuration which we think should not really change the interference situation. That applies only if the notified administration commits to say the modifying these characteristics shall not cause more interference or require more protection than the initial characteristics.

We think that whatever date we choose for the start of the general milestone methodology we will need some transitional measures. Again that's an issue that we are still discussing within CEPT and we have yet to conclude on that.

We agree though that suspension of assignments cannot be used to try to extend the milestone periods. Or reduce the requirements associated with any of the milestones. We are proposing to adopt all this by introducing a new Resolution at

WRC-19. We have a general agreement on the basic ideas but the detail has yet to be flushed out within the CEPT. I hope that helps. Thank you very much.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much.

>> CHANTAL BEAUMIER: Thank you very much. So CITELE supports the establishment of a milestone based approach to implement deployment requirements for non-GSO satellite systems and principles established by working party 4A. So far there is some more specific views expressed by some CITELE administrations that indicated bringing in to use should be considered successfully completed if one non-GSO satellite deployed. Under 13.6, or any other relevant provisions of the radio regulations, the bureau should only consider the altitude, inclination and the argument of the Parody for noncircular orbit. We believe that some tolerances should be allowed. The bringing in to use notification of frequency assignments to a non-GSO satellite system within the seven year regulatory period in accordance with the 11441 a prerequisite to the mile phone process. Frequency assignments have been notified and brought in to use. And for which the end of the associated seven year regulatory period occurred prior to the date of entry in to force of the final Acts of WRC-19 which we expect would be no later than January 2021. Finally the milestone process should apply to all space services in the frequency bands that were identified in the presentation. I am not going to list them all. Those that are form a consensus for maybe I will point out the other ones that some countries feel should be included and still be debated and that would be the C-band in particular, 3.4 to 4.2 gigahertz, 5.925 to 6.725 gigahertz. 20.2 to 22.1 and 42.5 to 43.5 gigahertz are also considered. As said which CEPT these are still being looked at and the list could change and again those are the views of some administrations in CITELE. At our next meeting in December we believe to receive specific proposals to articulate how this would be implemented. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much CITELE. RCC please.

>> OLGA DASHKEVICH: Thank you very much Mr. Chair. On bringing in to use we believe that the frequency assignments most live considered having been brought in to use that one space station with a confirmed capability of transmitting or receiving has been deployed on one of the notified orbital planes of the non-GSO satellite system. At present we have the need to identifying the RR in the continued spirit of 90 or less days of deployment of satellite in bringing in to use frequency assignments. We believe that orbital tolerance elements shall take in to account different orbits for non-GSO systems and

application of a system. On the second part of the issue, the procedures of the milestone based deployment approach, we support adoption of a new Resolution for FSS and MSS on the specific frequency bands. KU, KA, QV-bands. The current position of RCC does not contain specific time periods or the necessary percent of satellite deployment for each milestone. However in theory in identifying these criteria we plan to take in to account the need to prevent spectrum reservation by multi satellite systems which do not have real capability to implement the satellite constellation with notified characteristics. We believe that the procedure for the milestone based approach of deployment shall not be applied to frequency assignments to non-GSO satellite systems. Used for safety, of human life. Thank you very much.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much to the representatives of all regional organizations. This is a complicated issue and further effort will be required to be able to take a balanced and weight approach. Many people spoke about balance when developing such procedures. I think we should try to find this balance during the discussions at the conference so that the developed procedure can be efficient and does not create additional barriers for the use of such systems. Are there any questions? Comments? Or additional information? Iran you have the floor.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, sir. In the absence of any comment from our experts Mr. Vinnuk as you volunteered him to comment, I think this is another very complex issue like I said in 1.5 and we need to find some one victim for that in CPM. There are two victims. Having done that in the ITU-R Study Group. Maybe a consideration whether they are prepared to do that one, you need to find two quiet rooms and put these people together, closing the door. You are not allowed to come out until you come to some sort of arrangement that we discuss at the level of 600 or 1,000 people. You have to among them do something. There are many issues, transitional arrangement, entry in to force and many things. Applicability of frequency band so on and so forth. One comment that I have Mr. Chairman, is that if you want to modify radio regulations, please kindly be careful not to modify that which directly or indirectly affect the GSO. Otherwise you would be in a mess whether you cannot get rid of that. 1144, 13.6, dealing with the entire assignment. If you kindly do something you have to have additional 1144 or 15.6 specifically address this issue allowing the current procedure to continue because it is the result of the very, very tedious discussions. We have been able to do a solution for something. One thing that I suggest to the colleagues to work closely with each other. And to make utmost

effort traditional agreement without mobilizing people that may not have any project in the near future. To have more people to say yeah, we support this, we provide that. That does not help. The issue must be resolved among the concerned people, the players. Something you have done in the past and doesn't work. The UAS unmarked aircraft we brought to some countries. We didn't have any immediate interest. I have never seen any of those 15 countries, they have been forcefully pushing for position A, or position B. Let us work technically and as much as possible professionally. Mobilization of people again. The CPM should provide the ground for the conference. To provide opportunity for every player and not excluding one in favor of the other. To have preferred arrangement for everyone to allow these people to use it as in Article 44 effectively, efficiently and in a fair manner. This is something that should be very careful. The ball is in the camp of these players we have 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 players, some of them much bigger than the others. But some are the small players. So people should talk to each other and reach agreement. There is a room to bring these issues whether you have two years, four years, you have three years or milestone, fortunately we will be able to reduce several options to one single option thanks to the people that work on, the Chair of this group at the RTC. Perhaps he may be willing to continue if his administration allow him. There are many issues that we have. There is room to find. But I don't think that people should use this opportunity trying to exclude each other. They could provide possibility, opportunity to everyone in a fair manner to use this very new issues in future, maybe most of the GSO people they will convert to the non-GSO in the future. And sometimes you have terrestrial and then space and then -- and terrestrial come up and non-GSO is the top of everything. Find the solution for that and it is not an issue you postpone it for the next conference. This must be decided at WRC-19 to the maximum extent possible because it would create difficulties because the current rule is not fair. One satellite in one orbit protecting 1700, that may not be fair. So we have to find a solution. What solution? We need collaboration and cooperation and fairness really and above all we need also ethics. Ethics is very important. Trying to work with each other. Collaboration, this is African problem. I use it in the ICANN issue. If you want to go a short journey you can go alone. If you want to go a long journey you have to go together. Putting hand in hand and find a way. This is a very important work. Advice about distinguished African continent colleagues. Thank you, sir.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much for your comment. And for the proposals which we should make. Our proposal that

