

HIPSSA PROJECT

Cross Border Frequency Coordination:

Harmonised Calculation Method for Africa, HCM4A

Sub Saharan Africa

Final Report

Phase 2 – Draft HCM4A

19 October 2012



Disclaimer

This document has been produced with the financial assistance of the European Union. The views expressed herein can in no way be taken to reflect the official opinion of the European Union.

The designations employed and the presentation of material, including maps, do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of ITU concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or concerning the delimitations of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or of certain products does not imply that they are endorsed or recommended by ITU in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.



All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, by any means whatsoever, without the prior written permission of ITU.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
OBJECTIVE	4
THE SECOND PHASE OF THE PROJECT	4
EXPERTS RETAINED	4
DRAFT AGREEMENT	4
FOCAL POINTS	5
COMMENTS FROM ADMINISTRATIONS	5
REVISED DRAFT AGREEMENT	6
CONCLUSIONS	6
ANNEXES	7
RESPONSES FROM CENTRAL AFRICA	7
RESPONSES FROM SOUTHERN AFRICA	12
RESPONSES FROM WEST AFRICA	19
ATTACHMENT	24
LIST OF FOCAL POINTS	24

OBJECTIVE

1. The main objective of the HIPSSA Project on Harmonized Calculation Method (HCM) for Africa is to prepare a multilateral agreement including a harmonized calculation method, characterized by transparency and accuracy which can be accepted by all the participating countries.
2. This project is being undertaken under the aegis of the HIPSSA project which is a joint project between the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) and the European Commission (EC) and is part of a global initiative covering Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific Group of States (ACP).
3. During the first phase of the project, ITU experts contacted various administrations in subSaharan Africa and compiled information related to cross border frequency coordination through a questionnaire.
4. In order to do so, each Administration was requested to indicate a focal point dealing with spectrum management matters. The focal point had the responsibility to exchange information with the ITU regional experts and provide clarifications on the subject whenever the need arises.

THE SECOND PHASE OF THE PROJECT

5. Based on the results of the first phase of the project, the ITU team prepared a draft HCM for Africa Agreement with relevant Annexes (HCM4A). The draft Agreement for Africa is an adapted version of the existing HCM for Europe. The Agreement deals with co-ordination of frequencies between 29.7 MHz and 43.5 GHz for the purposes of preventing mutual harmful interference to the Fixed and Land Mobile Services and optimising the use of the frequency spectrum on the basis of mutual agreements.

EXPERTS RETAINED

6. In order to ensure continuity between the phase one (assessment) and phase two (preparation of a multilateral agreement), the same team of ITU experts were retained to coordinate comments from the various Administrations on a draft Framework Agreement.
7. The experts are:
 - i. Mr. Shola TAYLOR, senior international expert in charge of coordination
 - ii. Mr. Carlos Alberto ALAIS, regional expert for Southern Africa.
 - iii. Mr. Jean Ahmed BOREAU, regional expert for West Africa
 - iv. Mr. Andrew KISAKA, regional expert for East Africa
 - v. Mr. Hilaire MBEGA, regional expert for Central Africa
8. Each Administration was then invited to provide inputs to the Draft Framework Agreement that was sent to each Administration by the respective regional Experts.

DRAFT AGREEMENT

9. The Draft HCM4A Agreement (now Draft Agreement V1.1) has a number of Annexes relating to Land Mobile and Fixed Service respectively.
10. The Draft Agreement comprises of a Preamble and the following Articles :
 - i. Art 1 Definitions
 - ii. Art 2 General
 - iii. Art 3 Technical Provisions
 - iv. Art 4 Procedures
 - v. Art 5 Report of harmful interference
 - vi. Art 6 Revision of the Agreement
 - vii. Art 7 Accession to the Agreement
 - viii. Art 8 Withdrawal from the Agreement
 - ix. Art 9 Status of coordinations prior to the Agreement
 - x. Art 10 Languages of the Agreement
 - xi. Art 11 Entry into force of the Agreement
11. The Annexes relating to the **Land Mobile Service** are as follows :

- i. Annex 1: Maximum permissible interference field strengths and maximum cross-border ranges of harmful interference for frequencies requiring co-ordination in the Land Mobile Service
 - ii. Annex 2A: Data exchange in the Land Mobile Service
 - iii. Annex 3A: Determination of the correction factor for the permissible interference field strength at different nominal frequencies in the Land Mobile Service
 - iv. Annex 4 Propagation curves in the Land Mobile Service
 - v. Annex 5 Determination of the interference field strength in the Land Mobile Service
 - vi. Annex 6 Coding instructions for antenna diagrams in the Land Mobile Service
 - vii. Annex 7 Provisions on measurement procedures in the Fixed Service and the Land Mobile Service
 - viii. Annex 8A Method for combining the horizontal and vertical antenna patterns for the Land Mobile Service
12. The Annexes relating to the **Fixed Service** are as follows :
- i. Annex 2B Data exchange in the Fixed Service
 - ii. Annex 3B Determination of the Masks Discrimination and the Net Filter Discrimination in the Fixed Service
 - iii. Annex 7 Provisions on measurement procedures in the Fixed Service and the Land Mobile Service
 - iv. Annex 8B Method for combining the horizontal and vertical antenna patterns for the Fixed Service
 - v. Annex 9 Threshold Degradation in the Fixed Service
 - vi. Annex 10 Determination of the basic transmission loss in the Fixed Service
 - vii. Annex 11 Trigger for co-ordination in the Fixed Service

