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

7(I) Issue I – Possible method to mitigate excessive satellite network filings issue

Background information

Issue I focuses on the potential issue of excessive satellite network filings from two perspectives – supposedly excessive filings at the coordination (CR/C) stage, and supposedly excessive filings at the advance publication (API) stage. The supposed problem area targeted in Issue I is not one of Administrations incorrectly applying the Radio Regulations but it is instead the observation that many Administrations with active satellite network filings (i.e. API and CR/C) do not affirmatively suppress their filings even when it becomes clear that the frequency assignments will not be brought into use prior to the end of the regulatory lifetime of the filing. There is no requirement in the Radio Regulations for Administrations to affirmatively suppress a filing at any time. Adding additional interim filing obligations on Administrations during the regulatory lifetime of the filing would substantially increase burdens and costs both for Administrations and for the Bureau without having any real impact on the availability of the orbital/spectrum resource or reducing coordination burden for Administrations actively seeking to implement their satellite network filings.

The United States and Canada agree that Administrations should be encouraged, in keeping with guiding principles of the ITU, to either not submit satellite network filings to the ITU they do not intend to implement, or to relinquish previously submitted filings that Administrations no longer intend to use or are unable to implement. The United States and Canada do not agree, however, that the establishment of mandatory mechanisms for these purposes is either necessary or justified. There is indeed real congestion in some satellite frequency bands, and identifying available orbital/spectrum resources often is a challenge. At the same time, the current coordination process, as refined over the years, generally provides Administrations and operators intent on implementing their satellite network filings the opportunity to do so. Though not perfect, improvements through refinements to Articles 9, 11 and 13 and Appendices 30, 30A and 30B have minimized unnecessary and artificial barriers to new entry, and provided the BR with improved tools to ensure that the MIFR contains only networks actually in use.

To this end, the United States and Canada do not see that any revisions to the CR/C process that would add additional filing obligations during the regulatory lifetime are likely to reduce the number of filings in the ITU database. Nor are such revisions likely to ease a filing Administration’s path to implementation of its planned satellite networks. The United States and Canada thus propose no change under the CR/C component of Issue I (in keeping with Method I1.4 in Section 5/7/9.1.5.4 of the CPM Report).

With respect to the API process, the United States and Canada believe that elimination of the six-month period between API and receipt of the CR/C would provide some benefits in terms of processing of satellite network filings and reducing the number of APIs and, by association, CR/Cs submitted, by eliminating some of the inherent uncertainties in the current API and CR/C process. For this reason, the United States and Canada propose changes to the Radio Regulations under Issue C to eliminate that gap (in keeping with Option B to Method C3 in Section 5/7/3.5.3 of the CPM Report). That proposal, under Issue C, is not reproduced here.

NOC CAN/USA/37A9/1

ARTICLE 9

Procedure for effecting coordination with or obtaining agreement of other administrations1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 8*bis*    (WRC‑12)

**Reasons:** There is no need to change the Radio Regulations specifically to address the supposed issue of excessive CR/C filings.

NOC CAN/USA/37A9/2

ARTICLE 11

Notification and recording of frequency   
assignments1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 7*bis*    (WRC‑12)

**Reasons:** There is no need to change the Radio Regulations specifically to address the supposed issue of excessive CR/C filings.
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