should be implemented during the conference, yes, to find a quiet place where we could gather together the experts and not to let them out until they take decision. Maybe this is exactly what we will do. Maybe it is best to send them to a nongeostationary orbit and not let them come back until they take the necessary decision as to how they should act. Yes, Iran you have floor.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. In 1977 for broadcasting satellite service we had Mr. Charles Amiroff from Kenya. You go to the room until you find a solution. Workable solution which could be discussed. That is the issue. And it is possible to do that. That was -- he was chairing that group in order to have resolved this very, very complex issue. There s a possibility that people working together it is not pleasing anyone but to give them a task and to go and come back with something that's workable. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. Are there any other comments on this issue? You have the floor.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So my name was mentioned. So I feel I should say a few things. It is interesting that one solution that was offered to lock people in a room until a decision is made. That's more or less what happened at WRC-12 when we were trying to decide on 90 day bringing in to use of I believe it was Wednesday evening of the fourth week when the heads of regional groups was locked in the basement CIG and we arrived at an agreement to select 90 days. There were many issues and yet we found solutions for all of them except for this one that had to be dep sided by heads of regional group. Because it is subjective. How do you prevent gaming the system or warehousing of spectrum. What period is sufficient to act as determinant to prevent people from doing this. And it is a subjective decision and it is the same here. When you look at that list of frequency bands which is there not agreement on the various frequency bands because it is subjective as to where you think this abuse or misuse may occur. And why are there so many different options for the different milestones? It is because it is subjective as to what are the implications of one year or two year or three year. What are the implications of 10% or 15% or 20%. It is difficult because it is not precise what the determination will be. By echo what Mr. Arasteh said earlier, there should be flexibility and everyone needs to be quite open to listening to the perspective of others and trying to find a fair solution. This is going to be a very difficult issue at the upcoming conference. There is no question but I think if people listen openly and objectively I think it will be possible to drive this to a consensus view before the end of the conference. But it will take a lot of discussion and the other

complication is that this issue was recognized as having a possible implication for systems that were brought in to use from the last conference to this coming conference and so the whole transitional aspect again you can see that there are subjective views on the implications of how you would implement transitional measures. Good luck to the volunteer who takes this at the conference. But when this started at 4A it was considerably more complicated than it is now. A lot of convergence until the start of the process to here and I am reasonably optimistic that the upcoming conference will be able to converge on a single solution. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much for such an evaluation of what we are doing and what we have done. I would like to give the floor to Mr. Adeli.

>> Thank you. Following the comments from Mr. Arasteh actually I had this response in mind but I didn't want to say it, but actually I do have a couple of victims in mind. I am not going to discuss them now. This one and 1.5 are going to be some specific difficulties during the CPM and probably the WRC as well. For the issue A I would like to echo Jack. Actually during some discussion I had with some colleagues even yesterday we pointed out to the specific difficulty that for this issue it is a bit unique, different than the other agenda items. There is no right or wrong. You have proposals. Everyone would like to have some sort of an equitable access. We all would like to achieve the same goal. It is just a matter of which of these options would best provide us with a goal that we would like to have. We are all looking for the same goal which is not to warehouse spectrum, to find the best middle ground for these systems, to operate and to come in to operations and life. My only request I think, of course, all of us have this target that we would like to facilitate the work of the WRC. We would like to see work moving forward and tasks completed during the WRC as soon as possible. One way of doing that is to try to ease down the agenda items during the CPM. So I know, I have a big task in front of me for the CPM, actually in front all of us during the CPM to try it as much as possible to simplify the methods and simplify the agenda items for the WRC. Now this is one of the issues everybody is accepting that it is going to be difficult. We know that it is going to be difficult in the WRC. So my request and maybe the request goes specifically to the victim that is in my mind, just to try as much as possible and we need to work very hard during the CPM in order to reduce the options as much as possible for this issue during the CPM. So when we go to the WRC we at least have some easier possibilities. We have lists of options to look at. Even with that I know we will be having difficult times. We will have to

work long hours. But let's spend these hours in the CPM. I would request everyone who would work on this thing to look at and try hard in the CPM. Thank you very much.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. Very accurate comments. Because how we manage our tasks during the second CPM session will determine how we will spend our time at the conference. I'm looking at the watch, we have a bit more than five minutes before the session comes to an end and we have only looked at two agenda items but I am very happy on these two agenda items we had a very good discussion. And I doubt we haven't wasted the time ahead of us. We have many agenda items that we have to consider. I would like to use another approach not to give the floor to all the representatives of regional organizations, but only to those which have a specific position, for example, on issue B who supports no change. This will allow us to move forward a bit faster. Although it doesn't mean that I think that we will do the -- we will complete our work in the next five minutes. Maybe I will ask to have additional time after lunch in order to be able to complete this session. So let's try to use this approach. Iran, you have the floor.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, sir. I always 99.99% agree with the Chairman always. But perhaps we not ask who is in favor of no change or not in favor of no change. Perhaps all those which are the most complex issues that you treat after lunch and not all of the issues which almost straightforward and we don't need to talk about that, at least here. But which are the most complex among those. There are a few. There 13 issues in this. Some of them are straightforward. A few of them complex. You may decide that at some time just address those complex issues to deal with Chairman. Something in the issue A I want to say at the last comment, Chairman there is no point that somebody is right or somebody is wrong. Everyone is right. Because they have views. They have objectives. The issue is that as the head of the German Delegation to the Plenipotentiary Conference, we came here to reconcile divergent views. That was a positive message from that administration. We should reconcile, that's the problem how to reconcile that situation. Everyone has their own position or interest. So there is a lot of interest. Many types of interest. But reconciliation is quite necessary. You mentioned also fairness. We should have fairness and opportunity to everyone else. That everyone excluding warehousing and coming to the effectiveness and efficient use of spectrum. Remaining agenda item 7 this may be -- which item you need to discuss. Some of them may not be subject to discussion because they are not complex. More or less straightforward. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. We only -- we have even less time left now. Let's move to issue B now. So issue B relates to application of coordination in the car band to determine coordination requirements between the FSS and other satellite services. Method B1 no change. Method B2 proposes the use of the coordination arc in order to determine the bands affected using coordination arc since the band 29.5 to 30 giga herd and 19.7 to 22 are used also in stations in the mobile platforms. And so there is a difference between mobile and fixed services is eliminated. This is why this proposal came -- has an emerged. So in order to do this in three minutes I understand that if I give the floor to everyone it will not be enough time. I will ask a very simple question, who among the regional organizations who among the representatives of regional organizations believes that we should not make changes to the radio regulations? I see that all -- everyone sympathize with method B2. Of course, various options or opinions are possible and we will look at them at CPM. The next section is a group of issues on which within ITU-R consensus was achieved and a single method was identified which is now contained in the CPM report. I would like to skip this block of issues as well if or unless the representatives of regional organizations or anyone in the room have -- has a question or questions on this issue.

Look how fast we are moving ahead. So next issue is more complicated. It is the identification of specific satellite systems with which coordination has to be effected. 912 and 912A and 913. We three methods. No change. Method 2, proposed to add changes to -- one second, please. So second method proposes for the list which is determined by the radio regulation bureau for satellite systems, networks to be final and binding. And the third method states that the list should be only for information.

And I would like to ask the interpreters for five more minutes in order to be able to finish this issue.

>> That's fine, sir. Very, five minutes is fine.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: I will now give the floor to the regional organizations. APT what do you think on this item D?

>> MUNEO ABE: Thank you. Concerning issue D, APT members support method D2 or D3. So we haven't yet -- D2 or D3 but we prefer D2 or D3. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much.

>> Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. The initial ASMG position is to support method D2 in the draft CPM report. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. African telecommunication union you have floor.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. ATU supports method D2 and we

take comfort in the fact that such approach will not increase the workload of the bureau by publishing lists. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. CEPT.

>> STEPHEN LIMB: Thank you. We support method D2 and similarly we understand that the bureau could implement this relatively quickly and easily. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you. CITELE.

>> CHANTAL BEAUMIER: Thank you. So CITELE has a draft inter-American proposal supporting D2 as well. Thank you.