FOCAL POINTS

13. The list of focal points is provided in the Attachment to this report.

COMMENTS FROM ADMINISTRATIONS

14. Responses were received from the following Administrations
- a. **West Africa** – 13 of the 15 ECOWAS countries provided written comments; these are Benin, Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, The Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Senegal, Sierra Leone and Togo. Cape Verde did not provide any comment whilst Nigeria intends to provide its comment at the validation workshop
 - b. **Central Africa** – All the 9 countries provided written comments; these are Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Democratic Republic of Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon and Sao Tome and Principe
 - c. **East Africa** - Rwanda, Tanzania, Seychelles. Kenya and Sudan provided general comments of satisfaction with the agreement through teleconversations; the following countries did not provide any comments – Djibouti, Eritrea, Mauritius and Uganda
 - d. **Southern Africa** – All the 10 countries provided written comments; these are Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe; in addition, CRASA and SATA also provided comments.
15. The detailed comments received from each of the Administrations are provided in the Annexes. In general, the various comments may be summarised as follows :
16. There is general agreement with the provisional draft Agreement
- a. A number of Administrations requested for a validation workshop during which Administrations could benefit from a more detailed presentation; (*ITU has planned such a workshop to take place in Nairobi from 29 Oct-2 Nov 2012*)
 - b. The issue arose as to whether or not Administrations would need to buy the software that would be used for the exercise ; *it was pointed out by the project team*

that the final product will not be a complete software package, just a .dll together with the input/output data requirements ; this .dll can be linked to the existing spectrum management software of a country. With the original HCM there is a so called test program available into which you can enter the input data (in a given format) and you will receive the result as output - It means that the countries do not need to purchase the software but the active participation of the African experts will be required to the work of the group which is developing the .dll.)

- c. Some Administrations wanted the frequency ranges mentioned in the Agreement should be amended to suit their specific Administration ; it was however pointed out by the project team that Art 1.2.2 makes clear provisions for such frequency bands; furthermore, there are provisions (Art 1.2.3.1.) in the Agreement which allow for bilateral/subregional agreements which are not applicable to all the signatory Administrations

REVISED DRAFT AGREEMENT

- 17. The revised Draft Agreement prepared on the basis of the various comments received from the African Administrations are provided in a separate Attachment

CONCLUSIONS

- 18. This phase of the project has enabled a number of African Administrations in subSaharan Africa to familiarise themselves with the provisional draft Agreement which was circulated to all the concerned Administrations. It has also enabled the ITU to further sensitise various African Administrations on the importance of crossborder frequency coordination which until now had not been given the level of attention it deserves.
- 19. The planned validation workshop will provide an opportunity for Administrations to have a face to face exchange of views for the first time on this matter and take the necessary decisions required to move the project to implementation stage.
- 20. The follow up actions required include :
 - a. The endorsement of the draft Agreement by the validation workshop
 - b. The establishment of the process that will lead to the formation of the technical group to be responsible for the implementation including the appointment of a Managing Administration.

ANNEXES

RESPONSES FROM CENTRAL AFRICA

ADMINISTRATION	VERSION	DOCUMENT	ARTICLE	QUESTION	RESPONSE /COMMENT PROVIDED BY RE ¹	GENERAL COMMENT FROM FOCAL POINT
BURUNDI	French				Burundi has no specific comments for the draft Agreement.	Merci pour le document, je l'ai parcouru, je le trouve pas mal. Je vous demande de rectifier au point 1.1. "Nom de l'Administration". Pour le Burundi, il s'agit de l' Agence de Régulation et de Contrôle des Télécommunications (ARCT) et non l'ONATEL.
CAMEROON	French			ITU should organise a briefing meeting for all focal points for validation of the Agreement		
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC	French	Annexe 7	Appendice 1	Allocation of the frequency bands is subject to modifications and Administrations must take necessary measures to conform to any such modifications		
				-Ajouter sur l'Assignment Demandée : Motif de Coordination -Ajouter sur Type de Mesure : Lieu de mesure, Niveau du signal mesuré, Puissance mesurée. -Ajouter sur Données de Mesure :Puissance mesurée, Fréquence ou Canal mesurée.		
		Annexe 7	Appendice 2	-Ajouter sur Fréquence Assignée Brouillée : type de brouillage (son, bruit thermique, autres).		

¹ RE For Regional expert

ADMINISTRATION	VERSION	DOCUMENT	ARTICLE	QUESTION	RESPONSE /COMMENT PROVIDED BY RE ¹	GENERAL COMMENT FROM FOCAL POINT
CHAD	French				Chad agrees with the document without comments	
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO	French	Draft Agreement	Art.4	4.6.1 Barrer : « A condition que les Administrations concernées aient signées un accord autorisant de tels arrangements »		
			Art.8	Un an pour le retrait et non un mois.		
EQUATORIAL GUINEA	Spanish				<p>Equatorial Guinea wishes to have the documents in Spanish for better understanding.</p> <p>A workshop is expected for more explanations.</p>	<p>Con respecto a los documentos HIPSSA, pues, decirle que de parte de ORTEL no hemos observado por de momento alguna enmienda específica que señalar. Aunque, como observado en mi anterior e-mail, aquí hablamos principalmente el español y para analizar un documento como este hace falta que esté en un idioma bien conocido; aunque las terminologías son algo familiares porque técnicos, pero para muchos de mis técnicos en ORTEL hace falta que la documentación esté en español.</p> <p>No obstante, esperamos que habrá unos seminarios-talleres para que la gente pueda familiarizarse con estos temas de coordinación, que es muy importante y urgente.</p> <p>Pues, adelante con el proyecto.</p>
GABON	French		1.2.1	Add 3400-3600 MHz		
			1.2.3	Remove 3410-3600MHz Remove 22-22.6GHz		
			4.1.9	Replace the temporary usage of 45 days by 90days		