>> OLGA DASHKEVICH: Thank you very much Mr. Chair. RCC country support method 2 for this issue. Thank you very much.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: I see that all regional organizations support method D2 and we have a goal at the CPM to -- in order to move towards the reducing the number of methods and this issue we can reduce at least one of the methods. With this I would like to complete this session because we will have a block of issues after this which will probably require more time for discussion despite the fact that there is one method in issue E and Mr. Philippe.

>> Next week, next work.

(Laughter).

>> PHILIPPE AUBINEAU: Thank you Nikolay and congratulations from this discussion this morning. Good progress made this time but still need for more discussion. So we will continue this session this afternoon at 2 p.m. for maximum of one hour 15 minutes. I hope you don't need more than because we have scheduled the closing session at a quarter to 4. So this is what I can give you for this afternoon. And if you finish earlier we will again a break and we will start earlier the closing session. So with that I would like to adjourn for this morning and would welcome you at 2 p.m. again here in this room. Have a good lunch. And see you this afternoon.

(Session concluded at 12:05 p.m. CET)

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

RAW COPY

2nd ITU INTER-REGIONAL WORKSHOP
ON WRC-19 PREPARATION

NOVEMBER 22, 2018

14:00 CET

Services Provided By:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
1-877-825-5234
+001-719-482-9835
www.captionfirst.com

This text is being provided in a rough draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

(Return from lunch break)

>> PHILIPPE AUBINEAU: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, welcome back to the last afternoon of the workshop. Let me put it this way.

While you are taking your seat, I will check the interpretation channels. English.

>> Good afternoon, sir.

>> PHILIPPE AUBINEAU: Sorry, I cannot follow the channels, I trust you are here. French? Spanish? Thank you. Number four, it is okay. Chinese? Thank you. And Arabic? Can you hear me well? Yes? Thank you.

So now we are ready to continue this discussion on agenda item 7. So please, Nikolay, you may go ahead, thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much, Philippe. We have just a few more issues left. Maybe a fewer than half in issues. I think that we should try not to extend this consideration too much, so that we can have time left for the conclusion of our

session. We stopped on issue E, resolution, related to our Appendix 30B. We have a single method. This method seeks to establish special measures to be applied once with respect to the submission received from an administration, having no frequency assignments, in the RR Appendix 30B list.

The aim of the measures is to facilitate for the administrations with new frequency assignments in the list. The work of such systems, so that they can ensure an economically viable Satellite service on their national territory.

One of the aims is the initial aim when developing the allotment plan in 1988. When this plan was established. The principle of this method is very similar to what was adopted with regard to the band 21-22 gigahertz and contains the same key elements. It is not a new approach, we have come across it before and have found a good solution. And I think that within this conference, we will obtain or at least we will find a good solution. So this is the brief presentation, and I would like to now give the floor, starting from my left, so to change the order. RCC, you have the floor.

>> RCC: Thank you, Mr. Chair, the RCC countries support the draft EPB, with the modified characteristics within the national borders of the notifying administration or for entering additional system to the list of frequency assignments. With a service area limited to a national territory for administrations without any assignments on the list. The position of the RCC countries is in line with the single method developed by the working party for AITUR. Thank you very much.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much, CITELE, you have the floor.

>> CITELE: There hasn't been much discussion so far, but certainly we support the working party agreement for a solution that more directly addresses the underlying concern of administrations having no network under the Appendix 30B list and to convert those into assignments.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much, CEPT.

>> CEPT: Thank you. My understanding is CEPT members were closely involved in the development of the proposed resolution under this issue in working party 4A. CEPT supports this resolution going forward. I think that is all I need to say, thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. African telecommunication union, please.

>> ATU: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is one of the difficult

discussions, and we thank the participants for the spirit of cooperation in coming up with the issue and method. We support the resolution as it appears. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. ASMG, please.

>> ASMG: Thank you, chairman, good afternoon to all. For this issue, the ASMG does not have a clear position yet. I just want to remind everyone that our last meeting was two meetings earlier to -- earlier than two meetings of 4A, so a lot of developments happened on this issue. I understand there is a unified solution, but hopefully our position will change during our next meeting. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. APT.

>> APT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, we don't have a present view either on this issue, because this issue was developed at the last working part 4A, we hope to change our views for next meeting. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. To the participants of our discussion, I would like to ask the room whether there are any opinions, comments, or additional questions that you would like to ask? Iran, please?

>> IRAN: There is two issues, formally called issue E and issue F, which called for comprehensive revision. After some discussion, we found it is too complex and takes a lot of time of the conference, we're not discussing whether the proposal are right or wrong, people are standing instead of comprehensive review, going back to something before 2007, we should ask what is the problem or difficulty. If that difficulty explained from 4A, it might be possible to find a solution. If after two meetings, the solution is found and that administration was convinced to assist conference not to bring this issue -- complex issue of overhauling or comprehensive revision of this 30B and just addressing the issue on the table. That was the conclusion of the working party 4A, there was unanimous discussion, no doubt a meeting like ASMG and APT not have time to look at that one, happen recently. Therefore, it is not happen. But acceptance of this would assist the conference that discouraging that conversation not to bring the issue if comprehensive revision be reached takes considerable amount of time of the meetings and the conference, would not be quite helpful, although it may resolve problem of some, may have problem for others. We find something to solve the problem of everybody, and that is something that we have. So we expect that others will share should and look at the matter

and extend possible charge to facilitate the task of the conference, thank you, Chair.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you, very much for this additional comment. And for clarifying the background of the issue. Yes, we should focus on a specific task and to resolve the specific difficulties countries encounter rather than looking broadly and trying to review everything. If we set a specific goal, of course, we will be able to achieve it. If there are no further proposals or requests for the floor, with your permission, I will move to the next agenda item, agenda item issue F, measures to facilitate entering new assignments into the RR Appendix 30B list. Under this issue, we have two methods. Traditionally one of the method is no change. Method F2N and method F1 in regard to the technical parameters, very similar to the previous issue, but while in issue E, this was a specific decision to help countries that encounter such difficulties, then here, this method is proposed use for all the administrations that use assignments in the RR Appendix 30B, method provides for reduction of coordination up from 7 to 6 degrees. I apologize to 7 degrees and 6 degrees for KU band and also provides for the introduction of PFD masks, similar to appendixes 30 and 38. It is not a new method. It was already considered at previous conferences. In the past, it hadn't received support and now it is considered as part of the plan. I will now give the floor to the representatives of regional organizations, RCC, you have the floor.

>> RCC: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. On issue F, RCC countries support method F2. So no change to annex 4 of Appendix 30B, thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. CITELE, please.

>> CITELE: Thank you, chairman. Within the issue -- on this issue, within CITELE, there are limited discussions. Some countries have stated they support the studies for the triggers, considering the technological truth and ensuring the protect of existing and future networks. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much, CEPT, please.

>> CEPT: Thank you, chairman. This was a CEPT proposal, needless to say, we support method F1. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. ATU.

>> ATU: Thank you, we support method 1.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. ASMG.

>> ASMG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is actually similar to the previous position that we had. I understand that almost there

is a consensus on the way forward but for the time being we don't have a clear position. And probably, much probably this is going to change during the next meeting. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. And APT, you probably have a similar situation?

>> APT: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman, we're in the same situation as ASMG.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. Unfortunately, it is not our fault that the timetables of the meetings of the organization is like this. I'm sure at the next meeting, you will hold in the very near future, you will consider this issue and not only this issue, but all the issues. Are there any additional comments? In the room, on issue F? This doesn't seem to be the case. Let's move to the next agenda item.

Issue G.

It's related to updating the reference situation for regions 1 and 3. For the Satellite networks that work in line with appendixes 30 and 30A. When provisionally recorded assignments are converted, enter definitive recorded assignments. So the record becomes definitive. Here we have three proposals, traditionally, one of them is no change. And the two others that allow to a certain extent to convert the temporary record into a definitive record, under various conditions.

So I will give the floor now to the RCC. RCC, you have the floor.

>> RCC: On issue 3, RCC supports method G, so no changes to the regulations. Thank you very much.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you, very much. CITEL, you have the floor.

>> CITEL: On this issue, we have draft point of personal privilege for -- draft proposal for no change. We know it was before a specific focus on regions 1 and 3. You can say in a way of what we have currently in the documents from CITEL, that is a bit outdated and superseded by the new focus for the issues in regions 1 and 3. So I think actually while I have the floor, I will make a note to Philippe Aubineau that we will need to update the presentation we have for CITEL. I have noticed for a number of issues are missing or some are not reflecting the latest version of the output document. We will be publishing a revision. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. Very useful clarification, because, yes, many organizations find themselves in a difficult situation because the last working party in a meeting

looked at and reconsidered the issues and it is very important to understand what the position of the regional organization is. Nonetheless CPT, you have the floor.

>> CPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the list, we support method G1, thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. ATU, please.

>> ATU: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, we support the current situation with the updated, only when the PR is informed that there is a recommend. I would like to see a provision for dot 1 and dot 18, to reflect this view. Which is RG1.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you. ASMG, you have the floor.

>> ASMG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, we're in favor of G1 for this issue. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. And APT, please, you have the floor.

>> APT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. APT yet hasn't reached a unified view on this issue. So APT members support further studies of the possible modification of paragraphs 4.1.18 and 4.1.18B of appendixes 30 and 38. Without adversely affecting the plan while taking into account the implication of the modification on the assignment of the list. This is a current view. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. Are there any questions or comments? Iran, you have the floor.

>> IRAN: Thank you, we are new in this matter. If you allow me, we express technical and professional views. Chairman, I don't believe that we should go and touch 4118 and 4118 plus. I'm sorry to my European countries, at WRC-2000 when the plan of region 1 and 3 was adopted. They wanted the same procedures identical to 1141 of the regulation allowing people get into the database -- clear into the database with some uncoordinated process, waiting for some time for complaint, so on, so forth. I don't think technically it is possible to quantify interference, it is impossible. I don't think that we should get into that type of thing. If it is a problem, we have to find another problem. But not to solving something you create another problem. So technically, proficiently, as I have looked at this since 1977, in charge of the plan 1997, first revision, 2000 main revision, so on, so forth, I do not recommend that you try to quantify 4.118 nor get into the necessity otherwise to retain that in the Appendix 30 here. You will get difficulty, problems and so on and may have a negative impact also in the Article 11 of the

regulation and many other things. You have to find some other solution. We're not pointing toward any measure. Please consider this is a technical view chairman. I spend many years on this the appendixes so on, so forth. In charge of that and many things, we know that the secretary of the meeting, we know top officials and other things, not how difficult this issue 4118 is. Impossible to quantify. Another issue with that is that worked out many years in the preparation of the software, so on. Many others, I will not just single out one or two, for the risk. There are many other experts, if possible, please don't touch 4118, please, thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you. It is easier to explain in English, I will explain in English. Few technical details. During the last four -- almost 20 years, fall in the 118. It means if you follow this way, the reference situation will be not correct because networks are operational, however they're interfering effect is not reflected in the reference situation. It means that reference situation is false. Some administration may consider they have relatively good reference situation. In reality, it is very negative, because those networks that applied for 118, they're not taken into account.

It is additional information, technical.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much for the additional technical information. Are there any other comments? This doesn't seem to be the case. We will now move to the next issue. Issue H. Issue H seeks to amend Appendix 4. In order to include new amended data that provided to Satellite systems that are not under the coordination procedure of Section 2, Article 9. We have one single method here. I will not describe it. Because everything is quite clear here. In my opinion. And I think that all regional organizations in the end will agree with the fact that these changes will need to be made. Of course, not everybody has considered it. Some will need to do so, but I hope that on this issue there will be consensus. You will have unity, not only this issue, but there is another issue. So next issue, issue I. Linked to the changes to Appendix 4. It is also only one single method proposed.

So we have issue H. I apologize, I chose the wrong slide. So issue H, issue I, issue L, and that's it. So we have three more issues

that are dedicated to changes to Appendix 4, specifically in relation to characteristics. I don't think we need to give the floor to all regional organizations. I don't think anybody would be angry with me if we skip all of the issues. It is true, they reflect the technical aspects without which it would be very difficult for us to carry out calculations also, recommendations 1503 in the new version. So this is something that we need to adopt.

The next issue we'll touch upon, having skipped these, is issue J. It is related to PFT limit set in section 1, Annex 1.

Of RR Appendix 30. We have two methods. The traditional method, no change and the method which proposes to allow countries exceed the PFT limits within their national territory in order for Appendix 30 to allow for services to use all the spectrum of modern technology. We will change the order a little bit, so everybody is on the ball. So let's change the order. APT, please, you have the floor.

>> APT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Concerning issue J, our preliminary review is to support further studies at this stage. When we discussed this matter in March of this year. So at the next meeting, our interview will improve drastically, I think. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. ASMG, you have the floor.

>> ASMG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Similarly, I think the official ASMG position, if you see it is supporting the second method. And following other studies which have changed apparently, after the last working party meetings. So I think the position would be updated during our next meeting. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. ATU, you have the floor.

>> ATU: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, the preliminary review on this issue is J2, no change. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much, CEPT, you have the floor.

>> CEPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, we're the same as APT at the moment. We're still studying the issue, so our position is to support further study.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. CITELE, please.

>> CITELE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. CITELE is in the same position as APT, we're conducting studies and waiting for that to conclusion or wait on other positions before we can affirm.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. RCC.

>> RCC: Thank you RCC countries at this stage support method J2 of the draft report. No change to radio regulations. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. Are there any additional questions or comments? This doesn't seem to be the case. We can now move to agenda item 7, issue K. Difficulties for part B examinations. Appendix 30, 30A and relevant portion of Appendix 30B. We have one method here, not with the characteristics of the network should be taken into account, but the characteristics included in the plan. Often the process is lengthy. If the initial characteristics, for example, of the network have a global coverage zone entering the discussion, the zone was reduced and finally registered -- only the coverage zone which consists of several countries is registered, then it will lead to an improvement in the -- in the implementation of the examination, and will make it possible to -- for the list to include new networks as well. I will give the floor to the APT.

>> APT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Our view is as follows. APT members support further consideration of the method developed at the meeting of working party 4A in October, 2017. So we need a little more time to finalize our views on this issue. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. ASMG, please.

>> ASMG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, first, I would like to first congratulate the chairman of the working party responsible for agenda item 7, Mr. Jack, because the last one, there are a lot of developments and consensuses were reached where we did not catch during the last meeting. Even for this issue, I see there is a single method. Unfortunately for us, we did not take a final decision. So the decision has to be taken after our next meeting. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. ATU, you have the floor.

>> ATU: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, ATU support the single method as proposed in the draft. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much, CEPT.

>> CEPT: Thank you very much. Similarly we support that when the examination under part B is done, it should be under two steps. That refers to the single methods that we support, thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you, CITELE, please.