ADMINISTRATION	VERSION	DOCUMENT	ARTICLE	QUESTION	RESPONSE /COMMENT PROVIDED BY RE ¹	GENERAL COMMENT FROM FOCAL POINT
CONGO	French		6	The present Agreement is susceptible		
				<p>Vous avez inscrit le <i>Niveaux maximaux admissibles de champ brouilleur et portées transfrontières maximales de brouillages préjudiciables pour les fréquences nécessitant une coordination</i> dans l'annexe du service mobile, quand est-il du service fixe(ex. Wimax en bande 3.4GHz voir 2.5GHz qui existe majoritairement en Afrique centrale) ;</p>	<p>Le Wimax – (Worldwide Interoperability for Microwave Access) fait partie du service mobile. Les signaux sont reçus en utilisant les terminaux mobiles large bande avec une grande inter-opérabilité que l'on voudrait mondiale.</p> <p>Chaque service a les paramètres spécifiques utilisés pour la coordination. Pour le service fixe, on parle plutôt de seuil de dégradation du signal (Annexes 9, 11) et d'affaiblissement de transmission de référence (Annexe 10).</p>	
				<p>L'article 6. Révision du présent Accord, dit <i>Si cette Administration omet à nouveau de répondre, elle sera réputée avoir donné son consentement</i>, ne serait -il pas préférable, que le courrier devra avoir préalablement été acquitté, avant d'être considéré comme reçu , car il se pourrait que la demande n'ait pas été reçue, tenant compte de la réalité des moyens de communications dans nos Pays ?</p>	<p>Un total de 2 mois est en fait accordé à l'Administration pour réagir. Je pense qu'il ne faudrait pas encourager un certain laxisme et prétexte de nos Administrations dans le traitement des dossiers internationaux.</p>	
				<p>L'article 8. Retrait du présent Accord, si une administration(Pays) se retire que devient les accords bilatéraux contractés avec les voisins, se fondant sur le présent projet ? N'était -il pas nécessaire qu'une procédure de coordination préalable se fasse et aboutisse pour ce retrait ?</p>	<p>L'Accord HCM4A n'annule pas les accords bilatéraux existants. Il s'agit de les harmoniser avec le nouvel Accord de dimension multilatérale. La première phase du projet (phase d'évaluation) n'a recensé qu'un seul accord de coordination aux frontières existant en Afrique Centrale (Cameroun-Tchad) pour le service mobile.</p>	

ADMINISTRATION	VERSION	DOCUMENT	ARTICLE	QUESTION	RESPONSE /COMMENT PROVIDED BY RE ¹	GENERAL COMMENT FROM FOCAL POINT
CONGO contd	French		Art 9	<p>Statut des coordinations antérieures au présent Accord, dit <i>Dans le cas du Service Fixe, les Administrations concernées devraient échanger des informations sur l'utilisation de fréquences avant le [01.01.2013] dans les zones de coordination définies à l'Annexe 11.</i></p> <p><i>Une telle utilisation de fréquences sera considérée comme coordonnée et sera inscrite au Fichier des fréquences.</i></p> <p>Le délai semble trop court, car beaucoup d'administrations n'ont pas finis de constituer leurs fichiers, il conviendrait de laisser du temps et de la souplesse, pour ne pas prendre le risque de rendre ce projet inapplication, et ces dispositions violées dès le départ.</p>	<p>La date du 01.01.2013 est la date proposée pour l'entrée en vigueur de l'accord. Toutes les coordinations effectuées et réussies avant cette date sont directement enregistrées dans le Fichier des fréquences. Sinon, les coordinations se poursuivent dans le cadre de l'accord multilatéral HCM4A.</p>	
		Annex 1	2.1	<p>Limitation des brouillages préjudiciables causés par des émetteurs, dit <i>Dans le cas de fréquences préférentielles, le calcul s'effectue à partir d'une ligne secondaire.</i></p> <p><i>Chaque point de cette ligne secondaire se trouve à une distance minimale de tout point de la frontière telle que définie dans les accords respectifs.</i></p> <p>Quels critères seront retenus pour définir ces lignes secondaires ?</p>	<p>Les fréquences préférentielles peuvent être assignées, sans coordination préalable, par les Administrations concernées sur la base d'accords bilatéraux ou multilatéraux et en application des conditions qui y sont incluses. Les lignes secondaires dépendent des portées transfrontières maximales convenues de brouillages préjudiciables et des niveaux admissibles de champ brouilleur convenus dans les accords bilatéraux ou multilatéraux.</p>	

ADMINISTRATION	VERSION	DOCUMENT	ARTICLE	QUESTION	RESPONSE /COMMENT PROVIDED BY RE ¹	GENERAL COMMENT FROM FOCAL POINT
CONGO contd			2.2	<p>Limitation de la protection des récepteurs, dit <i>Une protection des récepteurs ne peut être exigée que si un émetteur de référence, situé à l'emplacement et à la hauteur du récepteur en question, produit un niveau de champ qui ne dépasse pas les valeurs spécifiées colonne 2 du Tableau, à une hauteur de 10 m au-dessus du niveau du sol et à une distance telle que spécifiée à la colonne 3 du Tableau</i></p> <p>Je n'ai pas bien compris ce qu'on voulait dire ici ?</p>	<p>La condition préalable pour la protection des récepteurs situés à l'emplacement de l'émetteur de référence est que les conditions spécifiées dans le Tableau soient d'abord respectées.</p>	
SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE						<p>Concerning the draft HCM agreement AGER has no relevant comments once the texts are in conformity with the standard agreements. Please do not hesitate to contact AGER if additional informations are needed.</p>