>> CITELE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, within CITELE, we have a preliminary proposal that aligns perfectly with the single method in the draft CPM text. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you. RCC, please.

>> RCC: Thank you, Mr. Chair, on issue K, RCC supports the single method that is brought by the working party of ITU-R.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. I think that this method will complement the collection of methods on which we have agreed and will facilitate our work both to the CPM and at WRC. Are there any further questions, requests for the floor? It doesn't seem to be the case. We'll move to the next issue, issue L was already discussed. And we saw that it has to definitely be included. And the last issue we have is issue M. Simplify the regulatory regime for non-GSO Satellite systems with short duration missions. There is only one single method here. It is proposed to adopt a new resolution. Together with regulatory regime for such systems it will be a bit more simple, because systems operate from one to three years, no more than three years, at least. And often, following difficult procedures that are contained in Article 9 and 11, will be difficult where if the procedure itself is up to seven years, but the procedures are half as long. It is proposed in the draft resolution. I would like to give the floor to APT to tell us about their attitude towards this resolution. Thank you.

>> APT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Issue M is quite a new issue. So we didn't have an opportunity to discuss this issue, and we will generate our position at the next meeting. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. I feel a bit guilty because I understand that this is a completely new issue, which was just adopted at the last session, I guess we'll now hear very response question -- response from the ASMG and from ATU. Am I wrong?

>> ASMG: Well, from the ASMG, there is no objection for having the resolution. But of course, as the resolution has been newly proposed, we have to look at the details of the resolution to have a final position on the details of the resolution as this is something completely new, as we said. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. I feel a bit better now, yes. ATU, you have the floor.

>> ATU: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I beg to differ with some of my colleagues about the issue being new. Some of us will recall that this was brought in 2015. We wanted it to be a stand-alone agenda item, but it was decided it can be addressed under working party 4A. And at working party 4A, there was a multicountry proposal, mainly from Africa, to develop this resolution. And we've glad that you have reached the stage that you have this to consider. So we support

this new resolution. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much, CEPT, you have the floor.

>> CEPT: Thank you, we support the draft framework and the principles in the resolution and associated regulatory regime, and we will set out what those are. The stop of the Space Station in case of harmful experience. And KPI and corresponding location should be accurate and complete regarding orbital perimeters and carriers. Four-month period shall not be changed. And API limited to a number of satellites, 10 is the maximum number, shall not be duplicated or reused. It is not possible to extend the period of validity beyond three years. Because of long story short, we support the regulatory framework. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much, CITELE, please.

>> CITELE: Thank you, chairman. At CITELE, mentioned before, the working party 4A, ended the day before CITELE's meeting. We did not discuss this issue. We suspect we would be in a similar position as was expressed by ASMG, probably not objection in principle, but we need to look at the detailed resolution.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. And in conclusion, RCC, please.

>> RCC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. RCC countries had time to meet after the working party 4A meeting and discuss issue M. We support ITR resolution and would not like to modify provisions so far of Article 9 of the IR. We're still studying the procedure of submitting data to the nonconsenting GSO with short duration missions, not subject to the coordination procedure, under section 2 of RR article 9. And possible measures to prevent possible interferences to existing and planned assignments. Given the mechanisms on providing commentaries to publications, by operators of Satellite services, we're in favor of maintaining four-month period for comments by the administration after publishing API for simplified regulatory regime for non-GSO systems on short duration missions.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. I see that there is support for this area, we'll need to work to facilitate this. Are there any other questions from the participants of the workshop? Iran, you have the floor.

>> IRAN: Thank you, sir. Yes, I think all of the views we have heard is positive with respect to the resolution. I think coming from the African colleagues and African colleagues are among these

developing countries. And there are more than 10 or 11 times in the Article 1 of the constitution that therefore to assist in the developing countries to achieve the objectives. Many points raised by colleagues including RCC and CEPT, to see if there is resolution and find refinement in order to meet those things. I think it is the unique method, perhaps we can proceed with that and see if there is a need to define it, in order to achieve the objective of colleagues. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. If there are no further questions, I would like to tell you, with great pleasure that this is the last issue we will be considering in our session. I would like to thank all the participants for the discussion. Not only those who are sitting here in the podium, but also those who are connected and part of the room. I would like to thank Philippe Aubineau who organized this discussion. Iran, you have the floor.

>> IRAN: Thank you, sir. We're pleased that under your leadership, which is now a member, we have gone through all of the things. We thank you very much for your knowledge, competence. And we wish to congratulate Mr. Jack -- some call him Mr. Jack, some people say Jack, the ease of adoption -- not adoption, but going to all of these things, really, as a result of his efforts, devotion and to the systems and hard work has done. I hope -- yes, I hope that we will benefit from his experience during the CPM to helping our brother Khalid Al Awadhi and other situations that we receive as possible and arrangements so forth. Mr. Chairman, being in the Working Party 4A, it is one of the important working parties, it mostly started with the efforts of John Danski (sp) many years ago, '71 and so on, so forth. Continued by two chairman only.

Mr. Rhythm, Mr. Reed and Mr. Wingnuk. (sp) These are the top experienced people on the efforts. We need to get help on their experience and to achieve the objectives, not have difficulties here. We have sufficient difficulties, more may be some of the other issues including the director, maybe also defer to that group, Mr. Jack has a lot of experience in that, and we express our appreciation and ask colleagues to have a round of applause for him. Thank you.

(Applause)

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much. I think the applause is the general support of what -- for what was said. I would like to interrupt -- I would like to say a few addition words of gratitude to a person, Nelson Marguerite, secretary of the Working Party 4A, who spent a lot of sleepless nights and weekends when we worked on

the text on item 7 and others. Thank you very much. I will give the floor now to Philippe.

>> PHILIPPE AUBINEAU: Thank you very much, I would like you to join me to applaud all the panelists we had this morning and this afternoon to present this complex information on chapter 3. So thank you very much for all those explanations and clarifications. Now, ladies and gentlemen, we are reaching the end of this workshop. And I have been requested if we may quickly turn to the closing session. So what I suggest is we have a very short break of five minutes, just to give time for our panelists to come to the podium for the closing session. And then we will start the closing session. So five minutes break now. And then if I may invite, so thank you again for all of you, I would like to invite panelists for the next session, closing session. Thank you, again.

(Break)

>> KHALID AL AWADHI: The only thing I can say by now is I hope that the workshop was as useful as we were anticipating it to be. I'm very glad and appreciative of everyone. And all who participated in the workshop. I would like to thank all the moderators during the workshops and the regional group representatives. I think during three days, we tried to cover the full story of the cycle of what happened, what discussions were made, what studies were made, it is a conclusion, but we tried as much as possible to make it as short as possible during the three days. For that, I thank everyone that participated in arranging and participation in this workshop. So in our panel today, at the end of the workshop, we have our dear director of the bureau, Mr. Francois Rancy and we have the chairman of the regional groups I would like to -- I would like for the panel to discuss a couple of things. In fact, I had in mind, I had some questions that I had -- I think it is good to hear from the representatives or the chairman of the regional groups regarding the workshop. So the first thing I really had -- I really wanted to discuss or open the discussion for is about this workshop, how it was. And how you think the conclusion of the workshop was, what was the conclusion, what was the result, what benefits? What topics or what specific subjects or agenda items you believe that you could find some sort of convergence, some sort of understanding and some sort of closed positions or closed understandings between the regional groups, what benefit you got ultimately from this workshop. At the same time, while discussing this, probably it is also a good

idea to discuss also what improvements we can have. As you know, from our schedule for the workshop, we have a third inter-regional workshop to be conducted next year just before the conference. We would really love to have the best benefit out of these workshops. So it is a good idea to hear from the regional groups, what ideas they have, what improvements they think could be done in our third workshop. Of course, the situation for this workshop is totally different than that one. And here, as you saw, some of the regional groups did not have the final positions as maybe their meetings were earlier than the final meetings of the responsible groups. And certainly, before the production of the draft CPM report. So maybe we did not have clear positions and clear understandings of each other's positions of the topics.

Next time it will be after the CPM, it will be after the final CPM report is done. The regional groups will have a clearer understanding what positions they have, how they think the best solutions are to resolve the agenda items. So these are the questions I would love our panel here -- kind panel to respond to. If you would allow me, I would first give the floor to the regional groups Chairman to respond to that.

So, please, if I give it to the Chairman of APT, you have the floor, please.

>> APT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, still, my voice is very bad. Forgive me. And I hope my contents of voice is not bad. Number one, I appreciate that we all prepare the organizers of the workshops. Also the chapter Rapporteurs. It is some magic that they are summary of 780 pages of CPM report within a couple of slides. It is like magic. It is very concise informations for us. So I appreciate that Rapporteurs.

Number two, I also found that views and comments from the floor was wonderful. It provides additional values to the chapter Rapporteur's information and also other regional group's preparations. Number 3. I appreciate particularly the chapter 4 Rapporteur, that report shows which method. I think that next workshops, the regional groups would be very well prepared with the chapter Rapporteurs may identify more easily which group support what part. And probably the discussions rather than repeating what our position would be as indicated in the document. Then the third workshop would identify what is the most difficult area and how we deserve that area, doing that we see 19.

So probably, I believe each regional group would be ready in the third

workshops to discuss that area as well. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL AWADHI: Thank you very much. I also -- maybe I apologize. We can discuss all of the things I have at once. So one last thing, probably if you can provide us, as well, with what plans and what coming activities or what final words you have as a Chairman of the APT, what is your region is planning to do in this coming period, please.

>> APT: Thank you. APT has a plan to meet two times from now before the WRC. We will meet in January in Korea and in Japan before the WRC in August. So I hope our regional group prepare everythings for the WRC-19 between those two occasions.

>> KHALID AL AWADHI: Sorry, I have to make this comment. When I was at school, if your family name starts the beginning the first letter of the alphabet, you are in trouble. (Chuckling) You are always the first person. I apologize for that. But this is how it goes. So ASMG, please. The same questions, if you could kindly provide us with the responses from your side, please.

>> ASMG: Thank you very much, Chairman. I think that the difficulties that I'm facing are less than those which APT is facing on behalf of the Arab group, I would like to firstly convey my gratitude to Rapporteurs of each of the chapters, which enabled us to follow the studies within the working parties and the study groups, and to make the -- all the endeavors necessary to order to bring forward the results in a clear manner. To feed into the CPM report. Also, I would like to point out that this workshop has allowed us to better understand the solutions which are -- have been put forward, turning to the relevant agenda items and to understand the different points of view under these agenda items, and to understand the outcomes of these studies. So all of this is part of the draft CPM report. With a view to understand the objectives of other regional groups through their proposals whilst hoping that this work will allow all of us to address the different opinions and to reach balanced outcomes during the WRC.

We would hope that at the next workshop here in agreement with APT, that we would hope that we would really emphasize and underscore these agenda items where divergence exists in order to better understand the reasons for this divergence. And are hoping to reach solutions. Our next meeting will have two more meetings for the WRC, the first one will take place in December between the 19th and 13th of December in Amman and Jordan. And the last meeting of the Arab group will take place between the CPM and WRC, but we don't have a confirmed

date for the meeting. Thank you, Chair.

>> KHALID AL AWADHI: Thank you, sultan, for the words. Representative for ATU, please share your thoughts on these questions.

>> ATU: Thank you, chairperson, it seems like we're reading from the same book. Perhaps a meeting. Because I want to want to fully agree with APT and ASMG that for the workshop, particularly the third one, we are hoping that all the regions sort of positions, if not same positions, when they will be level, will have been known and therefore, that workshop will focus on agenda items for which we seem to have divergence. Therefore, I would like to plea with all the regions to try and make known their documents to the bureau so perhaps the chapter Rapporteurs can have the time, ample time to do quick analysis to see where we seem to agree and where we seem to be a distance apart. And to try and therefore conduct the regional representatives in good time to alert them that perhaps the sessions would focus on this and not the other agenda item. That way, we may get the benefit of looking behind what is written on paper to try and see what kind of reasoning, for example, APT took, in order to arrive at this position.

So that will be my plea, exactly what APT and sang -- ASMG have said so far. The outlook of this was good in my personal opinion. Speaking on behalf of region, we had a few where we agree, and we had a few of where we seem to be a distance apart.

For example, the sticky issue of the out of band mission, the 26 band and agenda 113 still seem to be a sticky issue. I hope and pray from their region we should perhaps try and endeavor to sort of arrive at a single value as soon as we can. So that when we go to Egypt, the burden will not be placed on the conference to find that magic number. Let us try to find that magic number in good time. That will be our prayer.

The final words, two for one is the -- we continue to request for good will as we compromise on solutions as you know, it is quite difficult for two people with two different views to agree on something, if indeed there is no good will behind them. So that would be our plea.

Regarding our final steps to final check, we will have the two working groups, which are of adversarial nature, to our decision-making meetings, which are the African preparatory meetings for WRC-19, yes, we will have such a gathering in the working groups gathering, in good time before the final African preparatory meeting.

You will be informed in good time, discussions of what they recommend, with the most country, at least we know the host country will be South Africa. The discussions are about to conclude and therefore, you will be advised in good time. The PR also for the regions. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL AWADHI: Thank you very much for these nice words and comments. Now I move to the CPM representatives. Please, if you can give us your comments on the issues -- CEPT. It is 3:00 p.m., sorry.

>> At least three characters.

>> CEPT: I would like to apologize for Mr. Alexander who could not be here. I am taking his position for that. I short look back on this meeting in general. The meeting is presented by all regions, all organizations. All industries and interested parties. And the ITU provided the meeting so we could exchange our views in the different panels, but also to exchange views outside of the planned sessions. And that has been done via good leadership of the chapter Rapporteurs. And towards this kind of meetings are very important. The ITU is in total planning three different inter-regional workshops, to which they have all their own value. I would take up the first one, and I would like to pick up the word you used in the beginning of the time, Khalid. It is to burden understand the agenda items and to meet the people behind the agenda items. And the third session, the last one, all positions are developed. And by that time, it will be processed as contributions to the CBD. We would like to take into account the final positions of the regions and the expectations of the other stakeholders. And furthermore, we hope that ITU is providing, as they did during the last cycle, the last workshop, to provide us with an overview and metrics overview, in which it can simply see by calling of the region's positions of the CPM manages and then we can see if they're in line or not. So the more green lines, the better. I sincerely do hope we end up slightly before WSC to have all green lines in the methods. To achieve that, this meeting being the second one, could be the most important one. Our primary views and our positions are in developing mode, but are more mature than in the first session. But we haven't finalized the position yet. There is space to move. We need to research and study. We need to negotiate, we need to work ourselves via CPM towards the WRC. I'm sure this is an accelerator to prepare ourselves for the upcoming CPM meeting, even in experience to the planned regional meetings to see if we can confer on views prior.