RESPONSES FROM SOUTHERN AFRICA

ADMINISTRATION	VERSION	DOCUMENT	ARTICLE	QUESTION	RESPONSE /COMMENT PROVIDED BY RE ²	GENERAL COMMENT FROM FOCAL POINT
AGL/INACOM		Annex 1A/ Annex11			I believe that INACOM is referring to annex 1A point 2.2 where the maximum cross-border range of harmful interference in km is indicated in a table for each band of frequency within the MS service. Alternatively they maybe refer to Annex 11 section 1.1 where different coordination distances are given for different portions of radio spectrum to trigger coordination within the FS Service. In any case since they have expressed that this was the only comment. It is therefore concluded that INACOM is satisfied with the text of the agreement.	On the issue of the frequency bands listed with their respective distances, at the moment we have few assignments, so we have no problems in coordinating them.
BOT/BOTSWANA TELECOMMUNICATON AUTHORITY (BTA)		Main Agreement	General		BTA is generally satisfied with the text of agreement and annexes, however BTA have minor issues that going forward would need to be clarified.	
				1.2.3.1	Clause 1.2.3.1 Needs to be clarified as to the meaning of "...frequency falls under the responsibility of the Administrations".	The frequencies to be coordinated must be those that each Administration involved in the coordination is responsible for them.
			1.4	Frequency register , what would be the relationship between this register and the MIRF?	The Frequency Register database is not really linked to the master International Frequency Register. It is a database only to satisfy the terms and protocols established in the Agreement. However frequencies registered in the MIFR must be protected. Sometimes countries register a typical assignment, in that case if the frequency in question that is being coordinated falls under such category it should be protected.	

² RE For Regional expert

ADMINISTRATION	VERSION	DOCUMENT	ARTICLE	QUESTION	RESPONSE /COMMENT PROVIDED BY RE ²	GENERAL COMMENT FROM FOCAL POINT
			2.2	<p>This clause seems to suggest frequencies mentioned here would be exclusively in accordance with this agreement. BTA is of the view that in a case that there is some discrepancy, the Radio Regulations would take precedence as implied in clause 2.1</p>	<p>Nevertheless this agreement is to prevent interference and although could help to solve interference cases, the main purpose is of frequency coordination to avoid interference.</p> <p>I feel that the comment maybe redundant but it could be considered to amend 2.2 as underlined in the following text:</p> <p><i>Administrations shall assign frequencies exclusively in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement. If co-ordination is required, it shall be done prior to the putting into operation of the radio station affected. "<u>In a case that there is some discrepancy, the Radio Regulations would take precedence</u>" Otherwise, similar terms to RR Article 6.4 may be considered</i></p>	
			General	<p>Since this is a special arrangement as per Article 6 of the RRs, are there any enforcement measures in a case on non-complying member who is signatory?</p>	<p>This is something that maybe considered but this is up to HIPSSA and the validation meeting. On the other hand RR article 6 seems to be referring to allocations or frequency assignment arrangements between countries. And not to one organised by an external body such as HIPSSA</p>	
			11	<p>BTA recognizes that the intention is to bring this agreement into force in January 2013, but we wanted to know at which stage of the development of this "special agreement" are we at, relative to article 6 of RRs.</p>	<p>I am not too sure if this is a special agreement within the RR article 6 environment.</p>	
LSO/LESOTHO TELECOMMUNICATION AUTHORITY (LTA)		Main Agreement/Annexes	General			Lesotho is satisfied with the agreement and the annexes.

ADMINISTRATION	VERSION	DOCUMENT	ARTICLE	QUESTION	RESPONSE /COMMENT PROVIDED BY RE ²	GENERAL COMMENT FROM FOCAL POINT
MWI/MACRA		Main Agreement	1.2.1		<p>Regarding the several amendments suggested in section 1.2.1 I call the attention that this agreement is not for Southern Africa but for Sub-Saharan Africa. Although the Region and the sub-Region both fall within ITU Radio Region 1 there are many allocations that are made by means of footnotes applicable to certain countries within Southern Africa. For example the band 137-144 MHz is not allocated totally to Mobile services.</p> <p>For Example from 137 to 138 MHz is a secondary service. From 138 to 144 MHz the mobile allocation is constrained to those countries appearing in footnotes 5.211 and 5.212. Therefore I believe that it will be difficult to justify the complete inclusion of the 138-144 MHz for the whole of sub-Saharan Africa. But this is actually not a problem if 1.2.2 is considered:</p> <p>Consequently, it will be possible for all those frequencies not included in the table to make use of this coordination procedure and if required the countries involved may agree on the technical conditions based on this agreement.</p>	<p>Suggests the following amendments to the bands 380-385 MHz and 390-395 MHz to become 335-390 MHz and 397-399.9 MHz. Even the band 335-390 MHz should also be for PMR's.</p> <p>In addition changed the band 790-960MHz to 694-960 MHz.</p> <p>Furthermore introduced a band not considered that is to say 137-144 MHz</p>
			4.6.1			<p>Deleted text in brackets and underlined inserted text underlined and bold :</p> <p>Operators in neighbouring countries are allowed to conclude mutual arrangement(s <u>on the conditions that</u>) only if the Administrations concerned have signed an agreement authorizing such arrangements.</p>

ADMINISTRATION	VERSION	DOCUMENT	ARTICLE	QUESTION	RESPONSE /COMMENT PROVIDED BY RE ²	GENERAL COMMENT FROM FOCAL POINT
MWI/MACRA contd			4.6.2		The suggestion is welcome but may restrict the flexibility of the agreement.	Inserted text underlined and bold : Arrangements between operators may <u>not</u> deviate from the technical parameters or other conditions laid down in the annexes of this Agreement or in relevant bi- or multilateral agreements between the Administrations concerned.
			4.7.5			Inserted text underlined and bold : Within the Fixed Service, the protection of a receiver <u>frequency</u> may only be rejected if:
			4.7.5.1			Inserted text underlined and bold: the request for co-ordination for the associated transmitter <u>frequency</u> has been refused,
			4.7.7			Deleted text in brackets and underlined inserted text underlined and bold : In case a request for co-ordination is rejected or a conditional reply is given to such a request, the reasons shall be given for this, indicating, (if) <u>whichever is</u> appropriate, either the radio station to be protected or the radio station which could cause harmful interference to the planned radio station.
			6			All the references to one month in the text were converted to 30 days instead.
			7			The reference to one month and three months in the text were converted to 30 days and 90 days