We have done a lot of work. We will assess the same kind of difficulties.

Concerning the point on convergence, yes, that is a constant goal where we aim to the final solutions to bring us to leaders of the WSC and all based, basically on consensus. Basically, we like to raise a question. Concerning the CPM methods we have available now, in all six languages, do we really need all the proposed CPM methods? Is there a possibility to reduce? Some methods seem to have the same objectives and are only diverging in the wording used. CPT would endorse any proposal, any effort in that direction in the preparation of the CPM.

Another point I would like to raise is highlighted on the first day, the ultimate goal, for us, is that we like to gain from the new allocations, at the same time, we have to take into account the protection of the existing services. With that, I would like to echo what is said by Alexander Khun (sp) and you also Francine. We need to look at the issues. We are always looking forward to change our views and positions as we have during this workshop and we will do during the upcoming meetings and during CPM. Tuesday, next week, we'll start our next CPG meetings and we have two more CPG meetings planned for next year. One is planned to be taken place in Sweden, 20-24 of May. And the possible location of the Russian Federation at the end of August, to be presided 26 through 30 of August. You are more than welcome to participate. The upcoming meeting we will expect to finalize the first EPT, and the rest is divided between the remaining sessions. Thank you to all including Philippe Aubineau for the organization of the workshop, and thank you for all attending.

>> KHALID AL AWADHI: Thank you for your work and those words and thank you for the participation. Everyone should try to reduce as possible the number of methods for the agenda items. CITELE, you have the floor.

>> CITELE: Thank you, Khalid. Referring to what you said about your comment about school, I also learned that you're further behind on the list at school, because some things are said by colleagues already. No need to say more than to echo their comments. I would like to add the following. This workshop has really helped the administrations which I would like to underscore a couple of points. We have shared a number of visions in this room, with regard to which agenda items might be able to be resolved in domestic, national level,

and which agenda items are not able to be resolved in this way and if there is a need to make changes to the legislations to ensure an agenda item is resolved. I think this is something that is really relevant and really an interesting point to hear the different positions of it from the regions and from those administrations who have participated in this workshop. I think there is a really interesting to review these positions during the period to the conference and within the regional groups as well.

Something else I think is important to emphasize seems to be a convergence on different agenda items in terms of protecting the incumbent services which are currently in use. I think this is very relevant for the administrations, regions and CPM itself to determine and find which are the protection measure levels for the services and how can we reach regional consensus, firstly. And also the possibility of finding international consensus as well.

We also heard some positions on the agenda items where there has been a tendency towards convergence such as no change. And this is also very important to analyze further for administrations below the agenda items might be able to result early on in the WRC.

With regards to recommendations for the next workshop, I think that what my colleague from the ATU said with regards to comparisons. There is additional work that the Rapporteurs can do, including work which might be coordinated with the BR. I think at the moment, the functions work very well. At the third workshop, we will have already had the CPM. We would have had our regional meetings as well. And I think they will have more certainty when putting forward the regional proposals to the conference. And in this vain, as my CPT colleague said, I hope that during the proprietary conference, we can reduce the number of methods currently in existence in the draft CPM text.

And CITELE is also ready and stands ready to collaborate with other regions. Our aim is to reduce the number of options and methods that we have within the draft CPM text. CITELE has three further meetings in the future. The next will take place in Brazil in two weeks' time. We'll have a further meeting, beginning -- actually, beginning of April, in year, with regards to the CITELE procedure, this is the last meeting where members can submit new proposals with regards to the agenda. Finally, the last meeting you will have which will take place in Canada, August next year, and as CITELE, we would then hope to have consensual regional proposals in place before the WRC. On behalf of CITELE, I would like to convey my gratitude to Philippe

Aubineau for the organization of this workshop and Mr. Francois Rancy for the collaboration, which he has shown us to hold the workshops. I think they're always very useful for all the members of the ITU. I would also like to send the greetings of Mr. Carmelo Rivera a representative of the CITEEL region for the WRC preparation. He was not able to attend this meeting, however, he does send you all his warm greetings. I would like to thank Khalid for chairing and leading the issues for CPM and WRC.

>> KHALID AL AWADHI: Thank you Jose, for the words. Thank you for the thoughts and ideas you have given us. Glad everybody is share the same commonalities, there is a lot of commonalities on future workshops. I believe that the bureau is taking note of the ideas to be taken into consideration.

I would give also the floor to my friend, Mr. Albert Nalbandian to provide the last words from the RCC.

>> RCC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to note that this workshop should be considered in the context of WRC-19 preparation, which started immediately after the end of WRC-15. In many ways, the fact that we'll note that a lot of positive things were done that allows us to move forward towards the conference with a positive result is the outcome of the first session under your leadership planning the report finding Rapporteurs for the chapters, so on, so forth. I will answer immediately to the question, my vision. If we come back to the school issue, last person on the list it is easier for them always because the first ones have already said everything. All I can do is join what they said.

So I'm convinced -- of course not everybody will agree with me that three methods are enough to describe any issue that we're considering at the conference. If when we have eight methods or more, certain issues arise and we need to allocate time to understand these issues. So the appeal that we had here that we should look critically at the ability of methods and to make a choice. So what has been done up to now?

As a result of intensive studies, and a lot has been said about, this at present we have a draft report. The draft report allows us to make plans in terms of preparing proposals or general proposals as has become a tradition here. In this context, the tradition that has developed in terms of organizing three workshops is a very welcome. We shouldn't forget about this tradition. We should continue it in the future. At present, we have the results of studies which we work with. And in this context, this current meeting will

assist all those who have participated. And the participants of our meeting in turn will report to the administrations and organizations about the work that has been done. So in this regard, I think the success of our meeting is clear. And I think there is not much to it say about this, but under your leadership, distinguished Chair, with the help of the bureau headed by Mr. Francois Rancy and of course Philippe Aubineau, what needs to be done? Of course, at present, in all administrations and regional organizations, of course, as well, work is being done to clarify the positions of work being completed. So time has come to formulate proposals or general proposals which we can only start to do -- we cannot complete these without the draft report being approved. So the CPM report will be used as reference material to prepare proposals in the regional organizations. Just like other organizations, we plan to hold several meetings.

The first meeting will be in January, it will be dedicated to the preparation of the second CPM session.

Possibly there will be contributions from our organizations, and here, we are pleased to note, we are in favor of clarifying the procedure for the agenda under agenda 7 and 9 or rather 9.1.

Furthermore, first of March, we'll have a final version of the CPM report. Now using this document, and on the basis of course of domestic interests, the administration proposals will be prepared. These proposals, of course, once they're made, will need to be compared to the proposals of other regional organizations or administrations, we have planned to hold another meeting before the start of the conference.

So all of this, this whole procedure, which is similar to those of other regional organizations, and between these regional meetings there will be regional meetings where there will be other participants. No limitation on who can participate. I would hope at the conference we can at least count on the fact that certain number of issues -- and there are many of them -- that we can start with a green paper, so to speak, and at the end of the conference, we can declare, there is only one method for certain issues and everybody agrees to them. But still a lengthy procedure is needed in order for final acts to be concluded.

I wish everybody every success. I would like to thank all the organizers, and I conclude here. Thank you so much.