ADMINISTRATION	VERSION	DOCUMENT	ARTICLE	QUESTION	RESPONSE /COMMENT PROVIDED BY RE ²	GENERAL COMMENT FROM FOCAL POINT
MWI/MACRA contd	English		8			The reference to six months in the text was converted to 180 days
			10	How about the portuguese speaking countries?	It may be convenient to consider translations to portuguese and spanish to cover all Sub-Saharan Africa and promote a better understanding of the agreement. However the language on which the first original was written should prevail.	
			11		Inserted text underlined and bold: This Agreement shall enter into force <u>on</u> [1 Jan 2013]	
MOZ/INCM	English	Main Agreement	General			INCM is satisfied with the text of the agreement.
			1.2.1		Although FWA is fundamentally a fixed type of service, from the spectrum managemnt point of view it is closer to the mobile services than to the fixed service due to their cellula coverage. So it maybe justified to be included in the mobile services. FS and MS in both bands are primary with same rights. Then alternatively these bands could be included in the list of FS bands of the agreement.	A minor issue is : In the band 380-385 MHz and 390-395 MHz it was deleted the word only to include FWA.
NMB/CRAN	English	Main Agreement				CRAN has adopted a service technology neutral licence regime since May 2011. Therefore licensees are allowed to re-farm legacy 2G GSM frequencies for 3G/UMTS and LTE services. LTE has been launched in Namibia in the 1800 MHz band since May 2012. In line with the review of GE 06 Namibia is already preparing for spectrum migration in the band 694-790 MHz (The 700 Hz band). The

ADMINISTRATION	VERSION	DOCUMENT	ARTICLE	QUESTION	RESPONSE /COMMENT PROVIDED BY RE ²	GENERAL COMMENT FROM FOCAL POINT
						<u>concern of Namibia is that the 700 MHz band is not reflected under clause 1.2.1 for coordination in terms of this agreement.</u>
AFS/DOC :ICASA	English	Main Agreement	General			Expressed that are satisfied with the text but added comments.
			1			Inserted the word "ITU "before radio regulations
			1.2.1		This is an important issue which has also been pointed out by NMB. Actually all the MS bands in the agreement from 694 to 2690 MHz maybe considered for inclusion including as well LTE.	Expressed concern on limiting coordination to GSM 1800 as this excludes "LTE" which is being deployed in South Africa.
SWZ/SPTC COMMUNICATIONS REGULATORY UNIT	English	Main Agreement	General			<p>At this juncture it is much gratifying to announce that at the stakeholders discussions, the outcome was that we accept the processes as per the documents that were sent to us.</p> <p>However, it is also our feeling that future considerations would also be allowed.</p>
ZMB/ZICTA	English	Main Agreement	General			Kindly note that Zambia has looked at the draft agreement and it is fine with it.
ZWE/POTRAZ	English	Main Agreement	1.2.1			Due to developments in technology and the subsequent modifications of the International Table of Frequency Allocations, there is need to include spectrum bands such as the 694-862 MHz and the 2300 – 2400 MHz in the list.

ADMINISTRATION	VERSION	DOCUMENT	ARTICLE	QUESTION	RESPONSE /COMMENT PROVIDED BY RE ²	GENERAL COMMENT FROM FOCAL POINT
SATA	English	Main Agreement	Page 2			This Draft Agreement was prepared by a team of experts on the basis of the results of the first phase of the HIPSSA project
			Page 5			Instituto Nacional Angolano das Comunicações-INACOM (Angolan National Institute for Communications)
			Page 6			Instituto Nacional das Comunicações de Moçambique
			General			Provided full support even trying to get ZWE on board

RESPONSES FROM WEST AFRICA

ADMINISTRATION	VERSION	DOCUMENT	ARTICLE	QUESTION	RESPONSE /COMMENT PROVIDED BY RE ³	GENERAL COMMENT FROM FOCAL POINT
BENIN	French					Draft agreement seems to contain all necessary elements that should contain an agreement of this type; Suggest that the validation methodology be revised to allow stakeholders to appropriate the project in order to make more relevant proposals; Need a meeting in which the model could be explained.
BURKINA – FASO	French	Main Text	1.7	What is the understanding of the Managing Administration? Is it an Administration that will be designated when the draft agreement will be signed?	The Managing Administration is the Administration which will be responsible for the maintenance and registration of the HCM server. Of course, this Administration will be designated after the signature of the draft agreement. The procedure for designating this Administration is not defined yet.	The English version is clearer; need to review this aspect when finalizing the draft agreement
			4.2.4	What is the interest to notify stations using preferential frequencies before their entry into services?	The interest is to allow these frequencies to be entered into the Frequency Register.	
			4.5.4	Same question as article 4.2.4		
			4.7.2	The formulation « ne peut rejeter si » is preferable than « ne peut être rejeter que si »	Agreed	
CAPE-VERDE	French					No comments received
COTE D'IVOIRE	French	Main Text	4.3.3	It's said that Stations shall be entered into a Frequency register. Which Frequency Register? ITU's	The Frequency register is defined in Article 1.4. It's made up of lists set out by every	