>> KHALID AL AWADHI: Thank you very much for the Chair of the RCC region. I'll give the floor to the ASMG representative.

>> ASMG: I would like to thank you for giving the floor, and for the representative that was not able to attend our final meeting. Y on behalf of Heim -- him and the Arab groups, I would like to thank you for this and unify the opinions as much as possible in order to end the work for the next conference. I would like to thank Mr. Philippe Aubineau, the consultant that has worked hard to prepare the works at the radio sector and organized this distinguished workshop.

I would also like to convey a special thanks to Mr. Francois Rancy for all the contributions made during the past eight years in the radio sector and his attempt to help the managers and members to achieve their interests and to facilitate the work of introducing modern radio telecommunication technology for the various radio services that contribute to contributing countries and unify countries. We hope much success to Mr. Francois Rancy in the future at a personal and professional level.

Finally, on behalf of the Arab group and the UAE, we would like to thank the head of the CPM for the contributions made since the first meetings of the preparatory work in 2015 until this very minute. And we wish him Mr. Chairperson, we wish you much success in managing the upcoming period next February. Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

>> KHALID AL AWADHI: Thank you for the kind words and for your thanks and thanks are also presented to the Arab spectrum management group. I would be in success for that support, which is continuous and which is presented to carry out the tasks we have been given. I will give the floor to Mr. Francois Rancy for any -- for thoughts on the same topics, definitely, and any further topics you would provide us, please.

>> FRANCOIS RANCY: Yes, I think from the previous intervention, I think there is a unanimous view that we need to continue these type of workshops. And that they're extremely useful and something we will do next year, I think it is for next year and before the conference itself that we have the opportunity for a final round of informal interactions between the various regional groups. I would like to thank those that have done a good job in preparing the workshop. I guess we should applaud him and thank him.
(Applause)

I think we can see that this workshop is very important step in the process of preparing for the radio conference. We should keep in

mind that the process of the WRC is the process by which we produce new regulations which is the framework for radio communications by giving a very clear framework, but even more importantly by making sure that when we make modifications, the investments which have been made in previous years on the previous regulatory regulations will not be threatened by the changes we make.

Therefore, by the fact that we make our decision on consensus at the conference and on the basis of incredibly detailed and extensive studies, which gives summarizes this information, summaries and recommendations, lets everybody in the world trust that the regulations will continue to provide the right framework to invest in World Radio Communications and make long-term investments.

So it is what we need to always keep in mind when we discuss today is that to establish trust and confidence in the regulations, we have to establish trust and confidence between all of us. And to make all possible efforts to understand each other, to even once we have adopted the regional proposal or positions, we have even more so to continue to try to understand why is it that others do not agree with us.

And I think it is entering the beauty of the process, is that over the years, you build trust with other delegates in a constantly changing environment. I think it is the beauty and the reason for success of the process.

So I think we should all be proud that we are part of continuing to make this process relevant after 112 years of success. An ominous development of radio communications. And as my second mandate is now approaching to its end, I would like to tell you how much honored and pleased I was to support your efforts and serve you in carrying out the duties as I was in the previous 20 years to be part of it and to be sitting in your place and as I said, trying to understand why the others disagree with me.

The fact that they're not crazy or stupid, as you can think, but there are good reasons, and it is up to you to understand them.

So with this, I would like to wish you all the best in preparing for the WRC-19. I will retire at the end of next month, but I will stay in Geneva. So if you come to Geneva say hello. I would be very glad to see you again. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

One last, but important thing is that I am very pleased that my deputy, Mr. Mandia Mchunu has been elected as my successor. I'm sure he will continue to serve you well in this process. Thank you

very much.

(Applause)

>> KHALID AL AWADHI: Thank you very much, Francois, for this nice and touching words, actually.

Please allow me, also, personally, to thank you Francois for the big support that all of us have received from your sight, including myself during this last period of my work with the bureau. I have got a big support. I have got great ideas I have seen. I have seen a brilliant example in front of me on how to deal with different issues, specifically when there are ambiguities or complexities in the urgent items. I have seen how you tackle these issues. I've seen even that advices you provide for the Chairman of any specific conference or even study groups to tackle these difficult situations.

So allow me personally to really thank you and as you said, hopefully we are going to see you at least whenever we come to Geneva, you will be there, and we are hopefully going to be in touch in these coming years.

Also, if you allow me at this time, also to continue to thank all of you for the participation in this workshop. I'd like to -- I'd like to thank my region. I would like to thank the Chairman of the region. I would like to thank all the chairmen of the regional groups and the leaders for the participation in the workshops.

I would like to thank Mr. Philippe Aubineau for the huge efforts when it came to preparing for the workshop and the workshop and during the whole period that passed. He provided me with big support.

For the coming period, I would really look forward to working with Mario. I've been dealing with him -- we have all been dealing with him for the past period and we will continue to do so in his new responsibilities. I really look forward for his support during the coming CPM 2. I'm sure we are going to have great collaboration together. So I look forward to work with him in the CPM and after the CPM as well, during the coming period.

With that, I would like to thank all of you, and this session is concluded. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

Thank you very much. I would like to give the floor -- the floor, to Mr. (Indiscernible) you have the floor.

>> The participants like us also share and something to say. First of all, we thank you Mr. Al Awadhi for the leadership have you taken and also the leadership elect, as the existing role of deputy

director and in the future role. Listen to us careful leave to what we are expecting from him. Thanking the regional organization, the moderators, those representatives from regions that have actively contributed to the better understanding of the matter. Something I need to mention that the CEPT mentioned about the options, perhaps we need to be reminded maybe we need to modify resolution 2, the options and what options you have and what to do with all the options in the future. That is something we have to do.

Distinguished colleagues, as a participant, it is difficult to single out one of many, very difficult. I don't think that we can not do this. Philippe Aubineau is a dedicated, skilled competent person, a lot of devotions, not only actively contributed to this workshop, but he is during the bulk of the preparation of the CPM itself. And WRC. I have never seen any Secretary like Philippe Aubineau. He reads all the documents, all. And said he sees some slight discrepancies and friendly manner they allow him to make the editorial or make something to advocate the document. I think we have a lot of work before the CPM and WRC, it is very difficult. He's -- I would say a unique person. A unique person in ITU. I had the pleasure to work with him since '95 and working together in divisions that we have. And he continue to do that when now becomes, I think, one of the superstars of the ITU. And I invite the new director to take care of Philippe and make everything that he continue with the same courage and the same devotions in the activities in future.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have seen a very respectful person in the corridors. May not be at this meeting, that is Dr. Wallerby Timothy (sp). He's very knowledgeable, and benefitted from his advice all WRC. When we ask for the floor and gently, quietly express his views and guided us whenever we are in real difficulty. He rarely asks for the floor. When he ask, he give good advice. I have seen him in the corridor. We are very happy and pleasant to see him, to continue to providing his advice. These people that are knowledgeable and they're a set of the union and we should be proud having them and the benefit from them in one way or another.

Also, I would like to thank all the distinguishes colleagues and wish them in advance of the Americas happy new year, for the coming year that come. And last but not least, the dear interpreters that help us understand each other. Sometimes we are all international English or international French, and makes the job easy for us. I wish everybody a safe journey and happy return to the country and

see you at the next event which maybe CPM-19-2. Thank you very much.
(Applause)

>> KHALID AL AWADHI: Thank you very much. Now we will close
the workshop. Thank you.

(Chuckling)

(Applause)

(Workshop concluded 15:51)