³ RE For Regional expert

ADMINISTRATION	VERSION	DOCUMENT	ARTICLE	QUESTION	RESPONSE /COMMENT PROVIDED BY RE ³	GENERAL COMMENT FROM FOCAL POINT	
THE GAMBIA	English	Main Text		one or another Frequency Register?	Administration. There are as many lists as affected countries		
				It's said that " Co-ordination shall be null and void [..] ". This disposition is not necessary because the agreement must be valid at any time and it's not as easy for our countries to engage discussion.	Article 4.3.4 gives 30 months to a coordinated station to be put in operation. One might think that after this period, the EMC environment has changed and a new coordination procedure would be necessary to implement the same station "coordinated 2 years ago." This provision must be kept.		
			1.1	"The Gambia" Instead of "Gambia"		Need of a Validation / Training Workshop	
			1.2.1	Add "For CDMA 450 MHz and UHF PMR" in front of "440 – 470 MHz" Add "For CDMA and GSM 900 systems" in front of "790 - 960 MHz"			
			1.2.6	Explain why SRD are not subject to agreement			
			1.5	Use "signal" instead of "traffic" Add terms " to the extent that either parties loses quality signal "	Agreed		
			1.6	Use " Affected Administration " instead of "Administration Affected" New formulation is suggested			
			4.6.1	New formulation is suggested	Need to review the Main text as there is some useful comments		
			Annex 7	2			
			Annex 11	1.1			
GHANA	English					No observations	
GUINEA	French	Main Text	1.2.1	Suggest to add these bands:	The 694 – 790 MHz frequency band is on		

ADMINISTRATION	VERSION	DOCUMENT	ARTICLE	QUESTION	RESPONSE /COMMENT PROVIDED BY RE ³	GENERAL COMMENT FROM FOCAL POINT
				694 – 862 MHz for IMT; 2500 – 2690 MHz for WIMAX	the process to be assigned to mobile service after WRC-15 (probably). It's too early to include it on the draft agreement. The 2.6 GHz band is already included.	
			1.2.3	A part of the 5.2 GHz band is assigned to Fixe service	It's not a relevant comment	
			4.5	Specify the case wherein "Administration put without prior coordination and relevant bi or multilateral agreements stations with preferential code groups or preferential code group blocks"	Comment noted	
			Annex 5	3.4 "Corrections factor for frequencies". Why only 100 MHz, 600 MHz and 2 GHz. Comment and explain	They need to have training	
			Annex 6			Appendix and Figures must be commented
			Annex 7			Need to specify the recommendation T/R 25-08
GUINEA-BISSAU	Both	Main Text		"Autoridade Reguladora Nacional Das TIC – ARN – TIC" instead of "Instituto das Comunicacoes da Guine-Bissau – ICGB"		
LIBERIA	English					The intent of the agreement is a good one; it is in the right direction. There are few things that they do not fully comprehend.
MALI	French	Main Text	1.2.3.1	Instead of "La procédure de coordination mentionnée dans le présent Accord " write « La procédure de coordination mentionnée dans le présent Accord de coordination »	The proposal of adding « de coordination » at the end of the sentence is not relevant. Not agreed	
			1.3	Proposal of adding the terms "Ce	Why not !!!	

ADMINISTRATION	VERSION	DOCUMENT	ARTICLE	QUESTION	RESPONSE /COMMENT PROVIDED BY RE ³	GENERAL COMMENT FROM FOCAL POINT
			1.7.2	sont les" at the beginning of the sentence defining each type of frequencies		
				Proposal of replacing the term "ce sous-programme" by "il".	Agreed	
				2.3 Proposal of adding the term "dans"	Why not !!!	
NIGER	French	Main Text	1.2	Proposal of replacing "les fréquences des bandes" by "les bandes de fréquences".	See the issue, the right formulation is « les fréquences dans les bandes ». New formulation agreed	
			4.6	Ask to suppress the entire article	It's not relevant	
NIGERIA						No comments received
SENEGAL	French	Main Text	1.2.1	Proposal of merging "[380 – 385 MHz] and [390 – 395 MHz]" to "[380 – 395 MHz]" and deleting "for emergency and security systems only" Proposal of adding "694 – 790 MHz for 4G/LTE" Proposal of replacing "GSM" by "DCS" Proposal of adding at "[2500 – 2690 MHz", "Seulement pour les systèmes mobiles 4G/LTE et IMT »	Proposal agreed for the 2500 – 2690 MHz	
		Annex 1	1.2.3	Proposal of the list of the frequencies band by the list within ITU-R 746-10	Not relevant but must have the opinion of the team	
			4.3	Add within technical provision "(gain, etc..)"	Not relevant, these details are provided within annexes	
			2.1			Explain the figure and give it a title
			2.2			Incorporate comments suggested in the main text and keep the same consistency. Add the band 694 -790 MHz.

ADMINISTRATION	VERSION	DOCUMENT	ARTICLE	QUESTION	RESPONSE /COMMENT PROVIDED BY RE ³	GENERAL COMMENT FROM FOCAL POINT
		Annex 4				Take into account the amendments to the Recommendation ITU-R P.1546 (last revision)
		Annex 6				Comment and explain figures in appendices 1-8
		Annex 7	2	Specify CEPT/ERC recommendation		Add in the measurement protocol, the power of the interfering station
		Annex 11				Is the distance refers to the received signal to the remote X or the possibility of reuse channels from the same distance X
SIERRA-LEONE	English	Annex 4		Propagation curves are given for warm sea and cold sea propagation not for Harmattan period. In addition, Temperature range for cold and warm sea should be given.		During the implementation phase issues may arise which will result in the modification of some of the annexes
TOGO	French	Main Text	1.1	The acronym is « ART&P » instead of « ARPT »	Agreed	This agreement does not exclude bilateral agreements if necessary

ATTACHMENT

LIST OF FOCAL POINTS

CENTRAL AFRICA		
1	BURUNDI	BIZINDAVYI Déogratias Chef Section des Fréquences Tel : +257 79 92 59 94 / +257 22 21 07 76 Email : deobizi@yahoo.fr
2	CAMEROON	MOHAMADOU Awallou Sous-Directeur des Etudes, de la Planification et de l'Ingénierie du Spectre. Tel: +237 99776103 / +237 99776084 Email: m_awallou@yahoo.fr
3	CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC	BOALYO-FOUNGA Ferdinand Chef de Service des Radiocommunications Tel: +236 21 61566 / +236 21 051378 Email: boalyof@yahoo.fr
4	CHAD	MBANGADOUM Bolina Chef de Section Inspection et Contrôle Tel: +235 22 521518, +235 66 25 24 55, +235 99 21 63 53 Email: m.bolina@voila.fr bolina.mbang@yahoo.fr
		HASSANE Hisseine Designated Second Focal Point, Ingénieur Direction Radiocommunications Tel: +235 22 521518 / +235 66 256070 +235 99 92 02 11 Email: hisseinhas@yahoo.fr
5	CONGO	IWANDZA Beranger Directeur des Ressources et des Fréquences Tel: +242 05 504 97 37 Email: beranger.iwanda@arpce.cg
6	DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO	KIMASI TOMADIOLUNDA Richard DTTai Tel : +243 81 81 32 937 +243898220382 / +243999171588 +243818132927 / +243851496564 Email : richard.kimasi@arptc.cd richardkims@yahoo.fr
7	EQUATORIAL GUINEA	Rufino - OVONO ONDO ENGONGA General Manager Tel. : +240 333 099 518 / +240 333099518 Fax : +240 09 26 45 Mobile : +240 222 523 085 / 551 000 231 Email: rufino.ovono@gmail.com Skype: rufino-ovono
8	GABON	Jacques EDANE NKWELE ANINF. Tel : +241 06 24 83 26 Email : edanenkwele@yahoo.fr
		Clotaire ELANGMANE Second Designated Focal Point, ANINF Tel : +241 06 18 99 60 / +241 07 55 74 31 Email : c_mitterand@yahoo.fr
9	SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE	Orlando FERNANDES Directeur Général Mobile : + 239 990 30 13 Fax : + 239 222 73 61 Email : oaf@cstome.net

EAST AFRICA		
1	DJIBOUTI	Mohamed Chirdon Mobile: +25377810069 Email: Mohamed.chirdon@internet.dj
2	SOMALIA	Swad Farah Mobile : +252 615812199 Email: sfarah@mipt.gov.so
3	ETHIOPIA	Bedilu Woldemanarian Email: woldemar@ties.itu.ch
4	NORTHERN SUDAN	Eng. Ashraf Award Elikarim Mobile: +249 187171246 or +249 902963502 ashraf_a_widaa@yahoo.com
5	SOUTHERN SUDAN	Bullen Amos Sollo (Director of Spectrum) Tel : +211122254527 or +256 477 102571 Mobile: +211 912 922 027 Email: sorobullenamos@yahoo.com
6	MADAGASCAR	Augustin ANDRIAMANANORO Tel : +261 333310001 Mobile: +261 340 203 402 Email: dg@omert.org
7	TANZANIA	Johannes A K. Magesa Principal Frequency Management Engineer Tel Office : +255 22 241 2011-2 Mobile +255 716 181 415 Fax +255 22 241 2009-10 Email : jakmagesa@tcra.go.tz
8	UGANDA	Jonas Bantulaki (Assistant Director- spectrum) Tel : +256 414 339008 Mobile : +256 712464 680 Email : jobantu@ucc.co.ug
9	KENYA	S.K Kibe (Director of Spectrum) Tel : + 254 020 4242000 Email : kibe@cck.go.ke
10	RWANDA	Francis Ngabo (Director Scarce Resource) Mobile : +25 788772488 Email : francis.ngabo@rura.gov.rw
11	SEYCHELLES	Mr. Paul Pierre (Director of Radio Communication) Tel : +248 286600 Fax : +248 225325 Email : communications@ict.gov.sc
12	ERITREA	Zerai Teklehaimanot Mogos (Director of standards and regulation division) Tel : + 291 1 189215 or + 291 7 115470 Fax : + 291 185019 Email : Email: zerai.zerai@ties.itu.int

SOUTHERN AFRICA		
1	ANGOLA	<p>Mr. Octávio Domingos Machado Spectrum Management Staff Tel : + 244 923605024 , + 244 222338352 octmach2@yahoo.com.br</p> <p>Dr. Kumba Kianvu Head of Department of the International Relations Tel : +244 91 221 4853 kumbakia@yahoo.com</p>
2	BOTSWANA	<p>Mr.Thapelo Maruping BTA Engineering Services Tel : +2673957755 Mobile : +26772301101 Fax : +2673957976 maruping@bta.org.bw</p> <p>Mr Tshocanetsso Kepaletswe Senior Manager Radio Tel : +267 3957755 Mobile : +2673685542 Email : kepaletswe@bta.org.bw</p> <p>Mr. Luke Bathopi BTA Engineering Services Tel : +267 3957755 Mobile : +26771751523 Email : bathopil@bta.org.bw</p>
3	LESOTHO	<p>Mr. Thabiso Taela Engineer – Spectrum Planning&Assignment Tel : +266 2222 4300 <u>Mobile : +26663025247</u> <u>Fax : +266 2231 0984</u> Email : ttaela@lca.org.ls</p> <p>Mr. Lephoi Ntsoenea Manager – Spectrum Planning&Assignment <u>Tel : +266 2222 4300</u> <u>Mobile : +266 58882442</u> <u>Fax : +266 2231 0984</u> Email : Intsoebea@lca.org.ls</p>
4	MALAWI	<p>Mr. Jonathan Pinifolo Spectrum Planning Manager (Acting Deputy Director Spectrum management. Tel : +265 187 8708 Mobile : +265999 940 907 Fax : +265 1883 611 Email : jpinifolo@macra.org.mw, jonathanpinifolo@yahoo.com</p> <p>Mr. Stan Chimgoga Spectrum Planning Officer Tel : +2651877912 Mobile : +265881286573 Fax : +265 1883 611 Email : chimgoga@macra.org.mw</p> <p>Mr. Derek Konwani Spectrum Planning Officer Tel : +2651877912 Mobile : +265999463721 Fax : +265 1883 611 Email : dkondwani@macra.org.mw</p>
5	MOZAMBIQUE	<p>Mr. Mr Hilário Tamele Director of Technology and Radiocommunication Tel : +258 21 490 131/9 Mobile : +258 84398 7359 Fax: +258 21 494 435 Email : htamele@incm.gov.mz</p>

		Mr. Martins Simao Langa Chief of the Spectrum Management Department Tel : +258 21 490 131/9 Mobile : +258 82 459 2220 Email : mlanga@incm.gov.moz
6	NAMIBIA	Mr. Stanley Shanapinda Acting CEO Tel : +264 61 222666 Email : sshanapinda@cran.na
7	SOUTH AFRICA	Mr. Linden Petzer Chief Director Radio and Satellite Tel : +27 12 4278000 Mobile : +27 82 880 4616 Fax : +27 12 421 7044 linden@doc.gov.za Mr. Richard Makgotlho RF Specialist Tel : +27 11 566 3367 Mobile : +27 72 954 9348 Fax : +27 11 566 3281 Email : Makgotlho@icasa.org.za
8	SWAZILAND	Mr. Austin Mgabi Manager Frequency Management Tel : +268 2405 2393 Mobile : +268 7605 1097/+268 7712 2989 Fax : +268 2405 2020 Email : mamgabhi@sptc.co.sz Ms. Nozipho Freya Simelane Policy and Planning Officer Regulatory Affairs Tel : +268 2405 2328 Mobile : +268 7602 9277 Fax : +268 24052013 Email : nfsimelane@sptc.co.sz
9	ZAMBIA	Mr. Patrick Mutimushi Director- Technology & Engineering Tel : +260 21 244 431 Mobile : +260 96 692 0905, +260 97 716 4972 Fax : +260 21 124 6701 Email : pmutimushi@zicta.zm Mr. Kezias Mwale Manager Spectrum Planning & Licensing Tel : +260 211 246698 Mobile : +260 976 344 950 kmwale@zicta.zm
10	ZIMBABWE	Mr. Baxton Sirewu Head Spectrum Managements Tel : +263 4 797380 Mobile : +263 7 721 30581 Fax : +263 4 333041 Email : baxton.sirewu@potraz.gov.zw

WEST AFRICA		
1	BENIN	Géraud-Constant AHOKPOSSI, Chef Division des opérations ATRPT, 01BP 2034 Cotonou Mobile: +229 95 63 35 71 Office: +229 21 31 01 65 Fax: +229 21 31 00 67 aconstant@atpt.bi
2	BURKINA FASO	Arnaud DAMIBA Chef du Service des Opérateurs Mobiles ARCEP - Burkina Faso Office: +226 50375360 Mobile: +226 78819297 / +226 70174808 a.damiba@arce.bf
3	CAPE VERDE	David GOMES Agência Nacional das Comunicações +238 261 44 00 david.gomes@anac.cv
4	COTE D'IVOIRE	Koffi SIMON Membre RRB, Directeur des Radiocommunications Agence des Télécommunications de Côte d'Ivoire - ATCI simon@atci.ci koffisimon@yahoo.fr Mobile: +225 07 09 32 92 Office: +225 20 34 49 73
5	THE GAMBIA	Rodine S. RENNER Spectrum Manager, In charge of the Management and Monitoring of the National Spectrum rsr@pura.qm , rodinerr@yahoo.com mobile: +220 996 23 33 Office: +220 331 13 33
6	GHANA	Florence MARTEY Chief Manager, Engineering National Communications Authority – NCA florence.martey@nca.org.gh Mobile: +233 244 168 183 Office: +233 302 776 621
7	GUINEA	Alseny CAMARA Directeur des Opérations de Régulation Autorité de Régulation des Postes et Télécommunications – ARPT alsenyca@arptguinee.org alsenyca@yahoo.fr +22462211021 / +22460214454
8	GUINEA-BISSAU	Pedrinho SA Directeur des Radiocommunications Instituto das Comunicações da Guiné-Bissau Rua 5 de Julho, CP 1372, BISSAU sapedrinho@yahoo.com.br +245 660 7252 +245 592 7785
9	LIBERIA	Emmanuel J. PAYEGAR Engineering Director Liberia Telecommunications Authority (LTA) Mobile: +231(0)880427282 Office : +231(0) 27302019 epayegar@lta.gov.lr
10	MALI	Ibrahim Belco MAIGA belco@crt.ml Office: +223 20 23 14 90 Mobile: +223 66 76 59 88
11	NIGER	Salou Abdou Directeur Sectoriel Télécommunications Office: +227 20 73 90 08 Mobile: +227 90 46 22 02 salou.abdou@arm.ne
12	NIGERIA	Engr Festus DAUDU Ag Director Spectrum Management Federal Ministry of Information and Communication

		+2348077600357 festus.daudu@ties.itu.int
13	SENEGAL	Pape Cire CISSE Directeur des Radiocommunications Autorité de Régulation des Postes et Télécommunications – ARTP pc.cisse@artp.sn +221776370461 +221338690369
14	SIERRA-LEONE	Victor FINDLAY National Telecommunications Commission – NATCOM victorfindlay@yahoo.com +23233739066
15	TOGO	Modena AWANDI Chef Service Contrôle Fréquences, ARPT Tel: +228 2236363 Mobile: +228 9019484 modena@artp.tg , mod_awandi@yahoo.fr